



NPO DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-05-20_VPWON_1360454

Broadcast: NPO broadcast | 2025-05-20 | Analysed on: 2026-05-23 00:46

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)

4.8 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Schoof cabinet (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), SP (5 seats), CDA (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	Socialist, anti-market
GL-PvdA	2.4	25	Opposition (largest)	Progressive-left, climate, humane asylum
PvdD	2.5	3	Opposition	Animal rights, left-green
D66	4.8	9	Opposition	Liberal-progressive, pro-EU
CDA	5.5	5	Opposition	Christian democratic, centre-right
NSC	5.8	20	Government	Economic security, rule of law
CU	6.0	3	Opposition	Christian-social
VVD	7.0	24	Government	Liberal-right, free market
BBB	7.5	7	Government	Agrarian-populist
SGP	7.8	3	Opposition	Reformed, right-conservative
PVV	9.2	37	Government (largest)	Migration stop, Islam-critical, Wilders
FvD	9.5	3	Opposition	Far-right, Baudet

The coalition is under pressure due to fundamental disagreements over the Israel-Gaza conflict: NSC minister Veldkamp is pursuing a more critical course towards Israel than coalition partner PVV desires. At the same time, municipalities are struggling with the consequences of migration policy, with nuisance caused by unaccompanied minor asylum seekers creating a concrete administrative crisis. The position of NSC has been weakened following the departure of Pieter Omtzigt, further destabilising the internal coalition dynamics. The tension between national sovereignty and European cooperation runs as a common thread through multiple dossiers.

The Dutch public broadcaster (NPO) operates under the Media Act 2008, whereby Article 2.1 requires pluriform, balanced and independent reporting across the total output. The NPO system is fragmented: broadcasting associations (BNNVARA, AVRO TROS, KRO-NCRV and others) each bear their own editorial responsibility. PVV and Wilders have repeatedly criticised the NPO as a "left-wing broadcaster", illustrating the institutional tension between the largest governing party and the public broadcaster.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment per party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. Party programme
VVD	+1	13:20 "Israel has every right to defend itself. But Israel must do so within the boundaries of international law." — Party position: strict but fair foreign policy, pro-rule of law — correctly represented, VVD spokesperson is given space for a nuanced position
PVV	-2	10:12 "Veldkamp has been bold here and bypassed Wilders." / 10:39 "Wilders won't like that." / 11:03 "He has mainly been angry behind the scenes." — Party position: pro-Israel, national sovereignty — PVV position is described exclusively via third parties (correspondent) as an emotional reaction, without its own voice or substantive explanation; slightly distorting
GL-PvdA	0	Not present in the broadcast as a party or spokesperson — party position not represented
NSC	-1	09:53 "fits the picture of NSC at the moment. Pieter Omtzigt has left. They have been wiped out in the polls." — Party position: economic security, rule of law — NSC is primarily framed through electoral weakness and survival politics, not through substantive position; slightly distorting
D66	0	Not present in the broadcast — party position not represented
BBB	0	Not present in the broadcast — party position not represented
CDA	0	Not present in the broadcast — party position not represented
SP	0	Not present in the broadcast — party position not represented

Summary Party Bias

- Most accurate representation: VVD (score +1) — spokesperson is given space for their own position
- Strongest distortion: PVV (score -2) — position described exclusively via third parties as an emotional reaction, no own voice
- Average deviation from 0: 0.5
- Conclusion: Most parties are absent from the broadcast. Where parties are discussed, the VVD receives its own voice via a spokesperson, while the PVV is portrayed exclusively through a correspondent's interpretation as a party that is "angry" and has "given up the fight." This is a structural difference in treatment that reduces the PVV position to an emotional reaction without substantive underpinning.

Left-Right Overall Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +1.4

CLASSIFICATION: Left-favouring

Reasoning: The broadcast addresses the Israel-Gaza conflict from a frame that presents criticism of Israel as a diplomatic success, while the pro-Israel position of PVV is framed exclusively via third parties as obstruction. The nuisance issue with Syrian asylum seekers is treated in a nuanced manner with attention to structural causes (trauma,



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

perspective), which corresponds to a progressive frame. Right-wing coalition partners (PVV, BBB) are given no voice of their own; left-wing perspectives (humanitarian law, diplomatic pressure on Israel) dominate the agenda.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast details

- Title: NOS Journaal (evening broadcast, presumably 20:00 or 21:30)
- Date: 20.05.2025
- Length: Approx. 41 minutes (transcript ends at 41:07)
- Presenter/Reporter: Not named in transcript; correspondents Kysia Hekster (Brussels) and Arjan Noorlander (The Hague)

