



NPO DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-01-08_POW_05879109

Broadcast: NPO broadcast | 2025-01-08 | Analysed on: 2026-05-22 20:12

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

TOTAL SCORE

2.5/10

Unremarkable

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 favouring the left, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly favouring the right). The calculation is based on the difference in average favouring of left vs. right parties (grouping according to CHES 2024).

TENDENCY (L – R)

5.0 / 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 in office 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 Dick 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) and FvD (3 seats).

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

The coalition is under pressure over the asylum dossier, with PVV demanding maximum restrictions while NSC and VVD operate more pragmatically. The climate debate is polarised between the left-wing opposition advocating ambitious targets and the coalition supporting nuclear energy and relaxation of nitrogen rules. The relationship between the public broadcaster and the coalition is tense: PVV has repeatedly labelled NPO a "left-wing broadcaster". In addition, the purchasing power issue plays a central role in the public debate.

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



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment per party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. party programme position
VVD	0	Not addressed in this broadcast — score not applicable
PVV	0	Not addressed in this broadcast — score not applicable
GL-PvdA	0	Not addressed in this broadcast — score not applicable
NSC	0	Not addressed in this broadcast — score not applicable
D66	0	Not addressed in this broadcast — score not applicable
BBB	0	Not addressed in this broadcast — score not applicable
CDA	0	Not addressed in this broadcast — score not applicable
SP	0	Not addressed in this broadcast — score not applicable

Summary Party Bias

- Most accurate representation: Not applicable — no party-political content in the broadcast
- Strongest distortion: Not applicable
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: This broadcast is a regular news broadcast (NOS Late News) with international and domestic news reports without explicit party-political content. No Dutch party is mentioned by name, nor are party positions represented or assessed. A party-political bias assessment is not applicable on the basis of this transcript.

Left-Right Overall Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: 0.0

CLASSIFICATION: Balanced

Reasoning: The broadcast contains exclusively factual news reports on international events (LA wildfires, release of Cecilia Sala, Ukraine, Gaza), domestic news (chew bones, agricultural machinery crime, snow) and sport. No political positions are taken, no parties are assessed and no politically coloured frames are used. A left-right tendency cannot be demonstrated on the basis of the available content.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast details

- Title: NOS Late News
- Date: 08.01.2025
- Length (estimated from transcript):
- Presenter/Reporter: Two presenters (names not mentioned in transcript); correspondents: Kysia Hekster (Brussels/Meta), Mustafa Marghadi (Indonesia); sports presenter Eline
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Owner of dog kennel Noordhoorn	Entrepreneur/witness	None	Not applicable
Stefan and Tobi Witkop	Owners of agricultural contracting company Swifterbant	None	Not applicable
Kysia Hekster	NOS correspondent Brussels	NOS	Not applicable
Mustafa Marghadi	NOS correspondent Indonesia	NOS	Not applicable
Residents of Urk (multiple)	Citizens	None	Not applicable
FC Utrecht supporters (multiple)	Citizens	None	Not applicable
Bryan Linssen	Footballer NEC	None	Not applicable
Weather presenter (name not mentioned)	Meteorologist NPO	None	Not applicable

Main topic

This broadcast is a regular evening news programme with a broad range of international and domestic news reports without an overarching political theme.



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

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Owner of dog kennel Noordhoorn (name not mentioned)

Timestamp: 04:25

Statement

***"This owner of a dog kennel in Noordhoorn in the province of Groningen suspects, as does the NVWA, that chew bones cause these serious neurological abnormalities."**

Framing

Experiential expert as entrepreneur in the dog sector; no veterinary or toxicological training mentioned

Missing counter-voice: An independent veterinarian or toxicologist could have scientifically tested the causality claim

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Private (kennel owner); possible commercial interests in the reputation of competing brands

(b) MANDATE: Not compatible with neutral scientific assessment of causality

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Possible commercial interests, but not demonstrably influential

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Speaking openly about own dogs implies some personal risk

D3 Competence: -1 — Experiential expert, no veterinary expertise

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No previous statements available

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Emotional account, no quantitative substantiation

D6 Source level: -1 — Tertiary (personal observation)

• TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) COMPETENCE: The statement is partially framed as factual through the reference to the NVWA, but the NVWA position is not directly quoted; the kennel owner is implicitly presented as confirmation of the NVWA's suspicions.

