



NPO DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-09-18_POW_05878125

Broadcast: NPO broadcast | 2025-09-18 | Analysed on: 2026-05-22 21:34

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

TOTAL SCORE

3.9/10

Slight imbalance

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

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

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

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

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

4.5 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Schoof cabinet (since July 2024) is an extra-parliamentary cabinet consisting of PVV, VVD, NSC and BBB. Prime Minister Schoof is non-partisan. The largest opposition parties are GL-PvdA (25 seats), D66 (9 seats), SP (5 seats), CDA (5 seats) and PvdD (3 seats). PVV is the largest governing party with 37 seats.

| Party | CHES L-R | Seats | Government/Opposition | Core position |
|---------|----------|-------|-----------------------|---|
| SP | 1.1 | 5 | Opposition | Socioeconomically left, anti-market |
| GL-PvdA | 2.4 | 25 | Opposition (largest) | Climate, humane asylum, fair distribution |
| PvdD | 2.5 | 3 | Opposition | Animal rights, climate |
| D66 | 4.8 | 9 | Opposition | Pro-EU, liberal-progressive |
| 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 | Free market, liberal-right |
| BBB | 7.5 | 7 | Government | Agrarian-populist |
| SGP | 7.8 | 3 | Opposition | Reformed, right |
| PVV | 9.2 | 37 | Government (largest) | Anti-Islam, asylum stop, anti-elite |
| FvD | 9.5 | 3 | Opposition | Far right, sovereignty |

The main political fault line concerns migration and asylum policy, with the coalition advocating a tough approach and the opposition calling for a more humane policy. A second line of tension concerns the rule of law: opposition parties accuse Wilders of making unconstitutional statements, while the prime minister does not explicitly distance himself. Thirdly, the socioeconomic tension around purchasing power, spending cuts and wealth distribution plays a role. Finally, there is tension around the role of public broadcasting and media freedom, partly in the context of international developments regarding press freedom.

The Dutch public broadcaster (NPO) operates under the Media Act 2008, which requires pluriform, balanced and independent reporting (Art. 2.1). The NPO system is fragmented: broadcasting associations such as BNNVARA, KRO-NCRV and AVROTROS have their own editorial responsibility. PVV has 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 position |
|---------|----------------|--|
| VVD | 0 | Not covered substantively; no programme position presented or distorted |
| PVV | -2 | 02:53 "We are losing our country to criminals, to immigrants..." — Party position: asylum stop, de-Islamisation — Quote correctly reproduced but contextualised as a contrast to "compromise politics"; the positive policy content (purchasing power, state pension) is entirely absent — partially distorted by selective presentation |
| GL-PvdA | +1 | 03:29 "but according to opposition parties the prime minister must then speak out against unconstitutional statements" — Party position: rule of law, humane asylum — correctly presented as defender of the rule of law, but without substantive elaboration — indicated but incomplete |
| NSC | 0 | Not covered substantively as a party |
| D66 | 0 | Not covered substantively as a party |
| BBB | 0 | Not covered substantively as a party |
| CDA | 0 | Not covered substantively as a party |
| SP | 0 | Not covered substantively as a party |

Score explanation:

+5 = Party positions correctly and fully represented

0 = Party/topic not in broadcast

-5 = Party positions actively distorted or incorrectly represented

Summary Party Bias

- Most accurate representation: GL-PvdA, Score +1
- Strongest distortion: PVV, Score -2
- Average deviation from 0: 0.4
- Conclusion: The broadcast covers only one political segment substantively: the General Political Deliberations. Within that, PVV is cited exclusively via Wilders' most polarising statement (02:53), with no mention of the socioeconomic programme points (purchasing power, lowering the state pension age, abolishing the excess charge). The opposition is functionally positioned as defender of the rule of law. Most parties do not feature at all, which limits the party-political analysis in scope but not in significance.

Left-Right Overall Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +0.8

CLASSIFICATION: Slightly left-favouring

Reasoning: The broadcast places Wilders' statements about "immigrants" and "criminals" prominently as a polarising element (02:53), while the opposition is positioned as defender of the rule of law (03:29–04:13). The item on the French protests (07:05–08:40) gives the demonstrators — who are calling for taxation of the wealthy and protection of the welfare state — more speaking time and more sympathetic framing than the government position. The item on



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

knowledge migrants (11:34–13:17) addresses a topic that is sensitive for right-wing parties without critical contextualisation of the political context. The overall tendency is slightly left-favouring, but not systematic.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast data