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Kysia Hekster	EU correspondent NOS	NOS	Journalistic, neutral
Arjan Noorlander	Political correspondent NOS	NOS	Journalistic, neutral
Minister Veldkamp	Minister of Foreign Affairs	NSC	Centre-right
VVD spokesperson (name not mentioned)	Member of Parliament/spokesperson Foreign Affairs	VVD	Right-liberal
Sharon Dijksma	Mayor of Utrecht	PvdA (background)	Left
Alex de Waal	Researcher on famines	Independent academic	Non-political
Tess Meerding	VVD Utrecht faction leader	VVD Utrecht	Right-liberal
Indian Minister Jaishankar	Minister of Foreign Affairs India	BJP	Non-Dutch

Main theme

The broadcast covers three main topics: (1) the EU investigation into Israeli conduct in Gaza as a diplomatic initiative by Minister Veldkamp, (2) nuisance issues caused by minor Syrian asylum seekers in Utrecht, and (3) an in memoriam for former VVD leader Hans Wiegel.



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: Alex de Waal — researcher on famines and humanitarian crises

Timestamp: 03:19

Statement: "Alex de Waal is a renowned researcher in the field of famines and humanitarian crises."

Framing: Introduced as a "renowned researcher" without further institutional affiliation in the transcript; his analysis supports the frame of a serious humanitarian crisis in Gaza.

Missing counter-voice: An Israeli military or legal expert who could have explained the operational context and the Israeli position on humanitarian access.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Alex de Waal is affiliated with the Fletcher School (Tufts University) and World Peace Foundation. Funding via academic and philanthropic sources; no direct government funding established. Limited structural conflict of interest.

(b) MANDATE: His expertise in the field of famines is relevant to the humanitarian dimension; his mandate does not include legal assessment of the laws of war.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — Academic, no direct institutional ties to either party

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Academic reputation at stake if statements are incorrect

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Recognised expert on famines; this is his core area

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistently critical of humanitarian crises worldwide

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

D6 Source level: +2 — Primary researcher

• TOTAL: +8 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The introduction as "renowned" is a social attribution not further substantiated in the broadcast; his conclusions are presented as established fact without counter-voice from the Israeli side.

Expert 2: Kysia Hekster — EU correspondent NOS

Timestamp: 02:08

Statement: "You can certainly call it that. It is the first time that a large majority of EU countries says: our patience with Israel has now run out."

Framing: Hekster is deployed as a factual reporter but makes normative statements ("our patience has run out") that imply a political judgement.

Missing counter-voice: A correspondent or analyst representing the EU countries that are against the investigation.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: NOS, publicly funded via state contribution. Structurally independent but subject to editorial frameworks.

(b) MANDATE: Journalistic reporting; not neutral-analytical but interpretive.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No direct personal interest

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Journalistic reputation

D3 Professional competence: +1 — EU correspondent, but not a legal or diplomatic expert

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Unknown



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

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "Our patience has run out" is normative, not factual

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (reporting of meetings)

- TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Hekster is deployed as a factual reporter but her statements contain normative judgements that are presented as fact.

Expert 3: Arjan Noorlander — political correspondent NOS

Timestamp: 09:12

Statement: "Veldkamp has been bold here and bypassed Wilders."

Framing: Noorlander analyses the coalition dynamics but uses figurative language ("been bold", "bypassed Wilders") that implies a political judgement.

Missing counter-voice: A political scientist or PVV spokesperson who could have interpreted the coalition dynamics from a different perspective.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: NOS, publicly funded.

(b) MANDATE: Political correspondent; interpretive role.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No direct personal interest

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Journalistic reputation

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Political correspondent, but not an independent political scientist

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Unknown

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Figurative language with normative charge

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source

- TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Noorlander's analysis of Wilders as "angry behind the scenes" and having "given up the fight" is not substantiated with direct quotes or sources; it is presented as fact.

Missing expert groups:

- Israeli legal or military expert
- Independent international law expert on the genocide question
- Political scientist on coalition dynamics (instead of only NOS correspondents)

Summary:

Expert	Source light	Key finding
Alex de Waal	GREEN (+8)	Relevant expertise, no direct counter-voice
Kysia Hekster	YELLOW (+2)	Normative statements presented as fact
Arjan Noorlander	YELLOW (+2)	Political interpretations without direct source citation



2. SOURCE SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

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

Source 1: "Many studies have already demonstrated that"

Timestamp: 07:55 — Statement: "Many studies have already demonstrated that."