Expert 2: Kysia Hekster (NOS correspondent Brussels)

Timestamp: 06:19

Statement

***"Meta also seems to be positioning itself for changes in the European Union, just as in America."**

Framing

NOS journalist with expertise in EU policy; not an independent expert

Missing counter-voice: Digital rights organisation, academic media scholar

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Public (NOS/NPO)

(b) MANDATE: Journalistic interpretation, not scientific analysis

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — Publicly funded, no commercial interest

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Journalistic reputation at stake

D3 Competence: +1 — EU correspondent with relevant expertise

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Not verifiable

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Factual, reference to concrete steps (analysis to Brussels)



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

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary (journalistic interpretation)

- TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) COMPETENCE: Hekster is presented as a correspondent, which suggests a neutral framing; however, her interpretation is journalistic, not academic.

Expert 3: Mustafa Marghadi (NOS correspondent Indonesia)

Timestamp: 12:37

Statement

"Some journalists here started scratching their heads. Because they thought: What has he achieved as a coach?"

Framing

NOS journalist with regional expertise; not a football analyst

Missing counter-voice: Indonesian football association, sports analyst

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Public (NOS/NPO)

(b) MANDATE: Journalistic interpretation of local reactions

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No commercial interest

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Journalistic reputation

D3 Competence: +1 — Regional expertise

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Not verifiable

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Factual, refers to concrete achievements

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary

- TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) COMPETENCE: Marghadi articulates the scepticism of Indonesian journalists; this is a legitimate journalistic method but not an independent expert analysis.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent veterinarian/toxicologist (werewolf syndrome)
- Academic media scholar or digital rights expert (Meta decision)
- Climate scientist (LA wildfires)

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Owner of dog kennel Noordhoorn (name not mentioned)	0	+1	-1	0	-1	-1	-2	YELLOW
Kysia Hekster (NOS correspondent Brussels)	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+4	YELLOW
Mustafa Marghadi (NOS correspondent Indonesia)	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+4	YELLOW

Summary (matrix result):

- Kennel owner: YELLOW (-2) — experiential expert without veterinary expertise
- Kysia Hekster: YELLOW (+4) — journalistic interpretation, no academic analysis
- Mustafa Marghadi: YELLOW (+4) — regional journalistic expertise, not a sports analyst



2. SOURCE SELECTION

3/10

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: NVWA (Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority)

Timestamp: 04:01 — Statement: "About 50 owners and also the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority have their suspicions."

(a) Funding and management: State-funded, part of the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The NVWA has an institutional interest in demonstrating its own relevance and enforcement capacity; in an ongoing investigation, statements about "suspicions" are methodologically vulnerable

(c) Missing counter-source: An independent veterinary research institute (e.g. Wageningen University) could have tested the causality claim

Missing counter-source

Manufacturer Barkoo could have been given a right of reply

Source 2: Ministry of Defence

Timestamp: 07:45 — Statement: "This is what the Ministry of Defence reports following questions from NOS."

(a) Funding: State-funded

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The ministry has an interest in emphasising the Russian threat to justify defence expenditure; the figures (11 to 20 escorted ships) are not independently verified

(c) Missing counter-source: An independent maritime security expert or Russian response is absent

Source 3: Insurers (not further specified)

Timestamp: 08:02 — Statement: "International criminal gangs stole, according to the insurers, from as many as 46 companies last year, taking valuable tractors and other machinery."

(a) Funding: Private (insurance industry)

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Insurers have an interest in emphasising crime figures to justify premium increases; the source is not further specified (which insurer? which report?)

(c) Missing counter-source: Police figures or CBS statistics could have substantiated or nuanced the claim

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 02:26

Claim: "According to many, that was no coincidence."

Word marker: "according to many" — anonymous, unspecified source

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

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 07:47



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

Claim: "Russia is said to be using ships to map important infrastructure, such as undersea cables, and possibly sabotage it."

Word marker: "is said to" — conditional formulation without primary source

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

Summary: The source selection is predominantly institutional (government agencies, correspondents) with limited diversity; two rumours without a primary source increase the score by 2 penalty points. The insurer source is insufficiently specified for journalistic verification.



3. TIME ALLOCATION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Presenters (two): approx. 8 min. (40%)
- Weather presenter: approx. 2 min. (10%)
- Sports presenter Eline: approx. 1 min. (5%)
- Correspondents (Hekster, Marghadi): approx. 2 min. (10%)
- Interviewed citizens/those involved: approx. 5 min. (25%)
- Voice-over/reportage: approx. 2 min. (10%)

Summary: The time allocation is characteristic of a regular news programme without political guests; there is no asymmetric time allocation between political positions. The distribution across news topics is broad and proportionate.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is not shown, even though it is relevant?

Omission 1:

Context: Climate change as a causal factor in the LA wildfires

Relevant at: 00:27–01:49

Effect: The broadcast presents the wildfires as an exceptional but isolated phenomenon ("Never before has Los Angeles experienced such devastation") without mentioning the scientific consensus on the role of climate change in increasing wildfires. This creates an incomplete picture of the structural causes.