- Title: NOS Journaal (evening edition)
- Date: 18.09.2025
- Length (estimated from transcript): 40 seconds
- Presenter/Reporter: Not named in transcript; multiple field reporters
- Persons interviewed:

| Person | Function | Party/Affiliation | Political Spectrum |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| Prime Minister Schoof | Prime Minister | Non-partisan (cabinet PVV/VVD/NSC/BBB) | Centre (extra-parliamentary) |
| Geert Wilders | Parliamentary group leader PVV | PVV | Far right (CHES 9.2) |
| Unnamed opposition politician | Member of Parliament (presumably GL-PvdA or D66) | Opposition | Left-centre |
| Tanja van Stappershoef | Conflict divorce mediator | None | Non-political |
| Iris de Wit | Experiential expert on divorce | None | Non-political |
| Probation officer (anonymous) | Probation service | None | Non-political |
| Victim of domestic violence (anonymous) | Experiential expert | None | Non-political |
| Estate agent Hoofddorp | Estate agent | None | Non-political |
| Woman from India (Hoofddorp) | Expat/knowledge migrant | None | Non-political |
| Weather presenter Peter | Meteorologist NPO | NPO | Non-political |

Main topic

The broadcast is a regular news broadcast with several separate topics, of which the General Political Deliberations (day 2) is the politically most significant item.



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

CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS



Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Tanja van Stappershoef — Conflict divorce mediator

Timestamp: 05:32

Statement

"You want to guide parents through the divorce process so that things go better for the children."

Positioning: Professional mediator with a commercial interest in the expansion of divorce mediation as a municipal offering.

Missing counter-voice: Family court judge, behavioural scientist or critic of municipal paternalism.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Independent mediator; provides courses to municipal family coaches — financial interest in the expansion of municipal divorce policy.

(b) MANDATE: Not compatible with a neutral assessment of the effectiveness of divorce mediation; she is both advocate and practitioner.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Commercial interest in the expansion of the policy she advocates

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No demonstrable risk from her statements

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Practical experience as a mediator, but no academic background

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent with her professional practice

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Mix of practical experience and emotional framing

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (practical experience, no primary research)

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW (-4 to +4)

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The broadcast presents her as a neutral expert, while she has a structural interest in the policy expansion she advocates. This is Technique no. 2 (Source selection).

Expert 2: Probation officer (anonymous)

Timestamp: 01:21

Statement

"If we assess that the encounter could take place, we call the victim and coach the victim to increase the distance between the victim and the perpetrator."

Positioning: Operational probation officer; institutional interest in positive image-building for the GPS project.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Reclassering Nederland — publicly funded, under the supervision of the Ministry of Justice and Security.

(b) MANDATE: Not fully compatible with neutral evaluation; the probation service is both executor and assessor of its own project.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Institutional interest in the success of the project

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No demonstrable risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Direct operational knowledge



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

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent with institutional line

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly procedural and factual

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary executor

TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

Missing expert groups:

- Independent criminologist or victimologist for evaluation of the GPS approach
- Behavioural scientist for assessment of divorce mediation
- Constitutional lawyer for the political item

Source traffic light for participants:

| Source | D1 | D2 | D3 | D4 | D5 | D6 | Total | Signal |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|---------------|
| Tanja van Stappershoef — Conflict divorce mediator | -1 | 0 | +1 | +1 | 0 | 0 | +1 | YELLOW |
| Probation officer (anonymous) | -1 | 0 | +2 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +4 | YELLOW |

Summary (Matrix result as structured list):

- Tanja van Stappershoef: YELLOW (+1) — Commercial interest, no scientific substantiation, presented as neutral expert
- Probation officer: YELLOW (+4) — Institutional interest, but direct operational knowledge; acceptable as a practical source provided it is supplemented with independent evaluation



2. SOURCE SELECTION

4/10

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: Reclassering Nederland

Timestamp: 01:21 — Statement: "If we assess that the encounter could take place..."

(a) Funding and management: Publicly funded by the Ministry of Justice and Security; executor of the GPS project.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The probation service evaluates its own project; the success of the project is an institutional interest.

(c) Missing counter-source: Independent research into the effectiveness of GPS monitoring in domestic violence cases; victim organisations with critical voices.

Source 2: Municipality of Rotterdam (cited indirectly)

Timestamp: 01:42 — Statement: "Rotterdam started it, and calls it a success."

(a) Funding: Municipal; political interest in a positive evaluation of its own policy.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The municipality assesses its own initiative as a success without independent verification.

(c) Missing counter-source: Independent evaluation study; perspective of perpetrators or their lawyers.

Source 3: Reporter on location (French protests)

Timestamp: 08:13 — Statement: "The French government says: Cuts must be made because of the national debt and the budget deficit. But the demonstrators here on the street say..."

(a) Funding: NPO journalist.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: No direct conflict, but the framing gives demonstrators more sympathetic space (see Criterion 10).