(a) Funding and sponsorship: Not specified; not a single source is named.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The vague reference to "many studies" without source citation makes verification impossible and suggests a consensus that is not further substantiated.

(c) Missing counter-source: Studies or reports reaching different conclusions about Israeli conduct are not cited.

Rumour test (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 11:03

Claim: "He has mainly been angry behind the scenes."

Word marker: "behind the scenes" — implies non-verifiable information

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

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 10:20

Claim: "Wilders perhaps did not expect this."

Word marker: "perhaps" — speculative

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

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 27:43

Claim: "We heard today that many of those young Syrian boys are arranging to fight there, in Utrecht, across the country."

Word marker: "we heard" — anonymous source, not verified

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

Summary: The broadcast contains three unsubstantiated claims presented as fact or near-fact without primary source citation; this increases the score by 3 penalty points. Source diversity is limited: predominantly NOS correspondents and one political guest.



3. TIME ALLOCATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Israel-Gaza (correspondents + Veldkamp + VVD spokesperson): approx. 15 min. (37%)
- AMV nuisance Utrecht (Dijkma + report): approx. 10 min. (24%)
- In memoriam Wiegel: approx. 7 min. (17%)
- Other news items (India, Mexico, Bodegraven, Syria, ABN Amro, weather): approx. 7 min. (17%)
- Presenter/transitions: approx. 2 min. (5%)

Within the Israel-Gaza block:

- Pro-investigation/critical of Israel (Hekster, Noorlander, Veldkamp): approx. 10 min.
- Pro-Israel/PVV position: 0 min. (described exclusively via third parties)
- VVD spokesperson (nuanced): approx. 3 min.
- Humanitarian situation Gaza: approx. 2 min.

Summary: The distribution of speaking time within the Israel-Gaza block is structurally unbalanced: the critical position towards Israel dominates, while the pro-Israel position (PVV, the largest governing party) receives no speaking time of its own. This is a measurable asymmetry.



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: Israeli position

Context The entire Israel-Gaza block () contains not a single response from the Israeli side.

Relevant at: 01:07 — "The European Commission will investigate Israel's conduct in Gaza."

Effect The broadcast presents exclusively the critical position; the Israeli position on humanitarian access, military necessity and the EU initiative is entirely absent, creating a one-sided picture.

Omission 2: Ministry of Asylum and Migration

Context Mayor Dijksma explicitly requests national government support and criticises cabinet policy.

Relevant at: 31:43 — "Asylum seekers they would rather not have."

Effect The responsible minister (Faber, PVV) is given no opportunity to respond to Dijksma's criticism; the cabinet's position on AMV policy and funding is entirely absent.

Omission 3: Hamas role and 7 October context

Context The conflict is discussed without reference to the cause (Hamas attack 7 October 2023) or the role of Hamas in the humanitarian situation.

Relevant at: 12:13 — "Yes, and my call is: be strict and more critical of Hamas." (VVD spokesperson)

Effect The VVD spokesperson raises Hamas but this is not elaborated upon; the context of the Hamas attack and the hostages is absent, reducing the conflict to Israeli conduct versus humanitarian need.

Summary: Three structural omissions reinforce each other: the absence of the Israeli position, the absence of the responsible minister in the AMV issue, and the omission of the Hamas context together create a systematically one-sided picture on the two politically most sensitive dossiers.

Missing voices

- Israeli embassy/spokesperson: Could have explained the Israeli position on military operations and humanitarian policy
- Minister Faber (Asylum and Migration, PVV): Could have clarified the national government's position on AMV policy and funding, directly relevant to Dijksma's call
- COA spokesperson: Could have explained the operational challenges in supervising AMVs
- Legal expert in international law: Could have factually analysed the question of genocide and humanitarian law instead of leaving it to be answered politically
- Mayor of Groningen or Arnhem: Could have illustrated the comparative dimension of the AMV problem
- Nidos guardianship institution: Could have provided the perspective of the responsible guardianship organisation



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

- Hamas or Palestinian Authority: Could have represented the other party's perspective in the conflict (though this is journalistically complex)
- ABN Amro economist: Could have contextualised the purchasing power figures within a broader economic context



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

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: AMV numbers Utrecht

Timestamp: 26:16

Figure: "Of the 169, 94 come from 45 other municipalities in the Netherlands."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute: 169 young people in Utrecht's approach, 94 from elsewhere — shown ✓
- (b) Share: No ratio to total number of AMVs in the Netherlands — missing X
- (c) Trend: No comparison with earlier periods — missing X

Missing context: How many AMVs are there in total in the Netherlands? Is 169 a lot or a little? Is the number rising or falling?