Omission 2:

Context: Right of reply from Meta or digital rights organisations on the fact-checking item

Relevant at: 05:07–06:47

Effect: The broadcast presents Zuckerberg's decision and the historical inconsistency ("But what he now calls censorship, he called four years ago... the best way to combat disinformation") without a counter-voice from digital rights organisations or academics. The frame of "censorship vs. freedom of expression" is not critically interpreted.

Omission 3:

Context: Response from manufacturer Barkoo to the allegations about chew bones

Relevant at: 03:51–05:07

Effect: The brand Barkoo is named as the suspected cause ("The chew bones from the German brand Barkoo are no longer available to order online") without the manufacturer being given a right of reply. This is journalistically incomplete and potentially damaging to the company's reputation.

Summary: The three omissions concern respectively a structural scientific context (climate), a missing counter-voice in a current societal debate (Meta) and the absence of a right of reply in a reputation-damaging claim (Barkoo). The omission of the Barkoo right of reply is journalistically the most problematic.

Missing voices

- Climate scientist: Could have explained the link between climate change and the increasing intensity of wildfires in California
- Digital rights organisation (e.g. Bits of Freedom): Could have represented the perspective of civil rights and protection against hate speech in the Meta decision
- Independent veterinarian or toxicologist: Could have scientifically explained the werewolf syndrome independently of the NVWA
- Police spokesperson or investigative service: Could have explained the enforcement perspective on agricultural machinery theft
- Iranian human rights organisation: Could have explained the broader context of Evin prison and Iran's hostage policy
- Humanitarian organisation (e.g. Red Cross): Could have represented the perspective of the Gaza hostages and their families
- Los Angeles fire department spokesperson: Could have explained the operational challenges in fighting the wildfires
- Consumer organisation or animal nutrition expert: Could have framed the safety risks of chew bones for dogs more broadly



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: 07:38

Figure: "The number has almost doubled, from 11 in 2023 to twenty last year."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute values present (11 → 20); (b) Share missing (how many Russian ships pass through the North Sea in total?); (c) Trend present (increase)

Missing context

Without the total number of Russian ship movements on the North Sea, the doubling cannot be interpreted as alarming or normal

Effect

The doubling suggests a significant escalation, but without a denominator the absolute significance is unclear

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 08:02

Figure: "International criminal gangs stole, according to the insurers, from as many as 46 companies last year, taking valuable tractors and other machinery."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute number present (46); (b) Share missing (how many agricultural and horticultural companies are there in the Netherlands in total?); (c) Trend missing (increase or decrease compared to previous years?)

Missing context

Without comparative figures from previous years and the total number of companies, the severity of the problem cannot be assessed

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:32

Figure: "70,000 people have already had to leave the area."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute number present; (b) Share missing (what percentage of the LA population?); (c) Comparison with previous evacuations missing

Missing context

Los Angeles County has approx. 10 million inhabitants; 70,000 is 0.7% — this nuances the scale, but also the severity of the situation for the affected neighbourhoods

Summary: In three cases, absolute numbers are presented without the necessary denominator or trend comparison. This is not demonstrably manipulative but leads to incomplete information transfer.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 05:31

Quote

"But what he now calls censorship, he called four years ago before the American Congress the best way to combat disinformation."

Technique: Zuckerberg is implicitly associated with inconsistency and opportunism by contrasting his current position with his earlier statements

Effect

This suggests that Zuckerberg's current position is not principled but politically motivated; this is a legitimate journalistic observation but is presented as fact rather than interpretation

No persons are framed as "conspiracy theorists" or similarly in this broadcast.

Summary: The only relevant association technique concerns the implicit discrediting of Zuckerberg via his own earlier statements. This is journalistically defensible but should have been made explicit as interpretation.



7. TIMING

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Position: 00:06–01:49 (beginning)

Content: "State of emergency in California due to wildfires in LA."

Timing effect

The wildfires are placed as the opening item, maximising their news value. This is journalistically defensible given the scale of the disaster, but the choice to place this above the Ukraine item (03:00) implies an editorial prioritisation of American news over European security news.

Finding 2:

Position: 19:28–19:41 (end)

Content: "Pharmacy assistants are holding a nationwide strike for higher wages. The collective labour agreement negotiations have been deadlocked for months. In the US it is a day of national mourning: Former President Jimmy Carter is being buried."

Timing effect

Two potentially significant items (national strike, funeral of a head of state) are dealt with in the last 15 seconds without any interpretation. This structurally minimises their news value.

Summary: The placement of the pharmacy assistants' strike as the very last item without any interpretation is notable; a national strike in the healthcare sector is socially relevant and deserved more attention.



