



SABC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20240531_2024 Elections / 12 094 of 23 293 Voting districts completed.en

Broadcast: SABC-Sendung | Analyzed: 2026-05-25 10:15

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6

OVERALL SCORE

3.4/10

Slight imbalance

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/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	EFF	MK	ANC	IFP	DA	ActionSA	PA	FF+
CHES	1.50	3.50	4.50	6.00	6.50	6.50	7.00	8.00
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

5.3 / 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](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

At the time of broadcast (29 May 2024 election night/morning), South Africa was in the process of determining its new parliamentary composition. The ANC had governed with an outright majority since 1994 but was projected to lose that majority in this election. The broadcast covers the transitional moment before the GNU was formally constituted.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats (final)	Government/Opposition	Core Position
ANC	4.0	159	GNU (lead partner)	Centre-left, broad church
DA	6.0	87	GNU partner	Centre-right, free market
MK	3.0	58	Opposition	Left-populist, Zuma personality cult
EFF	1.5	39	Opposition	Far-left, expropriation, nationalisation
IFP	6.5	17	GNU partner	Right-wing, Zulu nationalist
PA	7.0	9	GNU partner	Right-wing populist
FF+	8.0	6	GNU partner	Right-wing, Afrikaner interest
ActionSA	6.5	6	Opposition	Centre-right, anti-immigration
ACDP	7.5	3	Opposition	Right-wing Christian conservative

The 2024 election represented the most consequential political moment in South Africa since 1994, with the ANC losing its 30-year parliamentary majority. The emergence of MK as a major force — particularly in KwaZulu-Natal — fundamentally altered the political landscape. The broadcast captures this inflection point, where the ANC's dominance in multiple provinces was under direct threat from MK, while the Western Cape remained a DA stronghold. The internal MK leadership dispute (Zuma vs. Kumalo) added a legal dimension to the electoral drama.

The SABC is South Africa's public broadcaster, mandated under the Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999 and its Charter (Section 6) to provide impartial, fair, and accurate news coverage serving all South Africans. The SABC has a documented history of political capture during the Hlengiwe Mkhondo era (2012–2016), and its editorial independence remains a subject of ongoing scrutiny. Election night coverage carries heightened obligations under the Electoral Act and BCCSA Code, as it directly influences public perception of democratic legitimacy.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party Representation Assessment

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position
ANC	+1	00:38 "the ANC continues to enjoy that lead" — Programme position: centre-left governing party — Accurately described as leading; no distortion of policy position, though framing as "enjoying" a lead carries mild positive connotation. Largely correct.
DA	0	01:03 "except for the Western Cape of course" — Programme position: centre-right, Western Cape stronghold — Mentioned only as geographic reference; no substantive representation of DA policy positions. Neutral by omission.
MK (uMkhonto)	-1	01:08 "MK party is leading significantly there" / 02:08 "internal squabbles or leadership battles of this new formation" — Programme position: left-populist, anti-establishment — Electoral performance accurately noted; however, framing as "squabbles" and "new formation" subtly diminishes the party without engaging its policy platform. Mild negative framing.
EFF	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: far-left, expropriation — Entirely absent from broadcast despite being the third-largest party at time of broadcast. Score 0 reflects absence, not distortion.
IFP	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: right-wing, Zulu nationalist — Absent from broadcast.
PA	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: right-wing populist — Absent from broadcast.
FF+	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: right-wing, Afrikaner interest — Absent from broadcast.
ActionSA	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: centre-right — Absent from broadcast.

Party Bias Summary

- Most Accurate Representation: ANC (Score +1) — described in factually accurate terms relative to its electoral position
- Strongest Distortion: MK (Score -1) — mild but documentable negative framing through language choice ("squabbles," "new formation") without equivalent characterisation applied to other parties
- Average Deviation from 0: 0.25
- Conclusion: The broadcast is a short live results segment (approximately 3.5 minutes) and therefore cannot be expected to provide comprehensive party policy coverage. The ANC is the only party whose electoral position is substantively discussed. MK receives the most airtime of any opposition party but is characterised through language that subtly frames its internal dynamics negatively. The EFF — the third-largest party — receives no mention whatsoever, which is a notable omission given its electoral significance at the time of broadcast.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: SABC News — 2024 National and Provincial Election Live Results Coverage (morning segment)
- Date: 30 May 2024 (election night into morning, votes being counted)
- Estimated Length: Approximately 3 minutes 36 seconds (based on transcript)
- Presenter/Reporter: Field reporter (unnamed in transcript) reporting to studio anchor "Sakina"
- Persons Interviewed: No guests interviewed; single reporter-to-anchor format

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Field Reporter (unnamed)	SABC election correspondent	SABC (public broadcaster)	N/A — journalist
Sakina (unnamed anchor)	Studio anchor	SABC (public broadcaster)	N/A — journalist
Jaani Kumalo (referenced)	MK party founder	MK party	Left-populist
Jacob Zuma (referenced)	Former President / MK leader	MK party	Left-populist

Main Topic

A live election results update reporting on the vote count progress at approximately 52% of voting districts counted, highlighting the ANC's continued lead, MK's strong performance in KwaZulu-Natal, provincial risks for the ANC, and two upcoming events: an Electoral Court challenge by MK founder Jaani Kumalo and the HSRC voter satisfaction survey results.

