



SABC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20240601_2024 Elections / Some parties make objections to results.en

Broadcast: SABC-Sendung | Analyzed: 2026-05-25 10:19

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

**OVERALL
SCORE**

2.7/10

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, South Africa's 2024 general election (29 May 2024) had just concluded and results were still being tallied. The incumbent ANC, which had governed with an outright majority since 1994, was on course to lose that majority for the first time. The broadcast captures the transitional moment before the Government of National Unity (GNU) was formally constituted. The three leading parties at the time of broadcast were the ANC, the DA, and the newly formed MK party. The Multi-Party Charter (MPC) — a pre-election coalition pact designed to unseat the ANC — was actively meeting to discuss post-election arrangements.

| Party | CHES L-R (est.) | Seats (final) | Government/Opposition | Core Position |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|
| EFF | 1.5 | 39 | Opposition | Far-left; land expropriation, nationalisation |
| MK | 3.0 | 58 | Opposition | Left-populist; Zuma personality cult, anti-establishment |
| ANC | 4.0 | 159 | GNU (lead party) | Centre-left; broad church, social democracy |
| UDM | 4.5 | 3 | GNU | Centre-left; rural base |
| Rise Mzansi | 4.5 | 2 | GNU | Centre-left progressive |
| GOOD | 4.5 | 1 | GNU | Centre-left progressive |
| Al Jama-ah | 4.0 | 2 | GNU | Left economics, socially conservative |
| DA | 6.0 | 87 | GNU | Centre-right; free market, liberal constitutionalism |
| ActionSA | 6.5 | 6 | Opposition | Centre-right; anti-immigration |
| IFP | 6.5 | 17 | GNU | Right-wing; traditional values, Zulu nationalist |
| PA | 7.0 | 9 | GNU | Right-wing populist; anti-immigration |
| ACDP | 7.5 | 3 | Opposition | Right-wing Christian conservative |
| FF+ | 8.0 | 6 | GNU | Right-wing; Afrikaner interest |

The broadcast occurs at the precise moment of maximum political uncertainty: the ANC's 30-year majority has ended, the MK party has emerged as a major force, and multiple parties are contesting results through Section 55 objections and potential court challenges. The Multi-Party Charter's internal negotiations — particularly the DA's stated commitment to unseating the ANC — represent the central coalition tension. The legal threshold for successful electoral challenges (demonstrating material prejudice to the overall outcome) creates a secondary tension between legitimate grievance and strategic litigation.

The SABC is South Africa's public broadcaster, mandated under the Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999 and its own Charter to provide impartial, accurate, and fair coverage of public affairs, including elections. The SABC's history of political capture during the Hludi Motsoeneng era (approximately 2012–2016) — during which editorial independence was systematically compromised in favour of ANC interests — remains a live institutional concern. Post-capture reforms have sought to restore editorial independence, but the broadcaster's structural proximity to the state (government appoints the board) means scrutiny of election coverage is particularly warranted.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment of whether each party's official programme positions were accurately represented in the broadcast. Score measures accuracy of representation — not whether a party was treated positively or negatively.

| Party | Score (-5..+5) | Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---|
| ANC | 0 | Named at 02:55 as one of "top three results." No programme positions stated or misrepresented. Party not characterised beyond electoral standing. Score: 0 (not substantively covered). |
| DA | -1 | 03:01–03:10: "The DA has already outlined that the number one loyalty or commitment is to the multi-party Charter that is the pre-election pack that was designed to unseat the governing party." The DA's programme position is liberal constitutionalism and policy-based governance; framing their MPC commitment as "designed to unseat the governing party" emphasises oppositional intent over policy substance. Mild framing distortion. |
| MK (uMkhonto weSizwe) | 0 | Named at 02:58 as one of "top three results." No programme positions stated or misrepresented. Score: 0 (not substantively covered). |
| EFF | 0 | 04:32–04:36: Julius Malema mentioned as expected to "come through today to reflect on those results." No programme positions stated or misrepresented. Score: 0 (not substantively covered). |
| IFP | 0 | 04:29–04:31: IFP leader Mr. Hlabisa mentioned as expected to attend. No programme positions stated or misrepresented. Score: 0 (not substantively covered). |
| PA | 0 | Not mentioned. Score: 0 (absent). |
| FF+ | 0 | 01:59–02:01: "We're expecting the FF also on the ground." Named only as expected attendee. No programme positions stated or misrepresented. Score: 0 (not substantively covered). |
| ActionSA | 0 | Not mentioned. Score: 0 (absent). |