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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 05:31

Triggering event: Zuckerberg announces abolition of fact-checkers

Reaction: "But what he now calls censorship, he called four years ago before the American Congress the best way to combat disinformation."

Comparison

In the coverage of the release of Cecilia Sala (02:01–02:52), the Iranian hostage-taking practice is described factually without comparable critical interpretation of the inconsistency in Iranian policy

Asymmetry: Slightly demonstrable — Zuckerberg's inconsistency is explicitly named; comparable inconsistencies of other actors (Iran, Israel) are not interpreted in the same way. However, the asymmetry is limited and can be explained by the fact that the Meta item is an opinion piece while the other items are purely factual.

Degree of indignation: 1/5

Selectivity: 1/5

Summary: There is a slight asymmetry in the critical interpretation of Zuckerberg's inconsistency compared to other actors, but the asymmetry is not systematic and can partly be explained by the different nature of the items.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast portray the subject?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 03:51–05:07

Missing perspective/fact: Response from manufacturer Barkoo and independent veterinary research

Relevance: The brand is named as the suspected cause; the right of reply is a fundamental journalistic principle

Effect

The absence of a right of reply from Barkoo and an independent scientific assessment makes the causality claim journalistically incomplete and potentially unlawful

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 05:07–06:47

Missing perspective/fact: Position of digital rights organisations, academics or victims of hate speech on the Meta item

Relevance: The debate on platform responsibility has multiple legitimate perspectives; only Zuckerberg's position and the historical inconsistency are highlighted

Effect

The public does not receive a complete picture of the social consequences of the decision

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 19:28–19:31

Missing perspective/fact: Background and context of the pharmacy assistants' strike

Relevance: A national strike in the healthcare sector touches on broader debates about employment conditions, staff shortages and accessibility of care

Effect

The item is dealt with in two sentences without any interpretation, meaning its social significance does not come across

Summary: The completeness of the broadcast is reasonable for a 20-minute news programme, but three structural gaps — missing right of reply for Barkoo, missing counter-voices on Meta, and underexposure of the pharmacy assistants' strike — reduce the informative value.

The NOS Late News of this evening reflects a broad news offering that is characteristic of a public broadcaster with a universal information duty. The wildfires in Los Angeles dominate the international news and touch on broader debates about climate change and disaster management. The release of Cecilia Sala illustrates the geopolitical tensions surrounding Iran and the practice of hostage-taking as a diplomatic instrument. The Meta report on the abolition of fact-checkers touches on the current debate about disinformation, platform responsibility and the relationship between freedom of expression and protection against hate speech.

Relevant Perspectives for a Balanced Broadcast

- Climate science perspective on the wildfires in LA (causes, climate change)
- Fire service and disaster management perspective (capacity problems, water infrastructure)

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



- Diplomatic-legal perspective on the release of Cecilia Sala (hostage exchange, international law)
- Digital rights and freedom of expression perspective on Meta's decision (pros and cons of fact-checking)
- Perspective of victims of hate speech and disinformation on the Meta decision
- Veterinary-scientific perspective on the werewolf syndrome in dogs
- Perspective of the agricultural sector on machinery theft (damage, prevention, enforcement)
- Geopolitical perspective on the Russian shadow fleet and underwater infrastructure
- Humanitarian perspective on the situation of hostages in Gaza
- Meteorological perspective on the snow forecast (already present in the broadcast)

Verification: Was each perspective addressed?

[A] INDICATED

Timestamp: 00:27–01:49 — Quote: "Never before has Los Angeles experienced such devastation from a wildfire." — Assessment: The broadcast mentions the scale but does not make an explicit link with climate change; the climate perspective is absent.

[B] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 01:27–01:46 — Quote: "There are too few firefighters to combat all the fires." — Assessment: Capacity problems and water infrastructure are briefly but factually mentioned.

[C] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 02:01–02:52 — Quote: "Whether Italy has struck a deal with Iran is not known." — Assessment: The diplomatic perspective is adequately addressed, including the uncertainty about a possible deal.

[D] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 05:07–06:47 — Quote: "Removing disinformation and hate on Facebook, Instagram and Threads goes too far, says Zuckerberg." — Assessment: Zuckerberg's position is presented; the counter-argument is implicitly indicated but not substantiated by a counter-voice.

[E] INDICATED

Timestamp: 05:54–06:06 — Quote: "Posts that spread hate or incite discrimination were removed." — Assessment: Concrete examples of removed hate messages are given, but victims or advocacy organisations are not given a voice.

[F] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 03:51–05:07 — Quote: "Chew bones cause these serious neurological abnormalities. Also known as the werewolf syndrome." — Assessment: The veterinary perspective is addressed via the kennel owner and reference to the NVWA; an independent veterinarian is absent.