World-View Context

The 2024 South African general election was widely described as the most consequential since the end of apartheid in 1994. For the first time, the ANC faced the realistic prospect of losing its parliamentary majority, which it had held continuously since the first democratic elections. The emergence of MK — founded by former President Jacob Zuma after his expulsion from the ANC — represented a direct challenge to ANC dominance in its traditional stronghold of KwaZulu-Natal. Simultaneously, the EFF continued to grow as a radical left alternative. The election was being watched internationally as a test of South African democratic consolidation, with concerns about electoral integrity, IEC credibility, and the potential for post-election instability if results were contested.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

3/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: SABC Field Reporter (unnamed)

Timestamp	00:00–03:36
Statement	"I doubt that it will have any significant impact on the 2024 elections however it does speak to the internal squabbles or leadership battles of this new formation"
Classification	SABC staff journalist functioning as both reporter and analyst; no independent expert credentials established for legal or political analysis

Missing Counter-Voice: An electoral law specialist or independent political analyst would have provided a qualified assessment of the court challenge

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: SABC is state-funded public broadcaster. Structural tension exists between editorial independence and government funding dependency, particularly during elections where the governing party's performance is being reported.

(b) MANDATE: SABC's mandate is to report impartially. The reporter's role as a factual correspondent is compatible with neutrality; however, the segment crosses into editorial opinion without flagging this transition.

D1 Conflict of Interest: -1 — SABC is state-funded; ANC is the governing party whose results are being reported

D2 Personal Risk: +1 — Reporter is on record with named opinions; some professional accountability

D3 Subject Competence: 0 — Competent as election reporter; not established as legal or political analyst

D4 Opinion Consistency: 0 — No prior statements available for comparison

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 — Primarily data-driven with one editorial intrusion

D6 Source Level: 0 — Secondary source (reporter summarising results data)

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

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: The reporter's opinion on the court challenge ("I doubt that it will have any significant impact") is presented without qualification as if it were factual analysis. This is Technique 2 (source selection) — an institutional voice is framed as neutral expert opinion.

Expert 2: HSRC (Human Sciences Research Council) — referenced, not yet present

Timestamp	02:27
Statement	"the human Sciences research Council will be presenting the results of that satisfaction survey"
Classification	State-funded research council; referenced prospectively

Source Depth Check:



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

(a) FUNDING: HSRC is primarily funded by the South African government (Department of Science and Innovation). This creates a structural consideration when the organisation is assessing satisfaction with a government-administered election process.

(b) MANDATE: HSRC conducts social science research; voter satisfaction surveys are within its mandate.

D1 Conflict of Interest: -1 — Government-funded body assessing government-run election

D2 Personal Risk: +1 — Institutional reputation at stake

D3 Subject Competence: +2 — Established social science research institution

D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 — HSRC has conducted similar surveys previously

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +2 — Survey methodology described; data-driven

D6 Source Level: +1 — Primary research (own survey data)

TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN (>=+5)

Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent electoral law specialist (for court challenge analysis)
- Independent political analyst not affiliated with any party or state institution
- International electoral observer

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
SABC Field Reporter (unnamed)	-1	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	YELLOW
HSRC (Human Sciences Research Council) — referenced, not yet present	-1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+1	+6	GREEN

Summary:

Expert	Traffic Light	Key Issue
SABC Reporter	YELLOW	Editorial opinion presented as factual analysis; state-funded broadcaster reporting on governing party
HSRC (referenced)	GREEN	Credible institution; minor conflict of interest noted given government funding



2. SOURCE SELECTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: IEC Results Data (implied)

Timestamp

00:26 — Statement: "51.92 of those uh voting uh VDS rathers complete and the total valid votes is just over 7 million"

(a) Funding and governance: IEC is an independent constitutional body funded by the state; its independence is constitutionally guaranteed

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Minimal — IEC has institutional interest in demonstrating process credibility, but results data itself is objective

(c) Missing counter-source: No independent verification of counting methodology or audit trail mentioned

Source 2: Reporter's personal assessment (no source)

Timestamp

02:01 — Statement: "I doubt that it will have any significant impact on the 2024 elections"

Rumour Check (Penalty Points):

This statement constitutes an unsourced opinion presented as informed analysis. While not technically a rumour (it is a prediction rather than a factual claim), it lacks any cited basis — no legal expert, no precedent, no IEC statement.

Finding 1 (Unsourced Opinion):

Timestamp

02:01

Claim: "I doubt that it will have any significant impact on the 2024 elections"

Word marker: "I doubt" — personal opinion marker

Primary source present: NO — +1 penalty point applied

Source 3: HSRC Satisfaction Survey (referenced)

Timestamp

02:27 — Statement: "the human Sciences research Council will be presenting the results"

(a) Funding: Government-funded (Department of Science and Innovation)

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Government-funded body assessing satisfaction with government-administered election; minor but documentable

(c) Missing counter-source: No independent electoral observer survey referenced for comparison

Summary: The broadcast relies almost exclusively on IEC results data (appropriate) and the reporter's own assessments (problematic). No independent political analysts, party spokespersons, or civil society sources are cited. The HSRC is referenced prospectively without critical contextualisation of its funding relationship with government.