Party Bias Summary

- Most Accurate Representation: ANC (Score 0) — named without characterisation, no distortion possible.
- Strongest Distortion: DA (Score -1) — the framing of MPC commitment as primarily about "unseating the governing party" subtly emphasises oppositional identity over the DA's stated policy-based rationale for the Charter.
- Average Deviation from 0: 0.1
- Conclusion: Given the extremely short duration of this broadcast (approximately 5 minutes and 10 seconds) and its operational focus on electoral procedure rather than policy debate, substantive party-political bias in programme representation is minimal. The single notable framing issue concerns the DA's MPC commitment being characterised in oppositional rather than policy terms, which is a mild but documentable distortion. No party's core programme positions were actively misrepresented.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: SABC News — Election Results Rolling Coverage (National Results Operations Centre)
- Date (from context): 30–31 May 2024 (post-election day; results still being tallied; Section 55 deadline referenced as 31 May at 21:00)
- Estimated Length: Approximately 5 minutes 10 seconds (transcript lines 00:00–05:10)
- Anchor / Reporter: Anchor: Chisala (surname not given in transcript); Reporter: KY Manga (SABC News political reporter, on the floor at the National Results Operations Centre, Midrand)
- Persons Interviewed / Featured:

| Actors | Function | Party/Affiliation | Political Spectrum |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| KY Manga | SABC News political reporter | SABC (public broadcaster) | Neutral/institutional |
| Chisala (anchor) | Studio anchor | SABC (public broadcaster) | Neutral/institutional |
| Musawenkosi Mani (mentioned, not present) | Political figure | Not specified in transcript | Not determinable |
| Julius Malema (mentioned, not present) | EFF leader | EFF | Far-left (1.5) |
| Mr. Hlabisa (mentioned, not present) | IFP leader | IFP | Right-wing (6.5) |
| FF+ representative (mentioned, not present) | Party representative | FF+ | Right-wing (8.0) |

Main Topic

A live procedural update on the status of South Africa's 2024 general election results, focusing on Section 55 objections, the legal framework for electoral disputes, coalition formation timelines, and expected political party appearances at the National Results Operations Centre.

World-Knowledge Context

South Africa's 2024 general election was the country's most competitive since the end of apartheid in 1994, with the ANC projected to lose its outright parliamentary majority for the first time. The emergence of Jacob Zuma's MK party as a major electoral force — drawing heavily from ANC support in KwaZulu-Natal — fundamentally altered the political landscape. The Electoral Act's Section 55 provides a formal mechanism for parties to object to results within 48 hours of polls closing; missing this deadline requires parties to seek condonation from the IEC. The Multi-Party Charter, signed before the election by the DA, IFP, ActionSA, and others, represented a formal pre-election commitment to coalition governance aimed at preventing an ANC-led government. The legal threshold for successfully challenging election results in court — demonstrating material prejudice to the overall outcome — is deliberately high to prevent frivolous litigation that could destabilise democratic processes.



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: KY Manga — SABC News Political Reporter

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Timestamp | 00:43 onwards |
| Statement | "well good morning once again to you chisala and to the viewers at home of course when you speak of section 55 of the Electoral act you're speaking about the objections which allows you to object between the 900 p.m. of 29th of May..." |
| Classification | SABC staff reporter providing procedural and political analysis. Not an independent expert. Employed by the broadcaster producing the content. |

Missing Counter-Voice: An independent electoral law specialist or IEC official would provide authoritative rather than journalistic interpretation of Section 55.

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: SABC is a public broadcaster funded by a combination of government grants, licence fees, and commercial revenue. The South African government (through the Department of Communications) has historically exercised influence over SABC appointments and editorial direction. Structural interest conflict: SABC has an institutional interest in presenting the election process as legitimate and orderly, given its role as the state broadcaster.

(b) MANDATE: SABC's mandate is to inform, educate, and entertain. KY Manga's role as a political reporter is compatible with factual reporting but not with providing legal interpretation of electoral statutes without qualification.

D1 Conflict of Interest: 0 — SABC is state-adjacent; mild structural conflict on election legitimacy framing, but no direct personal interest evident.

D2 Personal Risk: 0 — Reporter faces no personal risk from this reporting; standard professional assignment.

D3 Subject Competence: +1 — Political reporter with apparent familiarity with electoral procedure, but not a qualified electoral lawyer; legal interpretations are lay analysis.

D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 — No prior contradictory statements identifiable from transcript.

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 — Reporting is largely factual and procedural; minimal emotional loading.

D6 Source Level: 0 — Secondary source; reporter synthesising information rather than citing primary documents.

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: 47–04:08) are presented as authoritative analysis without qualification as lay interpretation. This constitutes mild framing as neutral expertise.

Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent electoral law specialist
- IEC official or spokesperson
- Independent election observer (EISA, AU observer mission)



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

Source Credibility Overview:

| Source | D1 | D2 | D3 | D4 | D5 | D6 | Total | Signal |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|---------------|
| KY Manga — SABC News Political Reporter | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 | 0 | +3 | YELLOW |

Summary (Matrix Result):

- KY Manga: YELLOW (+3) — Competent procedural reporter; legal interpretations presented without appropriate qualification; no independent expert included in this segment.



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: KY Manga (SABC reporter) as sole substantive source

Timestamp 00:43–05:06

Statement Entire substantive content of the broadcast is delivered by a single SABC reporter.

(a) Funding and Governance: SABC — public broadcaster, government-adjacent funding. See Expert 1 above.

(b) Structural Conflict of Interest: SABC has an institutional interest in presenting the electoral process as procedurally sound and manageable. The reporter's framing consistently emphasises the legal framework and process rather than the substance of the "vote rigging" allegations mentioned at 00:18.