[G] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 07:57–09:36 — Quote: "The estimate we had made was around 200,000 euros." — Assessment: The perspective of the affected entrepreneur is extensively addressed; the enforcement perspective of the police is absent.

[H] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 07:34–07:57 — Quote: "Russia is said to be using ships to map important infrastructure, such as undersea cables, and possibly sabotage it." — Assessment: The geopolitical perspective is addressed factually but concisely.

[I] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 06:47–07:17 — Quote: "Israel is taking into account that he was killed in an Israeli bombardment." — Assessment: The situation of the hostages is presented factually; humanitarian organisations are not given a voice.

[J] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 18:09–19:23 — Quote: "In Limburg those amounts can rise to 4 to 10 centimetres." — Assessment: The weather perspective is fully and professionally addressed.

Reasoning: The broadcast addresses most relevant perspectives at a factual level. The main gaps are the absence of a climate science perspective on the LA wildfires, the absence of counter-voices on the Meta report (digital rights



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

organisations, victims of hate speech) and the absence of an independent veterinarian on the werewolf syndrome item. For an evening news programme of 20 minutes, however, the coverage is broad and representative.

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)

3/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: How is the subject fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 05:14–05:36

Quote	<i>"In the US, CEO Zuckerberg is already stopping fact-checkers, people who check facts. Removing disinformation and hate on Facebook, Instagram and Threads goes too far, says Zuckerberg. But what he now calls censorship, he called four years ago before the American Congress the best way to combat disinformation."*</i>
Manipulation	The frame is set as "Zuckerberg reverses course" — the decision is primarily framed as inconsistency and opportunism, not as a principled debate about freedom of expression versus platform responsibility
Why problematic	Viewers who consider the decision principally defensible (freedom of expression, anti-censorship) are not offered this perspective; the frame steers towards a negative assessment of Zuckerberg's decision

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:49

Quote	<i>"Never before has Los Angeles experienced such devastation from a wildfire."*</i>
Manipulation	The wildfires are framed as an exceptional historical phenomenon without naming structural causes
Why problematic	The frame of "exceptional" prevents the link to climate change as a structural factor; this is a frame of coincidence rather than a frame of system

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 07:47

Quote	<i>"Russia is said to be using ships to map important infrastructure, such as undersea cables, and possibly sabotage it."*</i>
Manipulation	The frame is that of an active Russian threat; the conditional "is said to" is not further substantiated
Why problematic	The frame of Russian sabotage is presented as self-evident without verification or alternative explanation for the ship movements



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

Summary: The three framing findings are not systematically politically coloured but show a pattern of incomplete contextualisation: exceptionality without structural causes, inconsistency without principled debate, and threat without verification.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 04:34

Quote	<i>**Also known as the werewolf syndrome. Can be fatal.**</i>
Manipulation	The term "werewolf syndrome" is a popular name that evokes emotional and sensational connotations
Why problematic	The scientific term (serious neurological abnormalities caused by toxic substances) is replaced by a dramatising colloquial name; neutral alternative: "serious neurological condition"

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 05:21

Quote	<i>**Removing disinformation and hate on Facebook, Instagram and Threads goes too far, says Zuckerberg.**</i>
Manipulation	The paraphrase of Zuckerberg's position links "disinformation" and "hate" as one category, whereas Zuckerberg in his announcement distinguished between different types of content
Why problematic	The summary oversimplifies a nuanced position; neutral alternative: "adjusting the moderation policy"

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 11:22

Quote	<i>**Frans Verzeumeren in the background... and let's be honest, he's our sugar daddy here in Utrecht.**</i>
Manipulation	The term "sugar daddy" is informal and suggests a financially paternalistic character of the relationship between the sponsor and the club
Why problematic	This is an editorial choice to broadcast a quote from a supporter without commentary; the term is not neutral but has no political connotation

Summary: The word choice is predominantly neutral; the three findings concern sensationalisation ("werewolf syndrome"), simplification of a nuanced position (Meta) and an informal term in a sports context. No systematic political word choice is demonstrable.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

2/10

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:

Timestamp: 11:30–11:43

Triggering event: FC Utrecht supporter expresses scepticism about Haller's physical condition

Quote (presenter)

"Why not?"

Comparison

No follow-up questions are asked of other interviewed supporters (10:50–11:26)

Asymmetry: Slightly demonstrable — the sceptical supporter receives a follow-up question while enthusiastic supporters are not followed up; however, this can also be explained by the journalistic choice to explore a dissenting voice further

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 09:14–09:26

Triggering event: Entrepreneur Witkop mentions the damage of approx. 200,000 euros

Quote (reporter)

"What is the damage in money, may I ask? [...] And is that insured?"