Effect: The absolute numbers suggest a large-scale problem without the relative scale or trend becoming clear.

Finding 2: ABN Amro purchasing power figures

Timestamp: 21:33

Figure: "We are spending an ever smaller share of our income on fixed costs, such as rent and the energy bill."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute: Not given X
- (b) Share: "ever smaller share" — direction indicated but no percentage X
- (c) Trend: "since 2021" — trend indicated ✓

Missing context: No absolute percentages, no distinction by income groups, no comparison with other countries.

Effect: The positive news is dealt with in two sentences without any interpretation; the informational value is minimal.

Summary: Two cases of incomplete presentation of figures: the AMV numbers lack relative context, the purchasing power figures are treated too briefly for meaningful interpretation. No active manipulation, but structural incompleteness.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1: Wilders and obstruction

Timestamp: 10:12

Quote: "Veldkamp has been bold here and bypassed Wilders."

Technique: Veldkamp is framed as courageous ("bold"), Wilders implicitly as an obstacle that must be "bypassed".

Effect: Wilders is positioned without his own voice as an obstacle to be circumvented, not as a politician with a legitimate substantive position.

Association 2: PVV and electoral irrelevance

Timestamp: 10:46

Quote: "He has given up the fight a little. For his supporters it is not the most important topic."

Technique: The PVV position is reduced to electoral calculation, not substantive conviction.

Effect: The pro-Israel position of PVV is framed as political opportunism, not as a principled choice.

Summary: No explicit "guilt by association" in the classical sense, but a subtle association of Wilders/PVV with obstruction and electoral calculation without their own voice to refute this. Score limited because the technique is not deployed systematically.



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

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

Finding 1: Opening with diplomatic success

Position: 00:02 (beginning)

Content: "That war must stop. The misery is beyond comprehension. And I find it important that Europe has now embraced this signal from the Netherlands."

Timing effect: The broadcast opens with an emotional appeal ("misery is beyond comprehension") that sets the frame for the entire Israel-Gaza coverage before any context or counter-voice has been offered. This is the strongest position in a news broadcast.

Finding 2: Genocide question at the end of the Israel block

Position: 13:44 (end of Israel block)

Content: "Is what Israel is currently doing in Gaza genocide in your view?"

Timing effect: The most explosive question is asked at the end of the block, after which the answer ("Totally insane" — presumably a reaction from outside the interview) is not elaborated upon. The question is asked but the answer is left hanging, leaving an unresolved frame.

Finding 3: Wiegel portrait as closing

Position: 32:30 (end of broadcast)

Content: Extensive in memoriam for Hans Wiegel

Timing effect: The positive, nostalgic portrait of a VVD politician as the closing of the broadcast creates a warm final tone that contrasts with the critical tone in the earlier political coverage.

Summary: The opening with an emotional frame about Gaza and the strategic placement of the genocide question at the end of the block are the most significant timing findings; both reinforce the critical frame towards Israel.



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: Genocide question without equivalent

Timestamp: 13:44

Triggering event: VVD spokesperson speaks about Israeli conduct in Gaza

Reaction: "Is what Israel is currently doing in Gaza genocide in your view?" — direct, sharp question

Comparison: No comparable question about Hamas violence, hostages or the 7 October attack in the broadcast

Asymmetry: The most charged legal qualification is directed exclusively at Israeli conduct; Hamas violence is not questioned with comparable terminology.

Degree of indignation: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Finding 2: Tone with Dijkma vs. absence of ministry

Timestamp: 31:43

Triggering event: Dijkma criticises cabinet policy ("The cabinet must not burden the mayors of this country with the consequences of that.")

Reaction: No follow-up question, no confrontation with the cabinet's position

Comparison: With the VVD spokesperson on Gaza, follow-up questions are asked (13:32 "But should you attach consequences to that?")

Asymmetry: Dijkma's criticism of the cabinet is not confronted with the cabinet's position; the VVD spokesperson is questioned critically.

Degree of indignation: 1/5

Selectivity: 2/5

Summary: The genocide question is the most significant asymmetry: the heaviest legal qualification is directed exclusively at Israeli conduct without an equivalent for Hamas violence. The asymmetry is present but not systematic.



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: One-sided Israel-Gaza frame

Timestamp: 01:07 to 15:34

Missing perspective: Israeli position, pro-Israel politicians, hostage context, Hamas role

Relevance: Balanced reporting on an armed conflict requires hearing all parties involved

Effect: The broadcast presents the conflict exclusively from the perspective of criticism of Israel; viewers do not receive a complete picture of the complexity.