(c) Missing Counter-Source: No IEC statement, no party spokesperson, no independent legal expert, no election observer is cited. The entire broadcast relies on a single institutional source.

Source 2: "Vote rigging" allegations (unnamed)

Timestamp 00:15–00:18

Statement "with some parties contesting the results and allegations of vote rigging"

(a) Funding and Governance: Source unnamed; no attribution.

(b) Structural Conflict of Interest: Not determinable — source not identified.

(c) Missing Counter-Source: No IEC rebuttal, no specification of which parties made which allegations, no evidence cited for or against.

Rumour Check (Penalty Points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 00:15–00:18

Claim: "allegations of vote rigging"

Word Marker: "allegations" — unattributed

Primary Source Present: No — no party named, no specific allegation described, no IEC response. +1 penalty point.

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 02:01–02:05

Claim: "I'm also getting news that Musawenkosi Mani might also be here in a couple of moments"

Word Marker: "I'm getting news" — unattributed, speculative

Primary Source Present: No — unverified, speculative. +1 penalty point.

Summary: The broadcast relies almost entirely on a single SABC reporter as its substantive source, with no independent voices, no IEC response, and two unattributed claims. Source diversity is critically insufficient for a broadcast covering contested election results.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated Speaking Time:

- KY Manga (SABC reporter — procedural/analytical): approximately 3 min. 45 sec. (72%)
- Chisala (anchor — questions/transitions): approximately 1 min. 10 sec. (23%)
- No party representatives, experts, or other voices: 0 sec. (0%)
- Unaccounted/transitions: approximately 15 sec. (5%)

Summary: Given that this is a live rolling coverage segment rather than a structured debate or interview programme, the dominance of a single reporter is contextually explicable. However, the complete absence of any voice other than SABC staff — particularly given the "vote rigging" allegations raised at the outset — means no political position receives direct representation. The time distribution is not inherently biased between political positions, but it is structurally inadequate for the subject matter.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

The anchor raises "allegations of vote rigging" at 00:15–00:18 but this is never substantiated, attributed, or examined.

Relevant at: 00:15–00:18

Effect

The allegation is introduced into the broadcast as a framing element — creating an impression of contested legitimacy — but is then dropped entirely. This serves to raise concern without providing the viewer with the information needed to assess it. The IEC's response to these specific allegations is entirely absent.

Omission 2:

Context

The specific parties filing Section 55 objections are not named, nor are their specific grounds for objection.

Relevant at: 00:30–01:52

Effect

The viewer is told "a number of opposition parties are contesting the results" (03:41–03:44) but cannot identify which parties, what they allege, or whether the allegations have merit. This prevents informed civic assessment.

Omission 3:

Context

The MPC meeting is described as involving "a number of demands" from opposition parties (03:13–03:18) but no party spokesperson is included to articulate those demands directly.

Relevant at: 03:13–03:32

Effect

Coalition negotiations — the most consequential political development of the moment — are described speculatively ("you can expect some cabinet posts") rather than reported from primary sources.

Summary: The most significant omission is the failure to follow up on the "vote rigging" allegations raised in the anchor's opening. Raising an allegation of this gravity without attribution, evidence, or institutional response is a structural journalistic failure that leaves viewers with an unresolved and potentially misleading impression.

Missing Voices

- IEC spokesperson: Would have provided the official institutional response to condonation requests and the status of objections.
- Election law specialist (independent): Would have provided authoritative analysis of the legal threshold for court challenges beyond the reporter's lay interpretation.
- EISA (Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa) observer: Would have provided independent assessment of election integrity claims.



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

- MK party representative: Would have provided the specific grounds for their objections, given MK's emergence as the third-largest party.
- ANC spokesperson: Would have provided the governing party's response to the objections and its coalition formation position.
- DA spokesperson (live): Would have provided specific demands in the MPC meeting rather than speculative reporting.
- Constitutional law expert: Would have contextualised the 14-day government formation deadline and its constitutional implications.
- Civil society representative (e.g., My Vote Counts): Would have provided a citizen-centred perspective on the integrity of the electoral process.



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 01:00–01:06

Number: "48 hours after at 9:00 p.m." (Section 55 deadline)

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — stated correctly; (b) Proportion — not applicable; (c) Trend — not applicable.

Missing Context: None material — this is a statutory deadline, not an argumentative statistic.

Effect No manipulation; accurate procedural information.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 02:34–02:37

Number: "14 days for a new government to be formed"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — stated; (b) Proportion — not applicable; (c) Trend — not applicable.

Missing Context: The constitutional basis for this figure (Constitution s. 84(2)(f) and related provisions) is not cited, and the figure itself may be imprecise — the Constitution provides for the National Assembly to elect a President within a specified period after its first sitting, not a fixed 14-day post-declaration window. This is a minor inaccuracy rather than manipulation.

Effect Minimal; the figure is broadly directionally correct even if not precisely sourced.