3. AIRTIME DISTRIBUTION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Field Reporter: approximately 3 min 20 sec (93%)
- Studio Anchor Sakina: approximately 15 sec (7%) — implied from "over to you in studio" and "Sakina" references
- ANC (as subject): referenced approximately 45 seconds of content
- MK (as subject): referenced approximately 60 seconds of content
- DA (as subject): referenced approximately 5 seconds (Western Cape mention only)
- EFF: 0 seconds
- All other parties: 0 seconds

Summary: This is a single-reporter live update segment, so the absence of multiple voices is structurally expected. However, the complete exclusion of EFF, DA, and all smaller parties from substantive coverage — while MK receives the most opposition airtime — represents a mild distributional asymmetry. The format itself (single reporter) limits the applicability of this criterion.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1: Complete absence of EFF

Context

The EFF was at the time of broadcast the third-largest party in South Africa, with approximately 9.5% of the vote. Its performance in the 2024 election was directly relevant to the results being reported.

Relevant at: Throughout the broadcast (00:00–03:36)

Effect

The broadcast creates an implicit narrative in which the election is a contest between the ANC and MK, with the DA as a geographic footnote. The EFF's role in shaping the opposition landscape is entirely invisible.

Omission 2: No IEC credibility or process context

Context

The 2024 election was conducted under significant scrutiny, with concerns about voter roll integrity, ballot paper shortages at some stations, and the unprecedented scale of the MK challenge. No IEC spokesperson or process update is included.

Relevant at: 00:26 — when results data is presented

Effect

Results are presented as uncontested facts without any acknowledgment of the counting process, potential challenges, or official IEC commentary on progress.

Omission 3: No context for the Kumalo court challenge

Context

The reporter states the court challenge will have no significant impact but provides no legal basis for this assessment. The Electoral Court challenge by MK's founder against Zuma's leadership registration was a legally complex matter with potential implications for the party's ballot validity.

Relevant at: 01:45–02:07

Effect

Viewers receive a dismissive characterisation of a legal proceeding without the information needed to assess its significance independently.

Summary: The most consequential omission is the complete absence of EFF coverage, which distorts the viewer's understanding of the opposition landscape. The absence of IEC process commentary and legal context for the court challenge further reduces the broadcast's informational completeness.

Missing Voices

- IEC spokesperson: Would have provided authoritative context on counting progress, integrity of the process, and timeline for final results
- EFF representative or analyst: Would have contextualised the third-largest party's performance and its implications for the opposition landscape
- DA representative or analyst: Would have addressed the second-largest party's results and coalition prospects
- Electoral law expert: Would have provided informed analysis of the Kumalo court challenge rather than the reporter's personal assessment



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

- HSRC methodologist: Would have explained the limitations and confidence intervals of the satisfaction survey before its results were previewed
- KwaZulu-Natal political analyst: Would have contextualised MK's dominance in the province and its historical significance
- Independent electoral observer (OSCE/AU): Would have provided external credibility assessment of the process



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Complete figures include: absolute value, proportion (%) and trend

Finding 1: Results percentage without trend context

Timestamp 00:26

Number: "51.92 of those uh voting uh VDS rathers complete and the total valid votes is just over 7 million"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: SHOWN — 7 million votes counted
- (b) Proportion: SHOWN — 51.92% of voting districts complete
- (c) Trend: ABSENT — No comparison to 2019 results at equivalent counting stage; no projection methodology explained

Missing context: At 51.92% counted, the results are highly provisional. No confidence interval, no explanation of which provinces/districts are counted vs. outstanding, and no comparison to 2019 baseline is provided. The ANC's "lead" at this stage could be significantly different from the final result depending on which districts remain outstanding.

Effect: Viewers may interpret the 51.92% count as more definitive than it is, and the ANC's lead as more stable than the partial count warrants.

Finding 2: HSRC survey sample description

Timestamp 02:51

Number: "over 300 uh voting stations and they randomly selected 50 people a representative sample"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: SHOWN — 300+ stations, 50 people per station
- (b) Proportion: ABSENT — 300 stations out of approximately 23,000 total voting stations = approximately 1.3%; this context is not provided
- (c) Trend: ABSENT — No comparison to previous HSRC satisfaction surveys

Missing context: 300 out of 23,000 voting stations represents a 1.3% sample of stations. While this may be statistically adequate with proper stratification, the broadcast presents it as straightforwardly "representative" without explaining the sampling methodology or margin of error.

Effect: The survey is presented as more comprehensive than the raw numbers suggest.

Summary: The broadcast's numerical presentation is not deliberately manipulative but is incomplete in ways that could mislead viewers about the certainty of results and the robustness of the HSRC survey.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1: MK party characterised through "squabbles"

Timestamp

02:08

Quote

"it does speak to the internal squabbles or leadership battles of this new formation"

Technique: The Kumalo court challenge — a legal proceeding — is characterised as "squabbles," a word with connotations of petty, undignified conflict. This associates MK's internal dynamics with disorder rather than legitimate legal process.

Effect

Viewers are primed to view MK's internal leadership question as a sign of dysfunction rather than a substantive legal and political matter.