Finding 2: AMV issue without policy context

Timestamp: 22:16 to 32:27

Missing perspective: National government policy, Ministry of Asylum and Migration, COA position, legal frameworks for AMVs

Relevance: Dijksma's appeal to the national government requires, for balanced reporting, a response from the responsible ministry

Effect: The broadcast presents exclusively the municipal perspective; the national government perspective is entirely absent.

Finding 3: Coalition dynamics without PVV voice

Timestamp: 09:12 to 15:34

Missing perspective: PVV spokesperson or Wilders himself on the EU investigation

Relevance: PVV is the largest coalition party and has a fundamentally different position on Israel

Effect: The coalition dynamics are described exclusively via NOS correspondents; the PVV position is interpreted without verification.

Summary: Three structural completeness deficiencies reinforce each other and create a systematically one-sided picture on the two politically most sensitive dossiers of the broadcast; this directly touches on the pluriformity requirement of the Media Act.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How is the subject fundamentally framed?

Finding 1: Diplomatic success as starting point

Timestamp: 01:02

Quote: "Minister Veldkamp of Foreign Affairs drew a line in the sand and got what he asked for."

Manipulation: The EU investigation is immediately framed as a "success" and "line in the sand" — a normative judgement presented as fact.

Why problematic: Viewers are steered to assess the initiative as positive before any context or counter-voice has been offered; alternative frames (diplomatic escalation, precedent-setting, effectiveness) are not offered.

Finding 2: Israel as violator of humanitarian law

Timestamp: 01:12

Quote: "The minister believes that Israel is violating humanitarian law by not allowing aid into Gaza."

Manipulation: The ministerial opinion is presented as a factual description ("violates"), not as a political position.

Why problematic: The legal question of whether a violation of humanitarian law is occurring is contested and is being assessed by international courts; presenting a ministerial opinion as fact is journalistically careless.

Finding 3: AMV nuisance as cabinet responsibility

Timestamp: 32:00

Quote: "The cabinet must not burden the mayors of this country with the consequences of that."

Manipulation: Dijksma's frame — that the AMV problem is a consequence of cabinet policy for which the national government is responsible — is not confronted with an alternative frame.

Why problematic: The frame implies that the current cabinet (PVV-VVD-NSC-BBB) is responsible for a problem that also existed under previous cabinets; this is not contextualised.

Summary: The dominant frame of the broadcast is that diplomatic pressure on Israel is a success and that the cabinet is falling short in the AMV approach; both frames are not systematically challenged by alternative perspectives.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1: "Been bold"

Timestamp: 10:12

Quote: "Veldkamp has been bold here and bypassed Wilders."

Manipulation: "Being bold" has a positive connotation of courage and decisiveness; "bypassed Wilders" has a negative connotation of circumvention.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative would be: "Veldkamp took the initiative without prior consultation with the PVV."

Finding 2: "Our patience with Israel has now run out"

Timestamp: 02:17

Quote: "It is the first time that a large majority of EU countries says: our patience with Israel has now run out."

Manipulation: "Our patience has run out" is an emotionally charged expression that implies a moral judgement; it is presented as a factual description of the EU position.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "A large majority of EU countries supports an investigation into Israeli conduct."

Finding 3: "Diplomatic isolation"

Timestamp: 16:47

Quote: "It is yet another signal that Israel is finding itself in an ever deeper diplomatic isolation."

Manipulation: "Ever deeper diplomatic isolation" is a normative judgement that frames Israel's position as problematic and increasingly isolated.

Why problematic: Neutral alternative: "Several countries have taken diplomatic measures with regard to Israel."

Summary: The word choice in the Israel-Gaza block is consistently critical towards Israel and positive towards the EU initiative; neutral alternatives are not used, which has a cumulative effect on the tone.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

5/10

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: Follow-up questions to VVD on sanctions, not to Dijksma on cabinet policy

Timestamp: 13:32

Triggering event: VVD spokesperson says the cabinet policy is the right course

Quote (moderator): "But should you attach consequences to that? Do you want to go so far as to impose sanctions?"

Comparison: Dijksma criticises the cabinet (31:43) — no comparable follow-up question about what she herself could have done earlier or about her own responsibility

Asymmetry: The VVD spokesperson is questioned critically; Dijksma's criticism of the cabinet is not confronted with an opposing question. Asymmetry present but limited.

Finding 2: Genocide question as closing

Timestamp: 13:44

Triggering event: Discussion about Israeli conduct

Quote (moderator): "Is what Israel is currently doing in Gaza genocide in your view?"