Summary: No significant numerical manipulation is identified. The broadcast contains minimal statistical content. One minor imprecision in the government formation timeline is noted but does not constitute deliberate manipulation.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

03:06–03:10

Quote

"the pre-election pack that was designed to unseat the governing party"

Technique: The Multi-Party Charter is characterised by its oppositional purpose ("designed to unseat") rather than its stated policy rationale (constitutional governance, accountability). This associates the MPC — and by extension the DA — with a purely negative/destructive agenda rather than a constructive policy platform.

Effect

Mild delegitimisation of the MPC as an anti-ANC project rather than a pro-governance initiative. Not a classic guilt-by-association technique but a related framing mechanism.

No persons are labelled as "conspiracy theorists" or associated with extremist groups in this broadcast. The guilt-by-association score is low.

Summary: The single instance of associative framing concerns the characterisation of the MPC as primarily "designed to unseat the governing party," which subtly frames opposition coalition-building as destructive rather than constructive. This is mild and does not rise to the level of systematic guilt-by-association.



7. TIMING

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:15–00:18 (opening — first 18 seconds)

Content: "with some parties contesting the results and allegations of vote rigging"

Timing Effect: The "vote rigging" allegation is placed in the anchor's opening framing before any substantive reporting begins. This primes the viewer to interpret subsequent procedural information through a lens of electoral illegitimacy. However, the allegation is then never developed, creating an unresolved narrative tension. Placing an unsubstantiated allegation of this gravity in the opening frame — without follow-up — is the most significant timing concern in this broadcast.

Finding 2:

Position: 02:39–02:50 (middle)

Content: "in the most dramatic conclusion if that is not done then uh it would result in the costly exercise of having to uh do these or rerun these elections which is probably not an outcome that these opposition parties are hoping for"

Timing Effect: The election rerun scenario is introduced mid-broadcast as a speculative worst case, framed as something opposition parties would not want. This implicitly positions the opposition parties' legal challenges as potentially self-defeating, subtly discouraging the viewer from taking those challenges seriously.

Summary: The placement of the "vote rigging" allegation in the opening frame without subsequent development is the primary timing concern. It functions as a priming device that is never resolved, leaving an impression of contested legitimacy without providing the information needed to assess it.



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:

Timestamp

03:06–03:10

Triggering Event: Description of the DA's MPC commitment as "designed to unseat the governing party."

Reaction: Mild negative framing through word choice ("unseat" carries a connotation of illegitimacy or aggression).

Comparison

No comparable characterisation of the ANC's coalition-building efforts or the MK party's electoral strategy is made in this broadcast. However, given the extremely short duration and procedural focus of the broadcast, the absence of comparable characterisation of other parties is more likely a function of limited scope than deliberate asymmetry.

Asymmetry: Not conclusively demonstrable given the broadcast's narrow procedural focus.

Outrage Level: 1/5 — Mild framing, no emotional outrage expressed.

Selectivity: 1/5 — Marginal; insufficient broadcast scope to establish pattern.

Summary: No significant selective outrage is identified in this broadcast. The mild framing of the MPC as "designed to unseat the governing party" is the closest instance, but the broadcast's procedural character and short duration make it impossible to establish a pattern of selective emotional response.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:15–00:18

Missing Perspective/Fact: Specific identification of which parties made "vote rigging" allegations, what those allegations consist of, and what the IEC's response is.

Relevance: "Vote rigging" is a serious allegation that, if substantiated, would constitute a fundamental challenge to democratic legitimacy. If unsubstantiated, it is a politically motivated claim that should be identified as such.

Impact

The unresolved allegation leaves viewers with an impression of electoral illegitimacy without the information needed to assess it. This is the single most significant completeness failure in the broadcast.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 03:13–03:32

Missing Perspective/Fact: Direct statements from MPC parties on their specific demands in coalition negotiations.

Relevance: Coalition formation is the most consequential political process of the moment; speculative reporting ("you can expect some cabinet posts") is an inadequate substitute for primary source reporting.

Impact

Viewers receive an impression of coalition dynamics based on reporter speculation rather than party positions, potentially misrepresenting the actual state of negotiations.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 04:39–04:50

Missing Perspective/Fact: The broadcast notes that IFP and EFF have "seen their positions change in the political landscape" but does not explain what those changes are or their significance.

Relevance: The IFP's significant seat gains and the EFF's losses are electorally significant; their implications for coalition formation are directly relevant.

Impact

Viewers are told positions have changed without being told what changed or why it matters.

Summary: The broadcast's most significant completeness failure is the introduction of "vote rigging" allegations without attribution, specification, or institutional response. Secondary failures include speculative coalition reporting and the absence of any voice other than SABC staff. The completeness score of 4/10 in Step 2 is confirmed here.

Share of covered perspectives

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

[A] The legal perspective of parties filing Section 55 objections: what specific irregularities are alleged?

[B] The IEC's official position on the objections and condonation requests.

[C] The legal threshold for successful court challenges: what evidence would be required?



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

[D] The perspective of civil society election observers (EISA, OSCE observers if present) on the integrity of the count.

[E] The ANC's response to the objections and its coalition formation strategy.

[F] The MK party's specific grievances and its position on coalition negotiations.