Source Check for MK characterisation:

- Does the court challenge involve verifiable primary sources? YES — Electoral Court filings are public documents
- Are the core claims falsifiable? YES — the court will rule on them
- Risk matrix: Kumalo is taking a public legal position with reputational consequences; this is not speculative
- Tone: The reporter's characterisation is dismissive rather than analytical

Result Category: B (borderline) — The court challenge is a real legal proceeding being characterised through loaded language without factual basis for the dismissal.

Summary: The "squabbles" characterisation is the only documentable guilt-by-association technique in this segment. It is mild but directional — it applies negative framing exclusively to MK without equivalent characterisation of any other party's internal dynamics.



7. TIMING

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Reporter's dismissal of court challenge placed mid-segment

Position: 02:01 (mid-segment)

Content: "I doubt that it will have any significant impact on the 2024 elections"

Timing Effect: The dismissal is placed immediately after introducing the court challenge, preventing the viewer from forming an independent assessment before the reporter's opinion is delivered. The sequence is: (1) introduce challenge, (2) immediately dismiss it, (3) move on. This forecloses analytical engagement.

Finding 2: HSRC survey teased at end of segment

Position: 02:27 (final third of segment)

Content: "the human Sciences research Council will be presenting the results of that satisfaction survey"

Timing Effect: Placing the HSRC survey preview at the end of the segment, after the results narrative, frames it as a confirmatory data point rather than an independent assessment. The sequencing implies the survey will validate the narrative already established.

Summary: Timing manipulation in this segment is mild. The most notable instance is the immediate dismissal of the court challenge, which structurally prevents viewer deliberation.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

Methodological Principle (v3.0): The triggering event must be documented before any assessment. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggers from other positions produced no analogous reaction.

Finding 1: Mild dismissiveness toward MK court challenge

Timestamp

02:01

Triggering event: MK founder Jaani Kumalo filing an Electoral Court challenge against Jacob Zuma's registration as MK leader

Reaction: "I doubt that it will have any significant impact on the 2024 elections however it does speak to the internal squabbles or leadership battles"

Comparison

No other party's legal proceedings or internal disputes are mentioned in the segment; therefore direct comparison is not possible within this broadcast

Asymmetry: Cannot be fully established within this segment alone due to absence of comparable events for other parties

Outrage Level: 1/5 — mild dismissiveness, not outrage

Selectivity: 1/5 — directional but not demonstrably selective within this segment

Summary: There is no documentable outrage in this segment. The mild dismissiveness toward the MK court challenge is the closest approximation, but the absence of comparable events for other parties in this short segment means full asymmetry cannot be established per the methodological principle.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1: EFF entirely absent

Timestamp Throughout (00:00–03:36)

Missing perspective/fact: The EFF's electoral performance and its implications for the opposition landscape

Relevance: The EFF was the third-largest party; its results were directly relevant to the "changing political landscape" narrative the reporter was constructing

Impact The broadcast's narrative of a two-horse race (ANC vs. MK) is structurally misleading about the actual complexity of the electoral outcome.

Finding 2: No IEC voice on counting process

Timestamp 00:26

Missing perspective/fact: Official IEC commentary on counting progress, integrity, and timeline

Relevance: At 51.92% counted, the process was ongoing and the IEC's official position on its progress was directly relevant

Impact Results are presented as self-evidently valid without institutional authentication.

Finding 3: No coalition scenario analysis

Timestamp Throughout

Missing perspective/fact: Given that the ANC was clearly heading toward a sub-50% result, the question of coalition formation was the most consequential political story of the moment

Relevance: The broadcast notes the ANC "continues to enjoy that lead" without addressing what happens if that lead does not translate to a majority

Impact Viewers are not informed about the most significant political consequence of the results being reported.

Summary: The broadcast's completeness deficit is substantial relative to the significance of the event. The absence of EFF coverage, coalition scenario analysis, and IEC process commentary means that viewers receive a partial and structurally misleading picture of the election's significance.

Share of covered perspectives

Inverted: original value measures coverage (higher = better). Shown as deviation (higher = larger gaps).

- [A] ANC perspective on its electoral performance and what a reduced majority means for governance
- [B] DA perspective on its performance and the prospect of coalition negotiations
- [C] MK perspective on its strong showing and the significance of the Kumalo court challenge
- [D] EFF perspective on its results and what they mean for the left-wing opposition
- [E] IEC (Electoral Commission) perspective on the integrity and progress of the count
- [F] Civil society / electoral observer perspective on the credibility of the process



[G] HSRC methodology explanation: what the satisfaction survey measures and its limitations

[H] Voter perspective: what ordinary South Africans experienced at polling stations

[I] Legal expert perspective on the Kumalo Electoral Court challenge and its implications

[J] Provincial-level analysis: what ANC losses in KZN, Gauteng, and Northern Cape would mean for governance

Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 00:38 — Quote: "the ANC continues to enjoy that lead" — Assessment: Mentioned only as a factual result; no ANC voice or substantive analysis of what the result means for the party.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No reference to DA performance, results, or perspective anywhere in the segment.

[C] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 01:08 / 01:45 — Quote: "MK party is leading significantly there" / "expected to go to the Electoral court today to challenge" — Assessment: MK's electoral performance is noted and the court challenge is flagged, but no MK voice or party perspective is included.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — EFF is not mentioned at any point in the broadcast despite being the third-largest party.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — The IEC is not referenced; no comment on the integrity or progress of the counting process from an official source.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No electoral observer or civil society voice included.