Comparison: No comparable question about Hamas violence or hostages to the same or other guests

Asymmetry: The heaviest legal qualification is directed exclusively at Israeli conduct; no equivalent for the other party in the conflict.

Finding 3: Soft closing with Dijksma

Timestamp: 32:27

Triggering event: Dijksma closes with criticism of the cabinet

Quote (moderator): "Thank you for coming."

Comparison: With the VVD spokesperson, the interview ends after critical follow-up questions; with Dijksma, the criticism of the cabinet is not confronted

Asymmetry: Dijksma's criticism of the cabinet gets the last word without rebuttal; this reinforces her frame.

Summary: The moderation behaviour shows a pattern whereby criticism of the cabinet (Dijksma) is followed up less critically than the cabinet positions themselves (VVD spokesperson); the genocide question is the most significant asymmetry.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Different hard/soft questions to different people.

Asymmetry 1: VVD vs. Dijksma

To VVD spokesperson, 13:32: "But should you attach consequences to that? Do you want to go so far as to impose sanctions?" — hard, confrontational

To Dijksma, 31:39: "Is it realistic to expect the national government to provide more money for this?" — soft, almost rhetorical

Comparison: The VVD spokesperson is asked about concrete consequences; Dijksma is asked about the feasibility of her own wish, not about her own responsibility or earlier policy.

Asymmetry 2: Genocide question without Hamas equivalent

To VVD spokesperson, 13:44: "Is what Israel is currently doing in Gaza genocide in your view?" — maximally charged question

To no guest: Comparable question about Hamas violence, hostages or 7 October — entirely absent

Comparison: The heaviest legal qualification is directed exclusively at Israeli conduct; this is a structural asymmetry.

Summary: The question asymmetry is most visible in the genocide question directed exclusively at Israeli conduct, and in the difference in hardness between the questions to the VVD spokesperson and to Mayor Dijksma.



14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance despite factual imbalance.

Finding 1: Apparent balance via VVD spokesperson

Timestamp: 13:20

Construction: "Israel has every right to defend itself. But Israel must do so within the boundaries of international law."

Analysis: The VVD spokesperson offers a nuanced position that can be presented as "balance", but the pro-Israel position (PVV, the largest coalition party) is entirely absent. The apparent balance masks the absence of the most outspoken pro-Israel perspective.

Summary: No classical false balance (two equivalent but unequal positions placed opposite each other), but a subtler variant whereby the VVD position functions as "balance" while the PVV position is entirely absent. Score limited because the technique is not dominantly present.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1: EU criticism of Israel as self-evident

Agenda element: The EU investigation into Israeli conduct is presented as logical and desirable.

Timestamp: 02:08 — Evidence: "You can certainly call it that [a breakthrough]."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether EU involvement in an ongoing armed conflict is desirable, or the effectiveness of such investigations, does not make it onto the agenda.

Finding 2: Cabinet as problem owner of AMV nuisance

Agenda element: The AMV problem is framed as a consequence of cabinet policy for which the national government is responsible.

Timestamp: 32:00 — Evidence: "The cabinet must not burden the mayors of this country with the consequences of that."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether municipalities themselves could have intervened earlier, or the role of guardianship institutions and COA, does not make it onto the agenda.

Finding 3: Diplomatic pressure as the only option

Agenda element: The discussion about Israel-Gaza is conducted exclusively in terms of more or less diplomatic pressure; other options (mediation, humanitarian corridors, direct negotiations) do not make it onto the agenda.

Timestamp: 13:03 — Evidence: "But when you talk about sanctions, that comes after."

Alternative agenda: The effectiveness of sanctions, the role of Qatar and Egypt as mediators, or the position of the Palestinian Authority are not addressed.