[G] The DA's detailed position on the MPC meeting and its demands.

[H] The IFP's position on coalition negotiations given its significant seat gain.

[I] **Historical context:** how previous South African elections handled result disputes.

[J] **The implications of a potential election rerun:** cost, timeline, constitutional framework.

Assessment: Was Each Perspective Covered?

[A] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 00:15–00:18 — Quote: "with some parties contesting the results and allegations of vote rigging" — Assessment: Mentioned in passing by the anchor but not developed; no specific allegations are named or examined.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No IEC spokesperson or official statement is included. The IEC's role is described procedurally by the reporter but the institution itself is not given voice.

[C] COVERED

Timestamp: 03:47–04:08 — Quote: "one would argue that you would have to show a material difference that is you have to EI the discrepancy rather to the overall election outcome and show that you were unfairly prejudiced or disenfranchised" — Assessment: The legal threshold is explained clearly, though without reference to specific case law or legal expert confirmation.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No election observer organisations are referenced. Given the "vote rigging" allegations mentioned at 00:18, observer assessments would be directly relevant.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — The ANC's response to objections and its coalition strategy is not addressed beyond being named as one of the top three parties.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — MK party's specific objections and coalition position are not addressed.

[G] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 03:01–03:32 — Quote: "The DA has already outlined that the number one loyalty or commitment is to the multi-party Charter" — Assessment: DA's MPC commitment is noted but its specific demands in the meeting are described only speculatively ("you can expect some cabinet posts").

[H] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 04:29–04:36 — Quote: "we are expecting the IFP leader Mr. Hlabisa to come through today" — Assessment: IFP is mentioned as an expected attendee but its coalition position is not addressed.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No historical context on previous South African electoral disputes is provided.

[J] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 02:39–02:50 — Quote: "in the most dramatic conclusion if that is not done then uh it would result in the costly exercise of having to uh do these or rerun these elections" — Assessment: The rerun scenario is mentioned but not substantively analysed.



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

Completeness Score: 4/10

Reasoning: The broadcast covers the procedural legal framework (Section 55, condonation, court challenge threshold) with reasonable accuracy. However, given the anchor's explicit mention of "vote rigging allegations" at the outset, the failure to examine those allegations with any specificity, to include IEC response, or to reference election observer assessments represents a significant gap. The broadcast functions as a procedural briefing rather than substantive journalism on the contested election integrity question it raises.



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Timestamp | 00:00–00:18 |
| Quote | <i>"so as election uh process near completion South Africa is getting closer as I indicated to knowing who will form the seventh Administration"</i> |
| Manipulation | The election is framed as a process "nearing completion" — emphasising orderly procedural progress — immediately before the "vote rigging" allegation is introduced. This creates a cognitive dissonance: the process is presented as nearly complete and legitimate, while simultaneously being contested. |

Why Problematic: The "nearing completion" frame primes viewers to accept the results as essentially settled, potentially diminishing the perceived significance of the objections that follow.

Finding 2:

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Timestamp | 02:39–02:50 |
| Quote | <i>"in the most dramatic conclusion if that is not done then uh it would result in the costly exercise of having to uh do these or rerun these elections which is probably not an outcome that these opposition parties are hoping for"</i> |
| Manipulation | The election rerun is framed as a "dramatic" and "costly" outcome that opposition parties themselves would not want. This frames legal challenges as potentially self-defeating and implicitly discourages the viewer from taking them seriously. |

Why Problematic: Legal challenges to election results are a legitimate democratic mechanism. Framing them as leading to an outcome the challengers themselves would not want subtly delegitimises the exercise of legal rights.

Finding 3:

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Timestamp | 03:06–03:10 |
| Quote | <i>"the pre-election pack that was designed to unseat the governing party"</i> |
| Manipulation | The MPC is defined by its oppositional purpose rather than its stated policy rationale. "Designed to unseat" frames the coalition as a negative project (removal) rather than a positive one (alternative governance). |

Why Problematic: The MPC parties articulated their coalition in terms of constitutional governance and accountability. Reducing it to "unseating" the ANC adopts the ANC's framing of the opposition rather than the opposition's own framing.



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

Summary: The dominant frame of the broadcast is procedural legitimacy — the election is nearly complete, the legal framework is clear, and challenges are contextualised as difficult to sustain. This frame is not inherently biased but, combined with the unresolved "vote rigging" allegation, creates an inconsistency that subtly favours acceptance of the results over scrutiny of them.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

03:06–03:10

Quote

"designed to unseat the governing party"

Manipulation

"Unseat" carries connotations of illegitimacy or aggression — one "unseats" a rider, removes someone who should not be removed. The neutral alternative would be "to form an alternative government" or "to contest the ANC's majority."

Why Problematic: Neutral alternative would be: "the pre-election agreement to form a coalition government as an alternative to ANC-led governance."

Finding 2:

Timestamp

02:39–02:42

Quote

"in the most dramatic conclusion"

Manipulation

"Most dramatic" frames a constitutional mechanism (election rerun) as an extreme, almost theatrical outcome, implying it is outside the normal range of democratic processes.