(c) Missing counter-source: French economist or budget expert who substantiates the government's arguments in depth.

Rumour test (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 10:33

Claim: "Officially for financial reasons, but within the American media world they suspect that Colbert's criticism of Trump played a role."

Word marker: "they suspect" — anonymous source, no primary source

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



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

Summary: The source selection is predominantly institutional (probation service, municipality) or anonymous ("within the American media world"), without independent scientific or critical counter-sources. The rumour about Colbert is presented as factual context without source attribution.



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:

- Political item (Schoof/Wilders/APB): approx. 2 min. 30 sec. (approx. 17%)
- GPS/domestic violence item: approx. 2 min. 10 sec. (approx. 15%)
- Divorce mediation item: approx. 2 min. 00 sec. (approx. 14%)
- French protests item: approx. 1 min. 35 sec. (approx. 11%)
- Trump/Kimmel/media freedom item: approx. 1 min. 50 sec. (approx. 13%)
- Expats/housing market item: approx. 1 min. 45 sec. (approx. 12%)
- Other items (Ter Apel, ACM, Ukraine, Belgian hospital, brief items): approx. 1 min. 30 sec. (approx. 10%)
- Weather report: approx. 1 min. 10 sec. (approx. 8%)

Within the political item:

- Wilders (quote): approx. 20 sec.
- Schoof (quote): approx. 15 sec.
- Opposition (quote): approx. 20 sec.
- Reporter/commentary: approx. 55 sec.

Summary: The distribution of speaking time within the political item is relatively balanced between the three cited positions, but three of the four coalition parties (VVD, NSC, BBB) are entirely absent. The reporter takes a dominant position with approx. 55 seconds of commentary, which increases the risk of editorial steering.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: What is not shown, even though it is relevant? (Include Step 2)

Omission 1:

Context: The legal substantiation of the claim that Wilders' advocacy for a ban on Islamic schools "has nothing whatsoever to do with the democratic rule of law" is entirely absent.

Relevant at: 03:38–03:57

Effect: The opposition politician's claim is presented as an established fact, without the viewer being able to assess the legal grounds. This reinforces the opposition framing without scrutiny.

Omission 2:

Context: The positive policy results or programme points of the Schoof cabinet (purchasing power, excess charge, state pension) are not mentioned in the political item.

Relevant at: 02:30–04:24

Effect: The cabinet is positioned exclusively in terms of the tension between Schoof and Wilders, not in terms of policy achievements. This creates a one-sided picture of governmental dysfunction.

Omission 3:

Context: In the Ter Apel item (09:16–09:35), any contextualisation of the structural causes of the reception crisis, the perspective of the COA, or the political context of asylum policy is absent.

Relevant at: 09:16–09:35

Effect: The item reduces a complex policy crisis to a factual announcement about a penalty payment, without contextualising or attributing responsibility.

Summary: The selective omissions systematically affect the government position (no policy results, no intra-coalition perspective) and the legal nuance (no scrutiny of the unconstitutionality claim). This reinforces a picture of a cabinet in crisis without substantive policy context.

Missing voices

- Constitutional lawyer: Could have clarified whether and why Wilders' advocacy for a ban on Islamic schools is unconstitutional, and which legal norms are at stake.
- VVD/NSC/BBB spokesperson: Could have contextualised the intra-coalition tension and clarified the positions of the other coalition parties.
- Representative of the Islamic community: Could have illustrated the direct impact of Wilders' statements on those affected.
- COA spokesperson or municipal executive of Westerwolde: Could have provided structural context for the Ter Apel item.
- Dutch house-hunter in Hoofddorp: Could have represented the perspective of displaced local buyers.
- French economist or budget expert: Could have scrutinised the financial substantiation of the French spending cuts.
- Legal scholar on media freedom: Could have drawn the comparison between the American situation (Kimmel/Colbert) and the Dutch NPO context.
- Divorce judge or family court judge: Could have contextualised the legal framework around conflict divorces and youth care alongside the mediator.



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



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:

Timestamp: 01:38

Figure: "In the past six months, 32 victims have used the device."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — 32 victims; (b) Share missing — how many victims of domestic violence are there in total in the municipalities concerned?; (c) Trend missing — is this more or less than expected?

Missing context

Without a reference figure it is unclear whether 32 is a lot or a little; the figure is presented as evidence of success without a basis for comparison.

Effect: The viewer gets the impression of a successful programme without being able to objectively assess the scale or effectiveness.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 07:01

Figure: "A quarter of municipalities nowadays have an approach to relationships and divorces."

Dimensions: (a) Share shown — 25%; (b) Absolute value missing — how many municipalities is that?; (c) Trend missing — was this more or less before?

Missing context

Without absolute numbers and a trend line, the significance of "a quarter" is unclear.