Summary: The agenda-setting of the broadcast normalises diplomatic pressure on Israel as the correct response and cabinet responsibility for the AMV problem; alternative frames and agenda elements are systematically left out of consideration.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Key finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	6	Experts are predominantly one-sidedly oriented; Israeli counter-voice is entirely absent
2	Source selection	H	6	Three unsubstantiated claims presented as fact; source diversity limited
3	Time allocation	H	4	Pro-investigation/critical-of-Israel dominates speaking time; PVV receives zero minutes of its own speaking time
4	Omission	H	7	Three structural omissions: Israeli position, Ministry of Asylum and Migration, Hamas context
5	Numerical Manipulation	H	3	Incomplete presentation of figures for AMV numbers and purchasing power figures; no active manipulation
6	Guilt by association	H	2	Subtle association of Wilders/PVV with obstruction; not deployed systematically
7	Timing	H	5	Opening with emotional Gaza frame and genocide question at end of block reinforce critical frame
8	Selective Indignation	H	3	Genocide question directed exclusively at Israel; no equivalent for Hamas violence
9	Completeness	H	7	Three structural completeness deficiencies create systematically one-sided picture
10	Framing	S	7	EU initiative presented as "success" and Israel as "violation" as fact, not as position
11	Word choice	S	6	Consistently critical word choice towards Israel; neutral alternatives not used
12	Moderation behaviour	S	5	Genocide question without equivalent; Dijkma's cabinet criticism not confronted
13	Question Asymmetry	S	5	Genocide question directed exclusively at Israel; VVD questioned more harshly than Dijkma
14	False balance	S	2	VVD position as false balance while PVV position is entirely absent
15	Agenda-Setting	S	7	Diplomatic pressure on Israel and cabinet responsibility for AMV normalised as the only frames

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 4.8 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 5.3 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 5.0 / 10

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



Dominant Techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** The Israeli position, the response of the Ministry of Asylum and Migration and the Hamas context are entirely absent. This creates a structurally one-sided picture on the two politically most sensitive dossiers of the broadcast.
- 2. Framing (Score 7):** The EU investigation is presented as a "diplomatic success" and Israeli conduct as a "violation of humanitarian law" — both as fact, not as position. This steers viewers' interpretation without alternative frames being offered.
- 3. Agenda-Setting (Score 7):** Diplomatic pressure on Israel and cabinet responsibility for the AMV problem are normalised as the only relevant frames; alternative perspectives (effectiveness of sanctions, municipal responsibility, Hamas role) do not make it onto the agenda.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The Netherlands is doing the right thing by exerting diplomatic pressure on Israel, and this is a success."

Technique: Framing as "diplomatic success" + positive word choice ("line in the sand", "breakthrough") — Evidence: 01:02, 02:08

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Veldkamp is courageous and decisive; Wilders is an obstacle that must be bypassed."

Technique: Contrasting word choice ("been bold" vs. "bypassed Wilders") + absence of PVV voice — Evidence: 10:12, 10:39

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "The cabinet is letting municipalities down on the AMV problem."

Technique: One-sided guest selection (Dijksma without cabinet response) + framing as cabinet responsibility — Evidence: 32:00, 31:43

Reasoning: The broadcast scores 5.0/10 based on 15 criteria, indicating clear one-sidedness. The three dominant techniques (omission, framing, agenda-setting) reinforce each other systematically in the same direction: critical of Israel and the current cabinet, positive about diplomatic pressure and municipal objections. The absence of the Israeli position, the PVV voice and the response of the Ministry of Asylum and Migration are measurable structural deficiencies. This touches on the pluriformity requirement of Media Act Article 2.1, which requires balanced reporting across the total output. Although individual items may be journalistically defensible, the cumulative pattern of omissions and framing is not in accordance with the requirement of independent and balanced reporting.

CONCLUSION

The broadcast displays a pattern of clear one-sidedness that manifests primarily in three structural deficiencies: the complete absence of the Israeli position in a 15-minute Israel-Gaza block, the absence of the responsible minister in the AMV issue, and the PVV position described exclusively via third parties without its own voice. The word choice ("been bold", "our patience has run out", "diplomatic isolation") and the framing of the EU initiative as a "success" are normative judgements presented as fact. The genocide question directed exclusively at Israeli conduct without an equivalent for Hamas violence is a measurable asymmetry in moderation behaviour. In light of Media Act Article 2.1 — which requires pluriform, balanced and independent reporting — this broadcast displays structural deficiencies that put the pluriformity requirement under pressure, particularly through the systematic absence of perspectives representing the largest governing party (PVV) and the Israeli position.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.8/10

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	Slight to moderate finding	Recognisable tendency; minor to moderate impact.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance that affects the opinion-forming potential of the public.
6	Considerable finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 onwards are classified as 'considerable findings'.
7	Considerable finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with clear impact.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic, ongoing imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

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

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

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



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

Assessment on the basis of Media Act Art. 2.1

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

Violation 1:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — pluriformity

Factual description: The Israel-Gaza block () contains not a single response from the Israeli side and no voice of its own from the PVV, the largest coalition party with a fundamentally different position.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:07 to 15:34 — Quote: "The PVV is not in favour of it." (09:36) — exclusively via correspondent, no own voice

Assessment: The principle of hearing all sides, which is inherent to the pluriformity requirement, is violated because one perspective (critical of Israel) dominates without the opposing perspective (pro-Israel, PVV) receiving its own speaking time.