Why Problematic: Neutral alternative would be: "in the event that a government cannot be formed within the constitutional timeframe." The word "dramatic" introduces an emotional register that is inappropriate for procedural reporting.

Finding 3:

Timestamp

00:15–00:18

Quote

"allegations of vote rigging"

Manipulation

"Vote rigging" is an extremely loaded term implying deliberate criminal fraud. The neutral alternative — "allegations of electoral irregularities" — would be more appropriate for unverified claims at this stage of the process.

Why Problematic: Using "vote rigging" without attribution or specification introduces a criminal framing that may not be warranted by the actual allegations, which may concern procedural irregularities rather than deliberate fraud.

Summary: Word choice in this broadcast is generally measured but contains three instances where loaded or emotionally charged terminology is used in ways that subtly shape viewer perception — most significantly the use of "vote rigging" for unspecified and unattributed allegations.



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 triggers from other guests produced no analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 01:53–02:07

Triggering Event: Reporter KY Manga completes explanation of Section 55 condonation process.

Anchor Quote: "right KY and certainly uh I guess we'll hear from political parties in the next couple of hours we're expecting the FF also on the ground I'm also getting news that musy my Mani might also be here in a couple of moments"

Comparison

The anchor does not follow up on the "vote rigging" allegations raised in the opening frame. No question is asked about the specific nature of the allegations, which parties made them, or what the IEC's response is.

Asymmetry: The anchor raises "vote rigging" in the opening (00:18) but does not ask the reporter to address it substantively. This is a notable omission in moderation — the most serious allegation in the broadcast is introduced and then not pursued.

Note: This is a two-person SABC staff exchange (anchor and reporter) rather than a traditional interview with external guests. The moderation asymmetry framework is therefore of limited applicability. The primary finding is the failure to follow up on the "vote rigging" allegation rather than differential treatment of competing political guests.

Summary: The moderation behaviour is generally professional and procedurally focused. The single notable finding is the anchor's failure to follow up on the "vote rigging" allegation introduced in the opening frame, which represents a missed journalistic opportunity rather than deliberate asymmetric treatment of political positions.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

This broadcast does not feature interviews with political party representatives. The exchange is between an anchor and an SABC reporter. Question asymmetry in the traditional sense — differential treatment of competing political guests — is therefore not applicable.

Asymmetry 2:

The anchor's questions to the reporter are consistently soft and procedural:

- 00:27–00:43: "hany the section 55 objection several parties you know have asked for condemnation in other words they missed the deadline for objections and basically want to be heard talk us through that" — Soft, open-ended, inviting explanation.

- 01:53–02:07: Transition to expected attendees — no follow-up on "vote rigging."

No hard or challenging questions are posed to the reporter at any point.

Summary: The absence of external political guests means traditional question asymmetry cannot be assessed. The anchor's questions to the SABC reporter are uniformly soft and procedural. The failure to ask any challenging question about the "vote rigging" allegation is noted but is more appropriately categorised under Omission (Criterion 4) and Moderation Behaviour (Criterion 12).



14. FALSE BALANCE

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

03:41–03:50

Construct: "a number of opposition parties are contesting the results but remember if you are going to go to court uh one would argue that you would have to show a material difference"

Analysis

The reporter presents the legal challenge threshold immediately after noting that parties are contesting results, creating an implicit balance between "parties contesting" and "legal difficulty of succeeding." This is not false balance in the classic sense (presenting two equally weighted but unequal positions) but rather a subtle pre-emptive discounting of the legal challenges.

Summary: No classic false balance is identified in this broadcast. The broadcast does not present two artificially equivalent positions on a matter where evidence clearly favours one side. The mild finding above concerns pre-emptive discounting of legal challenges rather than false equivalence.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda Element Set: The election results are treated as essentially legitimate and the process as "nearing completion." The procedural framework (Section 55, condonation, court threshold) is presented as the appropriate lens through which to understand the objections.

Timestamp

00:00–00:10 — Evidence: "so as election uh process near completion South Africa is getting closer as I indicated to knowing who will form the seventh Administration"

Alternative Agenda: The "vote rigging" allegations — if substantiated — would represent a fundamental challenge to the legitimacy of the entire process, not merely a procedural matter to be managed through Section 55. An alternative agenda would foreground the specific allegations and their evidentiary basis before discussing the procedural response.

Finding 2:

Agenda Element Set: Coalition formation is treated as the primary political story, with the MPC meeting and its demands framed as the central post-election development.

Timestamp

03:01–03:32 — Evidence: "The DA has already outlined that the number one loyalty or commitment is to the multi-party Charter"

Alternative Agenda: The MK party's emergence as the third-largest party — and its implications for ANC coalition options — is not placed on the agenda. The broadcast implicitly treats the MPC (DA-led) coalition track as the primary story while the ANC-MK dynamic is absent.