Effect: The figure suggests growth and broad adoption without this being empirically substantiated.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 11:40–11:46

Figure: "Currently, over 1.5 percent of owner-occupied homes go to people who are moving to the Netherlands for work. That is 50 percent more than six years ago."

Dimensions: (a) Share shown — 1.5%; (b) Trend shown — +50% in six years; (c) Absolute value missing — how many homes is 1.5% in absolute numbers?

Missing context

The relative increase of 50% sounds alarming, but 1.5% of owner-occupied homes is a small share; the combination of both figures without absolute numbers can give a distorted picture of the impact on the housing market.

Effect: The viewer cannot assess the actual pressure on the housing market.

Summary: There is limited but demonstrable numerical incompleteness: absolute numbers, reference figures and trend lines are systematically absent from the statistics presented, preventing the viewer from independently verifying the presented "successes".



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups/ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 02:49

Quote

"But Wilders, who brought down the cabinet, is critical of precisely that compromise politics."

Technique: The subordinate clause "who brought down the cabinet" implicitly associates Wilders with political instability, while this is factually incorrect or misleading in the context of the current Schoof cabinet (which has not yet fallen). The phrasing suggests a pattern of destructive behaviour.

Effect: Wilders is positioned as a destabilising factor before his substantive position is presented.

Association 2:

Timestamp: 10:33–10:36

Quote

"Officially for financial reasons, but within the American media world they suspect that Colbert's criticism of Trump played a role."

Technique: Trump is associated with censorship and media suppression via an anonymous source ("they suspect"), without this being proven.

Effect: The association Trump = censorship is presented as a plausible background without factual substantiation.

Summary: The guilt-by-association techniques are present but limited in scope. The most notable is the factually questionable subordinate clause about Wilders "bringing down the cabinet", which creates a negative associative frame prior to his quote.



7. TIMING

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Position: 02:53 (early in the political item)

Content: "We are losing our country to criminals, to immigrants who, once again not all of them, have no regard for our norms and values and our rules."

Timing effect

Wilders' most polarising quote is presented as the first substantive political statement of the broadcast, directly after the neutral Throne Speech context. This sets the tone for the political item as a confrontation between polarisation and the rule of law, rather than as a substantive policy debate.

Finding 2:

Position: 09:40 (after the Ter Apel item)

Content: Trump/Kimmel item on media freedom and state censorship.

Timing effect

The item on media freedom follows directly after the asylum item, which can create an implicit association between the Dutch political climate and authoritarian media suppression, although this is not made explicit.

Summary: The timing of the Wilders quote at the beginning of the political item is the most significant finding: the polarising quote functions as a frame for the entire political segment, while policy content and coalition context are addressed later or not at all.



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 must be documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggering events at other positions did not produce an analogous reaction.

Score calculation (penalty points):

Score = Degree of indignation (0-5) + Selectivity (0-5)

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 03:29–04:13

Triggering event: Wilders' advocacy for a ban on Islamic schools (day 1 APB, not directly quoted in broadcast).

Reaction: "But according to opposition parties the prime minister must then speak out against unconstitutional statements." — The reporter presents the opposition demand as logical and justified.

Comparison

There is no comparable moment in the broadcast where an opposition statement is framed as "unconstitutional" or "problematic" and where the prime minister is called upon to distance himself.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — the normative pressure ("the prime minister must speak out") is placed exclusively on the government side.

Degree of indignation: 2/5 — Mild but present in the reporter's commentary

Selectivity: 3/5 — Directed exclusively at the government side; no comparable framing of opposition statements

Summary: There is a mild but demonstrable selective indignation: the normative expectation that the prime minister must distance himself from Wilders is presented as self-evident, while comparable normative pressure on opposition parties is absent from the broadcast.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast portray the subject? Are relevant perspectives, facts or actors systematically omitted?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 02:30–04:24

Missing perspective/fact: The positions of VVD, NSC and BBB on the tension between Schoof and Wilders are entirely absent.

Relevance: Three of the four coalition parties are directly involved in the coalition dynamics that are central to the item.

Impact

The impression arises that the coalition consists exclusively of the Schoof-Wilders tension, while the other coalition parties hold their own positions.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 09:16–09:35

Missing perspective/fact: Structural causes of the Ter Apel crisis and the perspective of COA and municipalities are absent.

Relevance: The penalty payment of 50,000 euros per night is a symptom of a broader policy crisis that requires contextualisation.

Impact

The item functions as a factual announcement without policy context, preventing the viewer from attributing responsibility.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 05:15–07:01

Missing perspective/fact: Critical voices regarding municipal paternalism in divorces, or scientific evidence for the effectiveness of the approach, are absent.