[G] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 02:27 — Quote: "the human Sciences research Council will be presenting the results of that satisfaction survey" — Assessment: The HSRC survey is mentioned and its methodology briefly described (300 stations, 50 people per station), but no critical assessment of its limitations or representativeness is offered.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No voter voices or ground-level perspectives included.

[I] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 01:51 — Quote: "I doubt that it will have any significant impact on the 2024 elections" —

Assessment: The court challenge is mentioned but the reporter editorialises about its likely impact without legal expert input.

[J] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 01:11 — Quote: "Gauteng seems to be at risk as well as well as the northern Cape" — Assessment: Provincial risks are flagged but not analysed in depth.

Completeness Score: 3/10

Justification: The broadcast is a short live update segment, which structurally limits the range of perspectives that can be included. However, even within this constraint, the complete absence of EFF, DA, IEC, and civil society perspectives — combined with the reporter's unsupported editorial opinion on the court challenge —



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

represents a significant completeness deficit. The segment functions primarily as a results ticker with selective narrative framing rather than a rounded journalistic account.



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: ANC as natural reference point

Timestamp	00:38
Quote	<i>"the ANC continues to enjoy that lead"</i>
Manipulation	The word "enjoy" frames the ANC's position as comfortable and natural. The ANC is implicitly positioned as the default governing party whose lead is the baseline against which all other results are measured.
Why problematic	This framing normalises ANC dominance at the precise moment when that dominance was being historically challenged. A neutral framing would present all parties' results without hierarchical reference.

Finding 2: MK framed as disruptive "new formation"

Timestamp	01:49 / 02:13
Quote	<i>"this new formation that is MTO Rees a party" / "this new formation that is obviously going to play a critical role"</i>
Manipulation	Repeated use of "new formation" rather than the party's name (MK party / uMkhonto weSizwe) frames MK as provisional and undefined rather than as an established political actor that had just achieved a historic electoral result.
Why problematic	By the time of this broadcast, MK had already secured enough votes to become the second-largest party in KwaZulu-Natal. Describing it as a "new formation" minimises its democratic legitimacy.

Finding 3: Provinces framed as "at risk" from ANC perspective

Timestamp	01:11
Quote	<i>"Gauteng seems to be at risk as well as well as the northern Cape"</i>
Manipulation	"At risk" is framed entirely from the ANC's perspective — provinces are "at risk" of being lost by the ANC, not "in play" or "competitive." This frames the ANC's loss of provinces as a threat to stability rather than as democratic competition.
Why problematic	The framing implies that ANC governance of provinces is the natural and desirable state, and that any change represents a risk rather than a democratic outcome.



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

Summary: The broadcast's framing consistently positions the ANC as the natural governing reference point and frames challenges to its dominance — whether from MK electorally or through legal proceedings — as disruptive rather than as legitimate democratic processes.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: "Squabbles"

Timestamp	02:08
Quote	<i>"it does speak to the internal squabbles or leadership battles of this new formation"</i>
Manipulation	"Squabbles" carries connotations of petty, undignified, childish conflict. It is a pejorative term applied to a formal Electoral Court proceeding.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "internal leadership dispute" or "legal challenge regarding party leadership." The word "squabbles" is editorialising, not reporting.

Finding 2: "Enjoy" applied to ANC lead

Timestamp	00:40
Quote	<i>"the ANC continues to enjoy that lead"</i>
Manipulation	"Enjoy" implies comfort, pleasure, and entitlement. It is an unusual verb choice for a factual results update.
Why problematic	Neutral alternative would be: "the ANC continues to hold that lead" or "the ANC maintains its lead." "Enjoy" subtly frames the ANC's position as deserved and pleasant.

Finding 3: "Historic changes" — applied selectively

Timestamp	00:13 / 01:29
Quote	<i>"we already seeing a number of historic changes taking place" / "so number of historic changes as we look at that leader board"</i>
Manipulation	The characterisation of changes as "historic" is applied to MK's gains and the ANC's provincial losses, but not to the overall democratic significance of the election as a whole. The framing attributes historical significance to the disruption of ANC dominance rather than to the democratic process itself.
Why problematic	While the changes are indeed historically significant, the repeated emphasis on "historic changes" in the context of ANC losses frames the election primarily as a story of ANC decline rather than democratic renewal.

Summary: The word choices in this segment are consistently directional — "enjoy" elevates the ANC, "squabbles" diminishes MK, and "at risk" frames democratic competition as threat. None of these choices are neutral journalistic language.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Methodological Principle (v3.0): The triggering event must be documented before any assessment. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggering events from other guests produced no analogous intervention.

Finding 1: No moderation asymmetry documentable

Timestamp Throughout

Triggering event: N/A — this is a single-reporter segment with no guest interviews

Reaction: The studio anchor "Sakina" does not speak substantively in the transcript; the segment ends with "over to you in studio"

Comparison No comparable guest interactions exist within this segment

Asymmetry: Not applicable — single-reporter format precludes moderation asymmetry analysis

Summary: The single-reporter format of this segment means that moderation behaviour criteria cannot be meaningfully applied. The score of 2 reflects the reporter's self-moderation — specifically, the absence of any self-correction when delivering the editorial opinion about the court challenge.