Summary: The broadcast's agenda-setting function primarily serves to normalise the electoral process as legitimate and procedurally manageable, while the "vote rigging" allegations — which could constitute an alternative agenda of electoral integrity — are raised but not developed. The coalition agenda is implicitly framed around the MPC track, with the ANC-MK dynamic absent.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 1–9): 2.7 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 10–15): 2.7 / 10

Dominant Techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 5):** The broadcast introduces "vote rigging" allegations in its opening frame and then fails entirely to develop, attribute, or respond to them institutionally. This is the single most significant journalistic failure in the broadcast — raising a serious allegation of electoral fraud without providing viewers with the information needed to assess it.
- 2. Completeness Failure (Score 5):** The broadcast covers a contested election result without including any voice other than SABC staff — no IEC spokesperson, no party representative, no independent legal expert, no election observer. For a broadcast explicitly covering "allegations of vote rigging" and Section 55 objections, this structural absence of primary sources is a material completeness failure.
- 3. Framing (Score 4):** The broadcast frames the election as a process "nearing completion" and treats the procedural legal framework as the appropriate lens for understanding objections, implicitly normalising the results as legitimate while simultaneously raising unresolved allegations of fraud. This creates a frame that serves to manage rather than examine the contested legitimacy question.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

****MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** ** "The election is nearly over; the legal framework for objections is clear; challenges face a high threshold."

Technique: Procedural framing, agenda-setting — Timestamps: 00:00–00:10, 03:47–04:08

****MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** ** "Opposition parties contesting results are engaged in a difficult and potentially self-defeating exercise."

Technique: Framing, word choice ("most dramatic conclusion," "probably not an outcome that these opposition parties are hoping for") — Timestamps: 02:39–02:50, 03:41–04:08

****MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** ** "South Africa's democratic process is proceeding normally within established legal frameworks, despite some contestation."

Technique: Agenda-setting, omission (failure to develop "vote rigging" allegations) — Timestamps: 00:00–00:18, 04:52–05:06

Manipulation Level Classification

Reasoning: The overall score of 2.7/10 places this broadcast at the upper boundary of "balanced" and the lower boundary of "slight tendency." The broadcast is not systematically biased in a party-political direction — it does not favour the ANC, the DA, or any other specific party. However, it exhibits a structural tendency toward institutional legitimacy framing: the election process is presented as essentially sound and nearing completion, while the "vote rigging" allegations that could challenge this frame are introduced but not examined. Under Broadcasting Act s. 6, which requires the highest standards of journalism including fairness and accuracy, the failure to attribute, specify, or respond institutionally to "vote rigging" allegations — while simultaneously using that allegation as an opening framing device — represents a departure from the accuracy and fairness standards required of the public broadcaster. The broadcast's procedural competence (accurate description of Section 55, condonation, court threshold) partially mitigates this finding.

CONCLUSION

This SABC News broadcast is a short live rolling coverage segment (approximately 5 minutes 10 seconds) covering the post-election results environment at the National Results Operations Centre on or around 30–31 May 2024. The broadcast demonstrates procedural competence in explaining the Section 55 objection framework and the legal threshold for court challenges. However, it commits a material journalistic failure by introducing "vote rigging"



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

allegations in its opening frame without attribution, specification, or institutional response — a failure that is inconsistent with the accuracy and fairness requirements of Broadcasting Act s. 6 and BCCSA Code Clause 16. The broadcast's reliance on a single SABC reporter as its sole substantive source, with no IEC voice, no party representatives, and no independent legal or electoral expertise, falls below the standard of completeness required for coverage of a contested election result. The framing of the election as a process "nearing completion" and the implicit discounting of legal challenges as difficult and potentially self-defeating creates a mild but documentable tendency toward institutional legitimacy framing that, while not constituting systematic party-political bias, represents a departure from the impartiality standard required of the public broadcaster under its Charter obligations.



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 | TIME DISTRIBUTION | 2/10 | <i>Unremarkable</i> |
| 4 | SELECTIVE OMISSION | 5/10 | <i>Significant imbalance</i> |
| 5 | NUMERICAL MANIPULATION | 1/10 | <i>Unremarkable</i> |
| 6 | GUILT BY ASSOCIATION | 1/10 | <i>Unremarkable</i> |
| 7 | TIMING | 2/10 | <i>Unremarkable</i> |
| 8 | SELECTIVE OUTRAGE | 1/10 | <i>Unremarkable</i> |
| 9 | SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE | 5/10 | <i>Significant imbalance</i> |
| 10 | FRAMING | 4/10 | <i>Slight imbalance</i> |
| 11 | WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY | 3/10 | <i>Slight imbalance</i> |
| 12 | MODERATION BEHAVIOUR | 2/10 | <i>Unremarkable</i> |
| 13 | QUESTION ASYMMETRY | 2/10 | <i>Unremarkable</i> |
| 14 | FALSE BALANCE | 1/10 | <i>Unremarkable</i> |
| 15 | AGENDA-SETTING | 4/10 | <i>Slight imbalance</i> |

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

2.7/10

Slight imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

2.7/10

Slight imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

2.7/10

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: Broadcasting Act s. 6; BCCSA Code Clause 16 (accuracy and fairness in context)

Conduct: Introduction of "vote rigging" allegations without attribution, specification, or institutional response.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:15–00:18 — Quote: "with some parties contesting the results and allegations of vote rigging"

Assessment: The use of the term "vote rigging" — which implies deliberate criminal electoral fraud — without identifying the alleging parties, specifying the alleged conduct, or including an IEC response, fails the accuracy and contextual fairness requirements of Clause 16. The allegation is introduced as a framing device and then abandoned, leaving viewers with an unresolved impression of electoral criminality that is neither substantiated nor rebutted. This constitutes a failure to report "in the correct context and in a balanced manner" as required.