Relevance: The broadcast presents municipal divorce mediation exclusively positively, without scrutiny of effectiveness or critical perspectives.

Impact

The item functions as promotion for a policy measure without journalistic scrutiny.

Summary: The broadcast displays a pattern of selective completeness: positive policy initiatives (GPS, divorce mediation) are presented without critical scrutiny, while the political item presents the coalition incompletely by ignoring three of the four coalition parties.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How is the subject fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 02:12–02:23

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Quote | <i>"King Willem-Alexander drew attention to it on Budget Day in the Throne Speech: the growing divisions in politics and society. Today, during the second day of the General Political Deliberations, it led to a heated discussion about the role of Prime Minister Schoof himself."</i> |
| Manipulation | The Throne Speech — delivered on behalf of the cabinet — is used as a normative framework against which the prime minister's behaviour is subsequently measured. This creates a circular argument: the cabinet warns against polarisation, but the prime minister does not act accordingly. |
| Why problematic | The viewer is guided towards the conclusion that Schoof is not living up to his own Throne Speech, without this being stated explicitly. It is an implicit accusation through framing. |

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 07:05–08:40

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Quote | <i>"The French have been hearing for years that the government must cut spending. But the demonstrators feel that the wealthy should be the first to make sacrifices."</i> |
| Manipulation | The French austerity debate is framed as a conflict between an abstract governmental necessity and the concrete justice demand of demonstrators. The government's argument is summarised in one sentence; the demonstrators' argument receives more space and emotional weight. |
| Why problematic | The frame "the wealthy should be the first to make sacrifices" is presented as a logical alternative without economic scrutiny, implying a normative judgement. |

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 09:40–10:13

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Quote | <i>"Donald Trump himself calls it a victory for the US, others call it state censorship."</i> |
| Manipulation | The two positions are presented as equivalent ("Trump himself" vs. "others"), but the rest of the item exclusively develops the state censorship interpretation, while Trump's position is not substantiated in depth. |
| Why problematic | The seemingly balanced opening masks a one-sided elaboration that presents the state censorship interpretation as factual reality. |



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

Summary: The framing in the broadcast is consistent: government positions (Schoof, French government, Trump) are consistently framed as problematic or inadequate, while opposition and protest positions are presented as normatively correct. This is not explicit bias but a structural framing pattern.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 02:49

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Quote | <i>"But Wilders, who brought down the cabinet, is critical of precisely that compromise politics."</i> |
| Manipulation | "Who brought down the cabinet" is a loaded subordinate clause that associates Wilders with political destruction. In fact, the Schoof cabinet has not fallen at the time of broadcast; the phrasing presumably refers to an earlier cabinet but is misleading in this context. |
| Why problematic | A neutral alternative would be: "Wilders, parliamentary group leader of the largest coalition party PVV, is critical of precisely that compromise politics." The current phrasing adds a negative judgement that is not factually substantiated in context. |

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 03:01–03:07

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Quote | <i>"There should be no wishy-washy story. There should be a firm story and a tough package of measures instead of a wishy-washy compromise."</i> |
| Manipulation | The word "wishy-washy" (used twice by Wilders himself) is not corrected or contextualised by the reporter. By leaving the quote without commentary, the connotation of "compromise = weak" is implicitly confirmed. |
| Why problematic | A neutral reporter could have clarified that "wishy-washy" is a value judgement, not a factual description of compromise politics. |

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 11:26–11:30

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Quote | <i>"Or as the president calls them: the losers of NBC. He did so from England, via his favourite communication channel: ranting on his own social medium."</i> |
| Manipulation | "Ranting on his own social medium" is an editorial judgement presented as a factual description. "Ranting" implies inappropriateness and a lack of dignity. |
| Why problematic | Neutral alternative: "via his social medium Truth Social". The addition of "ranting" is an editorial value judgement that is not marked as such. |

Summary: The word choice displays a pattern of negative connotations for right-wing or conservative actors (Wilders "brought down", Trump "ranting") without comparable normative language for other political positions.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be 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: 02:08

Triggering event: The victim of domestic violence has used the GPS device and shared her experiences.

Quote (presenter)

"It gave you freedom?"

Comparison

There is no comparable empathetic follow-up questioning with other interviewees in the broadcast; the question is suggestive and confirmatory in nature.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable but limited — the question is empathetic but not politically coloured; it concerns a vulnerable victim for whom some empathy is journalistically defensible.

Note: The broadcast contains no live interviews with politicians where moderation behaviour can be directly tested. The political quotes are pre-recorded clips. Moderation behaviour is therefore of limited analysability.

Summary: Moderation behaviour in this broadcast is of limited analysability due to the predominantly news format with pre-recorded clips. The only demonstrable asymmetry is the empathetic questioning of the victim of domestic violence, which is journalistically defensible.



