



SABC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20240607_2024 Election Outcomes / Contention of ANC's GNU proposal.en

Broadcast: SABC-Sendung | Analyzed: 2026-05-25 10:20

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

OVERALL SCORE

4.7/10

Significant 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)

4.2 / 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

Analysis Framework: Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, s. 6 | BCCSA Code Clauses 16 & 18

Methodological Standard: K11+K8 v3.0-detail — Trigger Event Documentation Required

Classification: Court-Ready Detail Analysis

South Africa is governed since the 2024 general elections (29 May 2024) by a Government of National Unity (GNU) — a broad coalition led by the ANC after losing its 30-year parliamentary majority for the first time since 1994. The GNU comprises the ANC (159 seats), DA (87), IFP (17), PA (9), FF+ (6), and five smaller parties, totalling approximately 287 of 400 seats. The main opposition outside the GNU consists of MK (58 seats, Jacob Zuma), EFF (39 seats, Julius Malema), ActionSA (6), and ACDP (3). Note: This broadcast was recorded during the coalition formation negotiations immediately following the 29 May 2024 election — the GNU had not yet been formally constituted at time of broadcast.

Party	CHES L-R (est.)	Seats	Gov/Opposition	Core Position
EFF	1.5	39	Opposition	Far-left; land expropriation without compensation, nationalisation
MK	3.0	58	Opposition	Left-populist; Zuma personality cult, anti-establishment
ANC	4.0	159	Government (lead)	Centre-left; broad church, social democracy
IFP	6.5	17	Government	Right-wing; traditional values, Zulu nationalist
DA	6.0	87	Government	Centre-right; free market, constitutional liberalism
FF+	8.0	6	Government	Right-wing; Afrikaner interest, property rights
PA	7.0	9	Government	Right-wing populist; anti-immigration
ActionSA	6.5	6	Opposition	Centre-right; anti-immigration, law and order
ACDP	7.5	3	Opposition	Right-wing Christian conservative

The central tension at the time of this broadcast is the post-election coalition formation process, with the ANC having lost its outright majority and needing to negotiate with parties across the ideological spectrum. The EFF and MK represent a radical left-populist challenge that explicitly rejects coalition with the DA and FF+, framing these parties as representatives of "white colonial and apartheid systems." The DA, conversely, conditions its participation on exclusion of parties that do not respect the Constitution, directly targeting the EFF. The IFP occupies a pragmatic middle position, signalling openness to multiple scenarios while awaiting further ANC consultation.

The SABC (South African Broadcasting Corporation) is the public broadcaster mandated under the Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999 to provide programming that serves all South Africans, with specific obligations of fairness, accuracy, impartiality, and balance under s. 6 of the Act and BCCSA Code Clauses 16 and 18. The SABC has a documented history of political capture during the Motsoeneng era (2012–2016), when editorial independence was systematically compromised in favour of ANC interests. Post-capture reforms have improved formal independence, but structural proximity to ANC-aligned narratives remains a live concern for media analysts and civil society.



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 positive/negative treatment.

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position
ANC	+2	00:31 "The ANC has decided to remain central and not to choose any of the left or right leaning ideological parties" — Programme position: centrist coalition-builder, broad church — Represented as neutral broker; accurate but incomplete (ANC's own ideological commitments not contextualised)
DA	+3	02:08 "The Democratic Alliance welcomes the fact that negotiations can now proceed into a more substantial phase" — Programme position: constitutional liberalism, free market, coalition-willing — Accurately represented as constructive and constitutionally committed; no distortion
MK	0	MK is mentioned at 01:05 only as a "bone of contention" in passing — Programme position: left-populist, anti-establishment, Zuma-led — Not represented substantively; no MK voice included; position not explained
EFF	+1	01:05–01:58 — EFF position on GNU opposition presented with direct quote and historical argument — Programme position: far-left, anti-DA, anti-apartheid-legacy parties — Core position represented but framing of EFF's argument as historically grounded vs. constitutionally problematic not explored
IFP	+3	03:15–04:15 — IFP statement read in full, three scenarios presented, procedural caution noted — Programme position: pragmatic right-wing, Zulu nationalist, open to coalition — Accurately and fairly represented
PA	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: right-wing populist, anti-immigration — Absent from broadcast
FF+	-1	02:15 — Mentioned only as a party the EFF refuses to work with ("freedom front plus") — Programme position: Afrikaner interest, property rights — No independent representation; appears only as a negative reference point in EFF's framing
ActionSA	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: centre-right, anti-immigration — Absent from broadcast

Party Bias Summary

- Most Accurate Representation: DA and IFP (Score +3 each) — both received substantive, direct-quote representation of their stated positions
- Strongest Distortion: FF+ (Score -1) — appears exclusively as a negative reference in EFF's framing, with no independent voice or position presented
- Average Deviation from 0: 1.25
- Conclusion: The broadcast accurately represents the positions of parties that provided direct statements (DA, IFP, EFF, ANC). However, MK — the second-largest party in parliament — receives no substantive representation despite being directly relevant to coalition negotiations. FF+ is mentioned only as a target of EFF criticism, creating a structurally asymmetric representation where right-wing parties either appear as villains in others' narratives or are absent entirely.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: SABC News Report — Post-Election Coalition Formation Negotiations
- Date (from transcript context): Approximately 4–6 June 2024 (references to "Sunday 2 June 2024" meeting and "Monday 10 June 2024" IFP NEC meeting; ANC announcement referenced as "last night")
- Estimated Length: Approximately 4 minutes 28 seconds (based on transcript timestamps 00:00–04:28)
- Presenter/Reporter: Unnamed SABC News reporter (sign-off: "SABC News, Johannesburg")
- Persons Interviewed / Quoted:

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Unnamed ANC spokesperson	Party spokesperson / negotiator	ANC	Centre-left (4.0)
Julius Malema (implied by EFF quote)	EFF President	EFF	Far-left (1.5)
John Steenhuisen (implied by DA quote)	DA Federal Leader	DA	Centre-right (6.0)
Unnamed IFP spokesperson	IFP coalition task team	IFP	Right-wing (6.5)
EFF spokesperson (additional)	EFF representative	EFF	Far-left (1.5)

Note: No individuals are named in the transcript. All quotes are attributed to parties, not named individuals. This is itself a finding (see Step 3, Criterion 2).