Violation 2:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6; BCCSA Code Clause 18 (opposing views on controversial issues)

Conduct: Absence of any party representative, IEC official, or independent expert voice in a broadcast explicitly covering contested election results and coalition negotiations.

Evidence: Entire broadcast (00:00–05:10) — no voice other than SABC staff is included.

Assessment: The question of whether election results are legitimate — raised explicitly by the "vote rigging" allegation — is a controversial issue of significant public importance. Clause 18 requires that opposing views be presented. The broadcast presents only the SABC reporter's procedural framing; no party contesting the results is given voice, no IEC response is included, and no independent assessment is provided. While the short duration and live rolling coverage format provide partial mitigation, the complete absence of any non-SABC voice on a broadcast covering electoral legitimacy challenges falls below the Clause 18 standard.

Violation 3:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6 (highest standards of journalism)

Conduct: Legal interpretation of Section 55 and court challenge threshold presented as authoritative analysis without qualification as lay interpretation.

Evidence: Timestamp 03:47–04:08 — Quote: "one would argue that you would have to show a material difference that is you have to EI the discrepancy rather to the overall election outcome and show that you were unfairly prejudiced or disenfranchised"

Assessment: The reporter's lay interpretation of the legal threshold for electoral court challenges is presented without qualification and without reference to an independent legal expert. While the interpretation is broadly directionally correct, presenting it as authoritative analysis — particularly on a matter of live legal significance — falls below the "highest standards of journalism" required by s. 6. An independent electoral law specialist should have been consulted.

Overall Assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 6

This broadcast exhibits three identifiable departures from the standards required by Broadcasting Act s. 6 and the BCCSA Code, none of which individually constitutes a severe or systematic violation but which collectively represent a pattern of structural inadequacy for the subject matter covered. The most significant departure is the introduction of "vote rigging" allegations without attribution or institutional response, which fails the accuracy and contextual fairness



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

requirements of BCCSA Code Clause 16. The complete absence of non-SABC voices on a broadcast covering contested election results falls below the Clause 18 standard for presenting opposing views on controversial issues of public importance. These findings do not establish deliberate political bias in favour of any specific party, but they do establish a structural tendency toward institutional legitimacy framing that is inconsistent with the impartiality and highest-standards requirements of the SABC's Charter obligations. A formal complaint to the BCCSA on the basis of Clause 16 (accuracy and context) would have reasonable prospects of success with respect to the "vote rigging" allegation finding.



CHAPTER 6 — Source Depth Check

KY Manga — SABC News Political Reporter

- 1. FUNDING:** SABC is funded by a combination of government grants (approximately 30–40% of revenue), television licence fees, and commercial advertising. The South African government, through the Department of Communications and Digital Technologies, exercises significant influence over SABC through board appointments. This creates a structural proximity to state interests.
- 2. MANDATE:** KY Manga's mandate as a political reporter is to report on political developments accurately and fairly. This mandate is compatible with factual reporting but does not extend to providing authoritative legal interpretation of electoral statutes without qualification.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** SABC has an institutional interest in presenting the electoral process as legitimate and manageable, given its role as the state broadcaster and its historical association with ANC-era governance. This creates a mild structural conflict of interest on questions of electoral legitimacy. No personal conflict of interest is identifiable from the transcript.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source Traffic Light, 6D):**
 - D1 Conflict of Interest: 0 — Mild institutional conflict (state-adjacent funding); no personal conflict evident.
 - D2 Personal Risk: 0 — Standard professional assignment; no personal risk.
 - D3 Subject Competence: +1 — Competent political reporter; not a qualified electoral lawyer.
 - D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 — No prior contradictory statements identifiable.
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 — Largely factual and procedural; minimal emotional loading.
 - D6 Source Level: 0 — Secondary source; synthesising information rather than citing primary documents.**TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** An independent electoral law specialist (e.g., from the University of the Witwatersrand Law School or the Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa) would provide authoritative rather than journalistic interpretation of Section 55 and the court challenge threshold. No such voice is included in this broadcast.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The SABC reporter's competence and professionalism are not in question. The "Yellow" rating reflects structural factors (state-adjacent funding, secondary source status, lay legal interpretation) rather than any finding of personal bias or incompetence. The absence of independent expert voices is a structural editorial decision, not a reflection on the individual reporter.

Analysis completed under Version 3.0-detail methodology. Methodological Principle K11+K8 applied: triggering events documented for all asymmetry assessments (Criteria 8 and 12). All asymmetry findings assessed against comparable triggers from other positions/guests before scoring.

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.



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

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



| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 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.



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.