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 victim of domestic violence, 02:08: "It gave you freedom?" — soft/confirmatory

To probation officer, 01:21: No critical follow-up question about the effectiveness or limitations of the system — soft/absent

Comparison

No critical questions are asked of any interviewee in the broadcast. The questions are predominantly confirmatory or absent (pre-recorded clips).

Asymmetry 2:

To Tanja van Stappershoef (divorce mediator): No questions about her commercial interest in the expansion of municipal divorce policy — soft/absent

Comparison

There is no comparable situation where an interviewee is critically questioned about conflicts of interest.

Summary: The question asymmetry is limited but demonstrable: no interviewee is critically questioned about the content or the interests behind their statements. This is partly inherent to the news format, but reinforces the pattern of uncritical presentation of policy initiatives.



14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance despite factual imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 09:40 — Construction: "Donald Trump himself calls it a victory for the US, others call it state censorship."

Analysis

The two positions are presented as equivalent in the opening, but the rest of the item (approx. 1 min. 50 sec.) exclusively develops the state censorship interpretation. Trump's position receives no substantive elaboration. This is a reverse false balance: the appearance of balance masks a one-sided elaboration.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 04:00–04:20

Construction: "Wilders on the one hand says that you gain nothing from weak compromises and soothing words. [...] And left-wing parties on the other hand say precisely that you must speak out against unconstitutional acts."

Analysis

The two positions are presented as equivalent, but the reporter adds: "If you do not do that, the rule of law in the Netherlands will be increasingly eroded." This is not a neutral summary but a normative judgement that presents the opposition position as correct.

Summary: There is limited false balance: the appearance of balance is created by naming two positions, but the elaboration and normative commentary consistently favour one side.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Stated agenda element: It is self-evident that the prime minister must distance himself from Wilders' statements about Islamic schools.

Timestamp: 03:29–03:57 — Evidence: "But according to opposition parties the prime minister must then speak out against unconstitutional statements."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether the opposition itself holds unconstitutional or legally questionable positions, or the question of whether the prime minister is constitutionally obliged to distance himself from statements by coalition partners, does not make it onto the agenda.

Finding 2:

Stated agenda element: Municipal divorce mediation is a positive and necessary development.

Timestamp: 05:15–07:01 — Evidence: "Guidance for parents during the divorce is therefore useful." — The reporter presents this as a conclusion, not as a viewpoint.

Alternative agenda: The question of whether municipal involvement in divorces is desirable, whether there are privacy objections, or whether the effectiveness has been proven, does not make it onto the agenda.

Finding 3:

Stated agenda element: The presence of knowledge migrants in Hoofddorp is predominantly positive (for homeowners).

Timestamp: 13:14–13:17 — Evidence: "It does have an advantage for homeowners here, because their property has become considerably more valuable."

Alternative agenda: The negative consequences for Dutch house-hunters, the political debate about the 30% ruling for expats, or the pressure on local facilities do not make it onto the agenda.

Summary: The agenda-setting displays a pattern whereby government policy and progressive policy initiatives are presented as self-evidently positive, while critical questions about effectiveness, legitimacy and negative side effects are systematically kept off the agenda.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

| No. | Criterion | Type | Score | Main finding (1 sentence) |
|-----|------------------------|------|-------|--|
| 1 | Expert selection | H | 5 | Experts have structural interests in the policy initiatives they assess, but are presented as neutral. |
| 2 | Source selection | H | 4 | Institutional sources evaluate their own policy; a rumour about Colbert is presented as factual context without a primary source. |
| 3 | Time allocation | H | 4 | Three of the four coalition parties are absent from the political item; the reporter takes a dominant commentary position. |
| 4 | Omission | H | 6 | Policy results of the cabinet, legal substantiation of unconstitutionality claims and intra-coalition perspective are systematically absent. |
| 5 | Numerical Manipulation | H | 3 | Statistics systematically lack reference figures and trend lines, making presented "successes" impossible to verify independently. |
| 6 | Guilt by association | H | 2 | Wilders is associated with political destruction via a factually questionable subordinate clause; Trump with censorship via an anonymous source. |
| 7 | Timing | H | 3 | The most polarising Wilders quote is presented as the first political statement, setting the frame for the entire political item. |
| 8 | Selective Indignation | H | 5 | Normative pressure ("the prime minister must speak out") is placed exclusively on the government side without comparable pressure on the opposition. |
| 9 | Completeness | H | 6 | Positive policy initiatives are presented without critical scrutiny; the political item lacks three of the four coalition parties. |
| 10 | Framing | S | 5 | Government positions are consistently framed as problematic; opposition and protest positions as normatively correct. |
| 11 | Word choice | S | 4 | Negative connotations for right-wing actors ("ranting", "brought down") without comparable normative language for other positions. |
| 12 | Moderation behaviour | S | 2 | Of limited analysability in news format; no significant asymmetry demonstrable. |
| 13 | Question Asymmetry | S | 2 | No interviewee is critically questioned; pattern of uncritical presentation of policy initiatives. |
| 14 | False balance | S | 3 | Appearance of balance masks one-sided elaboration in both the Trump/Kimmel item and the political item. |
| 15 | Agenda-Setting | S | 5 | Government policy and progressive initiatives are presented as self-evidently positive; critical questions remain off the agenda. |