Comparison

Factual, neutral follow-up questions without asymmetry compared to other interviewees

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable — the questions are factual and proportionate

Summary: Moderation behaviour is predominantly neutral and factual; the slight asymmetry with the Haller supporter is not systematic and can be journalistically defended.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Asymmetry 1:

To FC Utrecht supporter (sceptical), 11:30: "Why not?" — follow-up question, slightly critical

To FC Utrecht supporters (enthusiastic), 10:50–11:26: no follow-up questions — descriptive

Comparison

The sceptical supporter is asked a follow-up question, the enthusiastic supporters are not; this is a slight asymmetry that is journalistically defensible (a dissenting position deserves clarification)

Asymmetry 2:

To Bryan Linssen, 16:02: "What would you like to achieve with NEC?" — open, soft question

To Linssen, 15:25: "Can you be of help to them?" — open, soft question

Comparison

All questions to Linssen are open and inviting; no critical questions about his performances at Feyenoord or his age (34 years)

Comparison

Mustafa Marghadi does mention the critical questions of Indonesian journalists about Kluivert (12:48: "What has he achieved as a coach?") — however, this is a correspondent reporting local reactions, not the presenter interviewing a guest

Summary: The question asymmetry is limited and not political in nature; the slight asymmetry with the Haller supporters is journalistically defensible.



14. FALSE BALANCE

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance despite factual imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 05:47–05:57

Construction: "Meta was, compared to other tech companies, relatively ahead in tackling disinformation."

Analysis

This sentence suggests that Meta's earlier moderation policy was a positive outlier compared to the sector, which implicitly positions the current decision as a step backwards. There is no counterweight from a perspective that assessed the earlier policy as too restrictive.

Summary: There is no systematic false balance in this broadcast; the only relevant finding concerns an implicit positive framing of Meta's earlier moderation policy without counterweight.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Russian ship movements as a threat to infrastructure

Timestamp: 07:34–07:57 — Evidence: "Russia is said to be using ships to map important infrastructure, such as undersea cables, and possibly sabotage it."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether the doubling of escorted ships is a sign of increased Dutch alertness (rather than increased Russian activity) does not make it onto the agenda; nor does the question of what diplomatic or legal instruments are available

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Fact-checking as the norm for platform responsibility

Timestamp: 05:14–06:47 — Evidence: "Meta was, compared to other tech companies, relatively ahead in tackling disinformation."

Alternative agenda: The perspective that fact-checking itself is a form of editorial power that can be abused, or that algorithmic moderation raises fundamental questions about who determines the "facts", does not make it onto the agenda

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Pharmacy assistants' strike as marginal news value

Timestamp: 19:28–19:31 — Evidence: "Pharmacy assistants are holding a nationwide strike for higher wages. The collective labour agreement negotiations have been deadlocked for months."

Alternative agenda: The strike in the healthcare sector touches on broader debates about labour market issues, staff shortages and purchasing power; by dealing with the item in two sentences, its social importance is minimised

Summary: The agenda-setting is predominantly conventional for an evening news programme; the three findings show a pattern in which structural social questions (platform power, labour relations in healthcare, diplomatic alternatives to military alertness) do not make it onto the agenda.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	3	Predominantly journalists and experiential experts; no independent scientific experts on the most factually sensitive items
2	Source selection	H	3	Two rumours without a primary source and an insufficiently specified insurer source increase the score
3	Time allocation	H	2	No political guests; time allocation is proportionate for a regular news programme
4	Omission	H	4	Missing right of reply for Barkoo, missing counter-voices on Meta and underexposure of the pharmacy assistants' strike
5	Use of figures	H	3	Three cases of absolute numbers without denominator or trend comparison
6	Guilt by association	H	1	Only the implicit discrediting of Zuckerberg via his own earlier statements
7	Timing	H	2	Pharmacy assistants' strike and Carter's funeral are dealt with in the last 15 seconds
8	Selective indignation	H	2	Slight asymmetry in critical interpretation of Zuckerberg's inconsistency compared to other actors
9	Completeness	H	4	Three structural gaps: Barkoo right of reply, Meta counter-voices, pharmacy assistants' strike
10	Framing	S	3	Pattern of incomplete contextualisation on three items without systematic political colouring
11	Word choice	S	2	Limited sensationalisation ("werewolf syndrome") and simplification (Meta); no political word choice
12	Moderation behaviour	S	2	Predominantly neutral; slight asymmetry with Haller supporter journalistically defensible
13	Question asymmetry	S	2	Limited asymmetry, not political in nature
14	False balance	S	1	No systematic false balance; one implicit positive framing of Meta's earlier policy
15	Agenda-setting	S	3	Structural social questions (platform power, labour relations, diplomatic alternatives) do not make it onto the agenda