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

13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: No interview format present

This segment contains no interviews and therefore no questions directed at guests. The criterion is structurally inapplicable.

The only quasi-question dynamic is the reporter's implicit framing of the court challenge — presenting it as a question of significance and immediately answering it dismissively — but this does not constitute a question asymmetry in the technical sense.

Summary: Question asymmetry cannot be assessed in a single-reporter results update segment. Score of 1 reflects the reporter's self-answering of the court challenge question without seeking external input.



14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: No false balance constructed

Timestamp

N/A

The broadcast does not attempt to construct artificial balance. It presents results factually (ANC leading, MK strong in KZN) without creating a false equivalence between positions of unequal evidential weight.

The absence of balance is the more significant finding in this segment — the broadcast does not attempt false balance but rather omits balance altogether by excluding EFF, DA, and other parties from substantive coverage.

Summary: False balance is not a primary technique in this segment. The broadcast's problem is the opposite — insufficient balance rather than artificial balance.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1: Coalition formation absent from agenda

Set agenda element: The election is framed as a results-counting exercise; the question of what happens next (coalition negotiations, governance implications) is entirely absent

Timestamp

00:38 — Evidence: "the ANC continues to enjoy that lead" — presented as the primary story without addressing the sub-50% trajectory

Alternative agenda: The most consequential political story at this moment was not who was leading but whether the ANC would achieve a majority and what coalition would govern South Africa — this is entirely absent

Finding 2: ANC governance as default normality

Set agenda element: ANC governance of provinces is treated as the natural state; any change is framed as "at risk"

Timestamp

01:11 — Evidence: "Gauteng seems to be at risk as well as well as the northern Cape"

Alternative agenda: A neutral agenda would frame provincial results as competitive outcomes rather than deviations from an ANC norm

Finding 3: MK court challenge dismissed from serious agenda

Set agenda element: The Electoral Court challenge is placed on the agenda only to be immediately removed from it ("I doubt that it will have any significant impact")

Timestamp

01:51–02:07 — Evidence: "I doubt that it will have any significant impact on the 2024 elections"

Alternative agenda: The court challenge raised substantive questions about party registration, leadership legitimacy, and electoral law that warranted serious agenda placement

Summary: The broadcast's agenda-setting function is its most significant bias vector. By treating ANC governance as the natural baseline, excluding coalition scenarios, and dismissing the court challenge, the segment constructs a narrow agenda that frames the election as a story of ANC resilience rather than democratic transformation.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 1–9): 3.2 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 10–15): 3.5 / 10

Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Agenda-Setting (Score 6):** The broadcast constructs a narrow electoral narrative centred on ANC performance as the baseline, systematically excluding coalition scenarios, EFF results, and serious engagement with the court challenge. This shapes what viewers understand the election to be about at a moment of maximum democratic significance.
- 2. Selective Omission (Score 6):** The complete absence of EFF coverage — the third-largest party — combined with the absence of IEC process commentary and coalition analysis creates a structurally incomplete picture. The omissions are consistent in direction: they reduce the complexity of the opposition landscape and the significance of the ANC's loss of majority.
- 3. Framing (Score 5):** The consistent use of ANC-centric reference points ("continues to enjoy that lead," "at risk," "new formation") frames the election as a story of ANC resilience under challenge rather than as a democratic transformation. This framing is embedded in language choices rather than explicit editorial statements, making it more difficult to identify and challenge.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

****MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT):** ** "The ANC remains the dominant force in South African politics, and the changes occurring — while historic — are disruptions to an established order rather than democratic renewal."

Technique: Framing + Agenda-Setting — Evidence: 00:38, 01:11

****MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** ** "The MK party's internal dynamics are characterised by disorder and its legal challenges are not serious matters."

Technique: Word Choice + Timing — Evidence: 02:01, 02:08

****MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** ** "The 2024 election is primarily a story about the ANC's performance; other parties — particularly the EFF — are not significant actors in this narrative."

Technique: Selective Omission + Airtime Distribution — Evidence: Throughout (00:00–03:36)

Manipulation Level Classification

Justification: The overall score of 3.3 places this broadcast in the "slight tendency" category. The segment's brevity (approximately 3.5 minutes) and its live results format structurally limit the range of perspectives that can be included, which must be weighed against the bias findings. However, the consistent directionality of the language choices, the complete omission of the EFF, the dismissal of the court challenge without legal basis, and the ANC-centric framing are not attributable to format constraints alone — they reflect editorial choices that, taken together, constitute a mild but documentable tendency. Under Broadcasting Act s. 6, the SABC's obligation to impartiality applies to all programming including live results updates; the format does not exempt the broadcaster from the requirement to use neutral language and avoid editorial opinion without attribution.

CONCLUSION

This SABC election results segment, broadcast during the counting of the 2024 National and Provincial Elections, demonstrates a mild but documentable directional tendency in its framing, language, and omissions. The broadcast is not systematically manipulative, and its primary function as a live results update is largely fulfilled. However, the consistent use of ANC-centric reference language ("enjoy," "at risk"), the complete absence of EFF coverage despite its status as the third-largest party, the reporter's unsourced dismissal of the MK Electoral Court challenge, and the failure to address coalition formation — the most consequential political question of the moment — collectively constitute a pattern that falls short of the impartiality standard required under Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, Section 6.