Results



- HARD FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 1-9): 4.2 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 10-15): 3.5 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (Average all 15 criteria): 3.9 / 10

Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 6):** Three of the four coalition parties are absent from the political item; legal substantiation of unconstitutionality claims is not provided; policy results of the cabinet are not mentioned. The omission consistently creates a picture of a cabinet in crisis without substantive policy context.
- 2. Completeness (Score 6):** Positive policy initiatives (GPS, divorce mediation) are presented without critical scrutiny as successes, while the political item presents the coalition incompletely. This pattern of selective completeness favours a positive image of government policy and a negative image of coalition dynamics.
- 3. Framing / Agenda-Setting (Score 5 each):** The broadcast consistently frames government positions as problematic and opposition and protest positions as normatively correct. At the same time, government policy and progressive initiatives are presented as self-evidently positive, while critical questions remain off the agenda.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The Schoof cabinet is failing in its own promise to reduce polarisation, because the prime minister does not distance himself from Wilders' unconstitutional statements."

Technique: Framing via Throne Speech as normative framework + selective omission of intra-coalition perspective — Evidence: 02:12–02:23, 03:29–04:20

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Wilders is a destabilising factor who rejects compromise politics and holds unconstitutional positions."

Technique: Guilt by association ("who brought down the cabinet") + timing (polarising quote as first political statement) + selective indignation — Evidence: 02:49, 02:53, 03:34

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Government initiatives in the field of safety and family protection are successful and deserve expansion."

Technique: Uncritical presentation + agenda-setting + expert selection without counter-voice — Evidence: 01:42–01:55, 05:39–06:12, 06:20

Reasoning: The total score of 3.9/10 places the broadcast in the category "slight tendency". The findings are consistent but not extreme: the broadcast displays a pattern of selective omission (intra-coalition perspective, legal contextualisation), slightly favoured framing of opposition and protest positions, and uncritical presentation of government policy. This is not in accordance with the Media Act Art. 2.1 requirement of pluriformity and balanced reporting, but does not reach the threshold of systematic or extreme bias. The shortcomings are partly inherent to the short news format, but the pattern is consistent enough to qualify as a structural tendency.

CONCLUSION

The broadcast does not fully meet the requirements of pluriformity and balance as required by Media Act Art. 2.1. The most significant shortcomings are the systematic absence of three of the four coalition parties in the political item, the lack of legal contextualisation of the unconstitutionality claim, and the uncritical presentation of government policy initiatives. The framing of the political item — in which the Throne Speech is used as a normative framework to assess the prime minister's behaviour — is a structural editorial choice that consistently disadvantages the government position. At the same time, the findings are not of such a nature as to indicate deliberate or systematic manipulation; they are rather consistent with an editorial culture that treats progressive policy frames as self-evident. In the context of Media Act Art. 2.1, the broadcast as an individual episode is a borderline case, but the pattern of findings justifies attention in the context of the broader NPO output.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.2/10

Considerable imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

3.5/10

Slight imbalance

TOTAL SCORE

3.9/10

Slight imbalance

Average of Hard Facts and Soft Facts



KEY — Meaning of the scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

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

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

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



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

Assessment on the basis of Media Act Art. 2.1

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

Violation 1:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — Pluriformity

Factual description: Three of the four coalition parties (VVD, NSC, BBB) are entirely absent from the political item on the General Political Deliberations, while the item treats coalition dynamics as its central theme.

Evidence: Timestamp 02:30–04:24 — Quote: "Wilders on the one hand says that you gain nothing from weak compromises and soothing words. [...] And left-wing parties on the other hand say precisely that you must speak out against unconstitutional acts."

Assessment: The reduction of the coalition to exclusively the Schoof-Wilders tension, without mentioning the positions of VVD, NSC and BBB, is not in accordance with the pluriformity requirement. The picture that emerges — a two-way contest between Wilders and the opposition — is factually incomplete and misleading.

Violation 2:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — Balance

Factual description: The claim that Wilders' advocacy for a ban on Islamic schools "has nothing whatsoever to do with the democratic rule of law" is presented as factual context without legal scrutiny or a response from the government side.