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 2.7 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 2.2 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 2.5 / 10

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



Dominant Techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 4):** The absence of a right of reply in the Barkoo allegation is the most journalistically problematic finding; the brand is named as the suspected cause without the manufacturer being given a right of reply. In addition, counter-voices are absent on the Meta item and the pharmacy assistants' strike is structurally underexposed.
- 2. Completeness (Score 4):** The three structural gaps — Barkoo right of reply, Meta counter-voices and the pharmacy assistants' strike — reduce the informative value of the broadcast at specific points, without there being a systematic pattern of political one-sidedness.
- 3. Framing (Score 3):** The Meta item is framed as a story about Zuckerberg's inconsistency and opportunism, without opening the principled debate about freedom of expression versus platform responsibility. The wildfires are framed as an exceptional phenomenon without naming structural causes.

Key Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "Zuckerberg's decision to abolish fact-checkers is inconsistent and opportunistic."*

Technique: Framing via historical contrast — Evidence: 05:31, 05:47

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "The wildfires in Los Angeles are an exceptional disaster that is overwhelming the emergency services."*

Technique: Selective omission (no climate context) + timing (opening item) — Evidence: 00:06, 01:49

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Russian threat to Dutch infrastructure is increasing."*

Technique: Framing as threat + use of figures without denominator — Evidence: 07:34, 07:47

- Slight tendency (2.5)

Reasoning: The broadcast scores 2.5/10 on the overall manipulation scale, indicating a slight tendency without systematic political one-sidedness. The main shortcomings are journalistic-technical in nature: missing right of reply for Barkoo, incomplete contextualisation on the LA wildfires and the Meta item, and two rumours without a primary source. There is no demonstrable party-political bias. In the light of Media Act Art. 2.1, the findings are not of such a nature that they structurally violate the pluralism requirement, but the omission of the Barkoo right of reply and the two uncovered rumours are journalistic shortcomings that deserve attention.

CONCLUSION

The NOS Late News of this evening is a regular news broadcast without demonstrable party-political bias or systematic manipulation. The total score of 2.5/10 reflects a number of journalistic shortcomings that are not political but methodological in nature: the absence of a right of reply in the Barkoo allegation, two rumours without a primary source, and incomplete contextualisation on the LA wildfires and the Meta item. The broadcast broadly meets the requirements of Media Act Art. 2.1 regarding pluralism and balance, but the omission of the Barkoo right of reply is a concrete violation of the journalistic principle of the right of reply that also falls under the duty of care of the public broadcaster. The pharmacy assistants' strike — a national labour dispute in the healthcare sector — is dealt with in two sentences, which does not fully fulfil the informative function of the public broadcaster on this point.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

2.7/10

Slight imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

2.2/10

Unremarkable

TOTAL SCORE

2.5/10

Unremarkable

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	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 onwards are classified as 'significant findings'.
7	Significant 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	Significant imbalance	Multiple significant 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 FRAMEWORK (Media Act Art. 2.1)

Assessment on the basis of Media Act Art. 2.1

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

Violation 1:

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 (duty of care / right of reply)

Description of facts: The brand Barkoo is named as the suspected cause of serious neurological conditions and the death of dogs, without the manufacturer being given a right of reply

Evidence: Timestamp 05:00 — Quote: "The chew bones from the German brand Barkoo are no longer available to order online."

Assessment: The absence of a right of reply in a reputation-damaging claim is a violation of the journalistic duty of care that also falls under the public broadcasting remit; this is the most concrete legally relevant finding in this broadcast

Violation 2:

Standard: Media Act Art. 2.1 (factual accuracy / source attribution)

Description of facts: Two claims are presented without a primary source: the suggestion that the arrest of Cecilia Sala was no coincidence, and the claim that Russia is using ships for sabotage of undersea cables

Evidence: Timestamp 02:26 — Quote: "According to many, that was no coincidence."; Timestamp 07:47 — Quote: "Russia is said to be using ships to map important infrastructure, such as undersea cables, and possibly sabotage it."

Assessment: The use of anonymous or unspecified sources in factually sensitive claims is contrary to the requirement of factual accuracy and transparent source attribution that the public broadcaster is required to observe under Media Act Art. 2.1

No violation recognised for: Party-political bias, systematic one-sidedness, manipulative framing or selective indignation — these are not demonstrable in this broadcast.