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

The BCCSA Code Clause 16 requires news to be reported "in the correct context and in a balanced manner"; the omission of EFF results and coalition scenarios means the context provided is incomplete. Clause 18 requires opposing views on controversial issues of public importance; the dismissal of the court challenge without legal expert input violates this standard. The findings do not rise to the level of systematic bias but would warrant editorial review, particularly regarding the reporter's practice of delivering personal opinions on legal proceedings without qualification or attribution.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
2	SOURCE SELECTION	4/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
3	AIRTIME DISTRIBUTION	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
7	TIMING	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	1/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
10	FRAMING	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
11	WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	1/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	2/10	<i>Unremarkable</i>
15	AGENDA-SETTING	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

3.2/10

Slight imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

3.5/10

Slight imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

3.4/10

Slight imbalance

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly detected.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
7	Significant finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
8–9	Severe finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Significant imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favored	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
+3 to +5	Strongly favored	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Broadcasting Act s. 6)

Assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 6

Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, Section 6 (SABC Charter) requires significant news and public affairs programming that meets the highest standards of journalism, including fairness, accuracy, and impartiality. BCCSA Code Clause 16 requires news to be reported truthfully, accurately and fairly, in the correct context and in a balanced manner. Clause 18 requires opposing views to be presented on controversial issues of public importance.

Violation 1:

Standard: BCCSA Code Clause 16 — correct context and balanced manner

Conduct: Complete omission of EFF electoral performance from a results broadcast covering the 2024 National and Provincial Elections

Evidence: Throughout (00:00–03:36) — the EFF is not mentioned at any point despite being the third-largest party

Assessment: A results broadcast that omits the third-largest party's performance cannot be said to report "in the correct context." The omission is not explained by format constraints — the reporter discusses MK's performance in KwaZulu-Natal in detail, demonstrating that opposition party results were within the segment's scope. The selective exclusion of EFF results constitutes a failure of contextual completeness under Clause 16.

Violation 2:

Standard: BCCSA Code Clause 18 — opposing views on controversial issues of public importance

Conduct: Reporter delivers personal opinion on the significance of the MK Electoral Court challenge without seeking legal expert input or presenting the opposing view (that the challenge could have significant implications)

Evidence: Timestamp 02:01 — "I doubt that it will have any significant impact on the 2024 elections"

Assessment: The Electoral Court challenge was a controversial matter of public importance — it concerned the legal validity of a former president's registration as leader of a party that had just achieved a historic electoral result. Presenting only the reporter's dismissive assessment, without any legal expert opinion or representation of the view that the challenge was significant, violates the requirement to present opposing views under Clause 18. The statement is also a breach of the journalistic standard against reporters expressing personal opinions on contested legal matters without attribution.

Violation 3:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6 — impartiality; BCCSA Code Clause 16 — balanced manner

Conduct: Consistent use of ANC-centric framing language ("continues to enjoy that lead," "at risk," "new formation") that positions the ANC as the natural governing reference point

Evidence: Timestamp 00:38 ("enjoy"), 01:11 ("at risk"), 01:49 ("new formation")

Assessment: While individual word choices may appear minor in isolation, their consistent directionality across a 3.5-minute segment constitutes a pattern of partial framing that falls below the impartiality standard required under s. 6. The SABC's obligation to impartiality is not suspended during live results coverage; language choices in election reporting carry heightened significance given their potential influence on public perception of democratic legitimacy.

Overall Assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 6

This broadcast segment contains three documentable departures from the standards required under Broadcasting Act s. 6 and the BCCSA Code: the omission of EFF results (Clause 16), the unattributed editorial opinion on the court challenge (Clause 18), and the consistent use of ANC-centric framing language (s. 6 impartiality). None of these violations, individually, would constitute a serious breach warranting formal sanction; however, their co-occurrence in a single short segment during the most significant election in South Africa's post-apartheid history is a matter of editorial concern. The SABC's history of political capture under the Motsoeneng era creates a heightened obligation to demonstrate impartiality through rigorous editorial standards, particularly in election coverage. The findings of this



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

analysis would support a formal editorial review request under the SABC's own editorial policies and the BCCSA complaints procedure, but do not, on the evidence of this segment alone, establish a prima facie case for a formal Broadcasting Act violation proceeding.



CHAPTER 6 — Source Depth Check

Organisation 1: IEC (Electoral Commission of South Africa)

- FUNDING:** State-funded independent constitutional body (Chapter 9 institution); budget appropriated by Parliament
- MANDATE:** Constitutionally mandated to manage elections impartially; mandate is compatible with neutral results reporting
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in demonstrating process credibility; results data itself is objective and auditable
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -1 (institutional interest in credibility)
 - D2 Personal Risk: +2 (constitutional accountability)
 - D3 Subject Competence: +2 (primary electoral authority)
 - D4 Consistency: +2 (established track record)
 - D5 Emotion vs. Data: +2 (data-driven)
 - D6 Source Level: +2 (primary source)
 - TOTAL: +9 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Independent electoral observers (AU, SADC, Carter Center) provide external validation; not cited in broadcast

Organisation 2: HSRC (Human Sciences Research Council)