Evidence: Timestamp 03:38–03:57 — Quote: "Does Mr Schoof agree with me that Mr Wilders' advocacy yesterday has nothing whatsoever to do with the democratic rule of law?"

Assessment: Presenting a political position (the opposition's unconstitutionality claim) as factual context, without legal contextualisation or a counter-argument, is not in accordance with the balance requirement of Media Act Art. 2.1.

Violation 3:

Norm: Media Act Art. 2.1 — Independence / Balance

Factual description: The reporter adds a normative judgement to the summary of the political debate: "If you do not do that, the rule of law in the Netherlands will be increasingly eroded."

Evidence: Timestamp 04:13–04:20 — Quote: "If you do not do that, the rule of law in the Netherlands will be increasingly eroded."

Assessment: This is an editorial judgement presented as a factual conclusion. It implies that the prime minister's failure to distance himself from Wilders' statements leads to erosion of the rule of law — a political position that is not marked as such. This is not in accordance with the independence requirement of Media Act Art. 2.1.

Overall Assessment Media Act Art. 2.1

The broadcast displays three demonstrable shortcomings with respect to the requirements of Media Act Art. 2.1: insufficient pluriformity due to the absence of three coalition parties, insufficient balance due to the presentation of a political position as factual context, and a breach of the independence requirement by presenting an editorial judgement as a factual conclusion. These shortcomings are not of such a nature that they in themselves constitute a formal violation of the Media Act — the Act assesses pluriformity across the total output, not per episode — but they are consistent with a pattern that, if repeated, could lead to a formal review by the Media Authority. In the context of the broader NPO debate on independence and balance, the findings are relevant as part of a structural analysis.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE DEPTH CHECK

1. Reclassering Nederland

1. FUNDING: Publicly funded by the Ministry of Justice and Security; annual subsidy from the national government. No private or ecclesiastical funding.

2. MANDATE: Implementation of supervision and guidance of convicted persons; the GPS project falls within this mandate. However, the mandate is not compatible with a neutral evaluation of its own effectiveness.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Institutional interest in positive image-building for the GPS project: success justifies continuation and expansion of funding. The probation service evaluates its own project.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Institutional interest in the success of its own project

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No demonstrable risk for the employee

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Direct operational knowledge of the system

D4 Consistency: +1 — Consistent with institutional line

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly procedural

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary executor

TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

5. COUNTER-VOICE: No independent evaluation study cited; no perspective from victim organisations with critical voices regarding GPS monitoring.

2. Municipality of Rotterdam (cited indirectly)

1. FUNDING: Municipal; publicly funded.

2. MANDATE: Implementation of local safety policy; the GPS project is a municipal initiative. Not compatible with neutral evaluation of its own policy.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Political interest in a positive evaluation of its own initiative; success justifies continuation and adoption by other municipalities.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Political interest in the success of its own initiative

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No demonstrable risk

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Operational knowledge

D4 Consistency: +1 — Consistent with municipal policy

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Factual claim ("calls it a success") without substantiation

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (cited indirectly)

TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

5. COUNTER-VOICE: No independent evaluation; no perspective from perpetrators or their legal representation.

3. Tanja van Stappershoef — Conflict divorce mediator

1. FUNDING: Self-employed; provides courses to municipal family coaches — direct financial dependence on municipal commissions for divorce mediation.

2. MANDATE: Commercial interest in the expansion of municipal divorce policy; not compatible with a neutral assessment of the necessity or effectiveness of divorce mediation.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Financial interest in the policy expansion she advocates; she is simultaneously advocate and practitioner.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct financial dependence on municipal commissions

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No demonstrable risk

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Practical experience as a mediator

D4 Consistency: +1 — Consistent with professional practice

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Predominantly anecdotal and emotional

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (practical experience)



TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE LIGHT: YELLOW

5. COUNTER-VOICE: No scientific research into effectiveness cited; no critic of municipal paternalism in divorces given a voice.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be scrutinised. None of the sources cited in this broadcast is provided with an independent effectiveness assessment or a critical counter-voice.

Source traffic light for participants:

| Source | D1 | D2 | D3 | D4 | D5 | D6 | Total | Signal |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|---------------|
| Reclassering Nederland | -1 | 0 | +2 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +4 | YELLOW |
| Municipality of Rotterdam (cited indirectly) | -2 | 0 | +1 | +1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | YELLOW |
| Tanja van Stappershoef — Conflict divorce mediator | -2 | 0 | +1 | +1 | -1 | 0 | -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 may 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 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 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 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 allow a frame chosen by someone else to be imposed on them so easily.

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life — and an occasional smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.