Overall Assessment Media Act Art. 2.1

The NOS Late News broadly meets the requirements of Media Act Art. 2.1 regarding pluralism, balance and independence. There is no demonstrable party-political one-sidedness and the broadcast covers a broad range of topics with predominantly factual reporting. However, two concrete shortcomings are legally relevant: the absence of a right of reply in the Barkoo allegation and the use of two uncovered rumours without a primary source. These shortcomings are not of such a nature that they constitute a structural violation of the pluralism requirement, but they are contrary to the journalistic duty of care that the public broadcaster is required to observe under its statutory remit. A formal complaint to the Media Authority on the basis of these findings could be admissible, but the likelihood of a formal sanction is limited on the basis of the available findings.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE DEPTH CHECK

1. NVWA (Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority)

- FUNDING:** State-funded; part of the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (LNV)
 - MANDATE:** Supervision of food safety and product safety; the mandate is in principle compatible with a neutral assessment of product safety, but the NVWA has an institutional interest in demonstrating its own relevance and enforcement capacity
 - CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** In an ongoing investigation, statements about "suspicions" are methodologically vulnerable; the NVWA has an interest in visibility and decisiveness, which may reinforce the tendency to communicate prematurely
 - CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Institutional interest in relevance, but no commercial interest
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public statements bind the organisation
 - D3 Competence: +2 — Statutory mandate and expertise in the field of product safety
 - D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Not verifiable
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Institutional communication is predominantly factual
 - D6 Source level: +1 — Primary supervisory authority (but still in investigation phase)
- TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTER-VOICE:** An independent veterinary research institute (e.g. Wageningen University & Research) could have tested the causality claim; manufacturer Barkoo should have been given a right of reply

2. Ministry of Defence

- FUNDING:** State-funded
 - MANDATE:** National security and defence; the mandate is not fully compatible with neutral assessment of Russian intentions, since the ministry has an interest in emphasising threats to justify defence expenditure
 - CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Structural interest in emphasising the Russian threat; the figures are not independently verified
 - CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Structural interest in threat perception
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public statements bind the ministry
 - D3 Competence: +2 — Statutory mandate and operational expertise
 - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent with earlier policy
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Factual figures (11 → 20)
 - D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source (own operational data)
- TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTER-VOICE:** An independent maritime security expert or a Russian response is absent; the interpretation of the ship movements as sabotage intent has not been independently verified

3. Insurers (not further specified)

- FUNDING:** Private (insurance industry)
- MANDATE:** Commercial; the mandate is not compatible with neutral assessment of crime figures
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Insurers have an interest in emphasising crime figures to justify premium increases and expansion of insurance products; the source is not further specified
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Commercial interest in high crime figures
 - D2 Personal risk: 0 — Anonymous industry statement
 - D3 Competence: +1 — Access to claims data
 - D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Not verifiable
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Numerical claim
 - D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary (industry aggregate, not specified)



- TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

5. COUNTER-VOICE: Police figures (CBS Safety Monitor) or an independent research institute could have substantiated or nuanced the claim; the source should have been specified in more detail

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be critically assessed. The NVWA and the Ministry of Defence score GREEN on the credibility matrix, but this does not alter the fact that their institutional interests must be made transparent in the reporting.

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
NVWA (Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority)	0	+1	+2	0	+1	+1	+5	GREEN
Ministry of Defence	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+5	GREEN
Insurers (not further specified)	-2	0	+1	0	+1	-1	-1	YELLOW

Legal and methodological notes

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



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Netherlands — NPO

Act

Media Act 2008

Relevant articles

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

Core obligations

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

Supervisory authority

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

Complaints procedure

1. NPO Ombudsman
2. Media Authority
3. Court (administrative law)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC SOURCES

Literature

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

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

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



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

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

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

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

The following books are available from SVFAB

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



Unbalanced reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and source selection. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, removal of context and much more, illustrated with numerous examples. In addition, it becomes visible where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight but also empathy.

Optionally the book is supplied with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage — and someone else has written the script.

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

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

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



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



You think you see the world. In Wirklichkeit siehst du den Rahmen, den jemand um sie gelegt hat. Framing ist die älteste und eleganteste Manipulationstechnik der wereld ziet. Sie verändert nicht die Fakten – sie verändert, was wir aus den Fakten machen. Wie wir fühlen. Was wir glauben. Wie wir entscheiden. Und sie funktioniert – weil wir alle mitmachen. Täglich. Unbewusst. Auch du. Dieses Buch ist kein trockenes Lehrbuch. Es ist ein Übungsbuch – spielerisch, direkt, voller Beispiele aus dem echten Leben. Du lernst nicht nur, wie andere dich framen. Du lernst, wie du selbst framest – und wie du es bewusst und fair einsetzen kannst.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Hear news differently. Conduct conversations more confidently. And can no longer so easily have a frame imposed on them 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.