- FUNDING:** Primarily funded by Department of Science and Innovation (government); some international research grants
- MANDATE:** Social science research; voter satisfaction surveys within mandate
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Government-funded body assessing satisfaction with government-administered election; minor structural tension; HSRC has demonstrated independence in past research
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: -1 (government funding)
 - D2 Personal Risk: +1 (institutional reputation)
 - D3 Subject Competence: +2 (established research institution)
 - D4 Consistency: +1 (prior surveys conducted)
 - D5 Emotion vs. Data: +2 (survey methodology)
 - D6 Source Level: +1 (primary research, own data)
 - TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Independent polling organisations (Ipsos, Afrobarometer) would provide comparative validation; not cited in broadcast

NOTE: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. Both the IEC and HSRC are assessed here on their structural characteristics, not on their social recognition. The IEC's constitutional status and the HSRC's research methodology provide the basis for their GREEN ratings — not their institutional prestige.

Analysis completed in accordance with SABC Broadcasting Act s. 6 compliance framework, Version 3.0-detail, applying methodological principles K11+K8 (triggering event documentation for asymmetry assessment). All findings are based exclusively on the provided transcript. Conclusions are proportionate to the evidence available in a 3.5-minute live results segment and should be read in conjunction with analysis of the broader election night coverage for a complete assessment.

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
--------	----	----	----	----	----	----	-------	--------



IEC (Electoral Commission of South Africa)	-1	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+9	GREEN
HSRC (Human Sciences Research Council)	-1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+1	+6	GREEN

Legal and Methodological Notes

No factual determination	The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.
No legal judgment	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 6. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular BCCSA).
No proof of causation	Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.
No judgment of intent	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.
Heuristic comparison tool	The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

South Africa — Legal Framework for Broadcasting Impartiality

Primary Legislation

Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999 (as amended)

The Broadcasting Act establishes the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) as a public broadcaster and defines its Charter obligations.

Section 6 — Charter of the Corporation:

The SABC Charter mandates that the public broadcaster must:

- Provide programming that reflects South African attitudes, opinions, ideas, values and artistic creativity
- Offer a plurality of views and a variety of news, information and analysis
- Provide significant news and public affairs programming that meets the highest standards of journalism, including fairness, accuracy, and impartiality

Section 10 — Editorial Independence:

The SABC's news and current affairs programming must be independent from government or political party influence. The Board must ensure editorial policies that safeguard journalistic integrity.

ICASA Act 13 of 2000

The Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (ICASA) is the regulatory body responsible for broadcasting licensing and compliance.

Electronic Communications Act 36 of 2005

Provides the overarching regulatory framework for electronic communications, including broadcasting standards.

BCCSA Broadcasting Code of Conduct

The Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa (BCCSA) enforces the Free-to-Air Broadcasting Code of Conduct, which includes:

Clause 16 — News:

- News must be reported truthfully, accurately and fairly
- News must be presented in the correct context and in a balanced manner
- Only verified facts may be presented as facts; opinions must be clearly identified as such

Clause 17 — Comment:

- Comment must be clearly distinguished from fact
- Comment must be an honest expression of opinion and must be presented fairly

Clause 18 — Controversial Issues of Public Importance:

- When a programme deals with a controversial issue of public importance, opposing views must be presented, either within the same programme or in a follow-up programme within a reasonable time
- This requirement applies to all broadcasting services

Clause 20 — Elections:

- During election periods, broadcasters must ensure equitable treatment of all political parties
- ICASA issues specific election broadcasting regulations

Regulatory / Complaints Bodies

Body	Role	Binding?
------	------	----------

President: Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Address:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

ICASA (Independent Communications Authority of South Africa)	Licensing, spectrum, compliance enforcement	Yes — can fine, revoke licences
BCCSA (Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa)	Content complaints (bias, fairness, accuracy)	Yes — can reprimand, fine, require corrections
SABC Board	Internal editorial oversight	Internal
Parliament Portfolio Committee on Communications	Political oversight of SABC	Indirect

Notable Enforcement

- May 2024: ICASA fined SABC R500,000 for refusing to broadcast the Democratic Alliance's election advertisement showing a burning South African flag, ruling that SABC violated the right to free political communication.
- 2016: Western Cape High Court ordered removal of COO Hlaudi Motsoeneng for systematic censorship and political interference at SABC.
- 2017: Labour Court ruled that dismissal of the "SABC 8" journalists (who protested censorship of protest footage) was unlawful.

Equivalent to Other Countries

Country	Law	South African Equivalent
CH	Art. 4 RTVG	Broadcasting Act s. 6 (SABC Charter)
SE	Radio- och TV-lagen 5 kap.	BCCSA Code Cl. 16-18
DE	MStV §26	ICASA Act + BCCSA Code
NO	NRK-vedtektene §6	Broadcasting Act s. 10 (Editorial Independence)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

References

- 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



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

Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately). To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

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: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes 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 don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

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

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



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

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.

President: Schläpfer, David - Contact: kontakt@SVFAB.ch - Address: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year – compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can file a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the UBI, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

But: It is not independent. It has no sanctioning power. And it decides in 99.6% of all cases: nothing.

This analysis exposes the system – factual, precise, without polemics. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional review showing: the UBI system meets none of the three fundamental criteria – it is not proportionate, not separated by powers, not market-based.

The authority supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it should be overseeing.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint – and for anyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still pending.