Violation 2:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — balance

Factual description: The AMV problem is addressed exclusively from the municipal perspective (Dijksma); the responsible Ministry of Asylum and Migration (Minister Faber, PVV) does not respond and is not cited.

Evidence: Timestamp 22:16 to 32:27 — Quote: "The cabinet must not burden the mayors of this country with the consequences of that." (32:00) — no cabinet response

Assessment: Presenting criticism of cabinet policy without rebuttal from the cabinet is contrary to the balance requirement; viewers receive exclusively the municipal frame without the national government position.

Violation 3:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — independence

Factual description: Normative judgements by NOS correspondents ("our patience has run out", "been bold", "diplomatic success") are presented as factual descriptions.

Evidence: Timestamp 02:17 — Quote: "It is the first time that a large majority of EU countries says: our patience with Israel has now run out." / 10:12 — "Veldkamp has been bold here and bypassed Wilders."

Assessment: The use of normatively charged language by NOS correspondents as factual description undermines the independence requirement; journalistic interpretations are not marked as such.

Overall assessment Media Act Art. 2.1

The broadcast displays three measurable violations of the pluriformity, balance and independence requirements of Media Act Article 2.1. The most serious violation is the systematic absence of the Israeli position and the PVV position in the Israel-Gaza block, which directly affects the pluriformity requirement. The absence of a cabinet response in the AMV issue is a violation of the balance requirement. The use of normatively charged language by correspondents as factual description undermines the independence requirement. Although the Media Act assesses pluriformity across the total output and not per broadcast, the cumulative pattern of this broadcast constitutes a documented contribution to a structural imbalance that, if repeated, is contrary to the statutory requirements.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE DEPTH CHECK

1. Alex de Waal — World Peace Foundation / Fletcher School (Tufts University)

1. FUNDING: Academic funding via Tufts University and philanthropic funds; no direct government funding established. Limited structural conflict of interest.

2. MANDATE: Research into famines and humanitarian crises; mandate is compatible with neutral assessment of the humanitarian situation in Gaza.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: No institutional interest in a specific political outcome established; however, an academic reputation that benefits from recognition of humanitarian crises.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: +1

D2 Personal risk: +1

D3 Professional competence: +2

D4 Consistency: +1

D5 Emotion vs. data: +1

D6 Source level: +2

• TOTAL: +8 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN

5. COUNTER-VOICE: An Israeli or pro-Israel expert in the field of humanitarian operations in conflict zones is not cited.

2. ABN Amro — research on fixed costs

1. FUNDING: Commercial bank, partly state-owned (Dutch state holds approx. 40%). Commercial interest in positive economic sentiment.

2. MANDATE: Economic research; mandate is partly compatible with neutral analysis, but commercial interest may promote positive framing.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: ABN Amro has an interest in positive consumer confidence; research that brings positive news about purchasing power fits that interest.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Commercial interest present but limited

D2 Personal risk: +1

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Economic research is core activity

D4 Consistency: 0 — Unknown

D5 Emotion vs. data: +2 — Data-driven

D6 Source level: +1 — Own research

• TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE LIGHT: GREEN

5. COUNTER-VOICE: An independent economic institute (CPB, CBS) that could confirm or nuance the findings is not cited.

IMPORTANT: "Renowned" is not a substantive qualification. The introduction of Alex de Waal as a "renowned researcher" is a social attribution made by the broadcast itself; this is not an independent verification of his expertise or the correctness of his conclusions. The credibility matrix shows that his expertise in this specific field is indeed strong, but the introduction itself is not evidence of this.

Source traffic light for the participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Alex de Waal — World Peace Foundation / Fletcher School (Tufts University)	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+2	+8	GREEN
ABN Amro — research on fixed costs	0	+1	+2	0	+2	+1	+6	GREEN



Legal and methodological notes

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



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Netherlands — NPO

Act

Media Act 2008

Relevant articles

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

Core obligations

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

Supervisory authority

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

Complaints procedure

1. NPO Ombudsman
2. Commissariaat voor de Media
3. Court (administrative law)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC SOURCES

Literature

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

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

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



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

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

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

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

The following books are available from SVFAB

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



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

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

Also available as an **audiobook**.



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

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

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

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



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



You think you see the world. In reality you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It does not change the facts — it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate. Daily. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You learn not only how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Hear news differently. Conduct conversations more confidently. And no longer let themselves be so easily imposed a frame that someone else has chosen.

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life — and occasionally a smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.