Main Topic

A news report on the post-election coalition formation negotiations in South Africa following the 29 May 2024 general elections, covering the ANC's proposal for a Government of National Unity and the responses of the DA, EFF, and IFP.

World-Knowledge Context

The 2024 South African general elections produced a historic result: the ANC fell below 50% for the first time since 1994, winning 40% of the vote. This triggered an unprecedented coalition negotiation process. The ANC's proposal for a Government of National Unity (GNU) — modelled loosely on the 1994 post-apartheid GNU — was contested from multiple directions: the EFF and MK rejected any coalition involving the DA and FF+, framing these parties as representatives of apartheid-era interests; the DA welcomed the GNU proposal but conditioned participation on constitutional respect and exclusion of the EFF; the IFP signalled cautious openness. The MK party, as the third-largest party, was a critical wildcard, particularly regarding KwaZulu-Natal provincial government formation. The negotiations took place against a backdrop of South Africa's severe socioeconomic challenges, including unemployment above 32%, persistent load shedding, and high crime rates.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

"Expert" 1: Unnamed ANC Spokesperson

Timestamp: 00:00–00:30

Statement: "The ANC has entered these discussions with an open mind and a commitment to speak to all parties that have a stated intention to advance the interests of the people of South Africa"

Classification: Party spokesperson; direct partisan interest in framing ANC as neutral and inclusive

Missing Counter-Voice: An independent political analyst or MK/EFF spokesperson to challenge the "open mind" framing

Source Depth Check:

(a) **FUNDING:** ANC party funds; directly funded by the party whose position is being presented

Conflict of interest: Maximum — spokesperson is paid to represent ANC interests

(b) **MANDATE:** Explicitly partisan; mandate is to advance ANC's negotiating position, not to provide neutral analysis

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — Direct party employee presenting party position

D2 Personal Risk: -2 — No personal risk; advancing employer's interests

D3 Subject Competence: +1 — Competent on ANC internal processes; not competent as neutral analyst

D4 Opinion Consistency: +1 — Consistent with ANC's stated coalition strategy

D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 — Relatively measured language; procedural framing

D6 Source Level: -1 — Secondary source (party statement, not primary document)

TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) **PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** The ANC spokesperson is presented without any label identifying them as a partisan source. The framing "The ANC has entered these discussions with an open mind" is presented as a factual statement rather than a political claim. This is Technique 2 (Source Selection) — partisan framing presented as neutral fact.

"Expert" 2: EFF Spokesperson (unnamed, likely Malema)

Timestamp: 01:05–01:58

Statement: "We do not want to form any part of a government with representatives of the white colonial and apartheid system"

Classification: EFF party leader/spokesperson; direct partisan interest; most ideologically charged statement in the broadcast

Missing Counter-Voice: Historical expert to contextualise 1994 GNU; DA or FF+ response to the "apartheid system" characterisation

Source Depth Check:

(a) **FUNDING:** EFF party funds; directly funded by the party whose position is being presented

Conflict of interest: Maximum — spokesperson advancing EFF's negotiating and ideological position

(b) **MANDATE:** Explicitly partisan; mandate is to advance EFF's political agenda

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 — Direct party representative



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

D2 Personal Risk: -1 — Some political risk in taking hardline position; but consistent with EFF brand
D3 Subject Competence: +1 — Competent on EFF's own position; not a neutral analyst
D4 Opinion Consistency: +2 — Fully consistent with EFF's long-standing anti-DA, anti-apartheid-legacy position
D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: -1 — Emotionally charged language ("white colonial and apartheid system"); limited data
D6 Source Level: -1 — Secondary source (party statement)

TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: The EFF statement is the longest and most ideologically elaborated in the broadcast. It is presented without challenge, fact-check, or counter-perspective. The historical claims about the 1994 GNU (FW de Klerk as Deputy President, etc.) are accurate in narrow factual terms but are presented in a politically loaded framing that goes unchallenged.

"Expert" 3: DA Spokesperson (unnamed)

Timestamp: 02:08–03:14

Statement: "The Democratic Alliance welcomes the fact that negotiations can now proceed into a more substantial phase"

Classification: DA party spokesperson; direct partisan interest

Missing Counter-Voice: EFF or MK response to DA's constitutional conditions

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: DA party funds

Conflict of interest: Maximum — party spokesperson

(b) MANDATE: Explicitly partisan

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2
D2 Personal Risk: -1
D3 Subject Competence: +1
D4 Opinion Consistency: +2 — Consistent with DA's stated pro-GNU, pro-constitution position
D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +2 — Measured, procedural language
D6 Source Level: -1

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: DA statement is procedural and measured; presented accurately but without independent verification of DA's constitutional claims.

"Expert" 4: IFP Spokesperson (unnamed)

Timestamp: 03:15–04:15

Statement: "It is abundantly clear that difficult choices and political considerations of material consequences for the country are upon us"

Classification: IFP coalition task team; direct partisan interest

Missing Counter-Voice: None specifically required; IFP's procedural caution is relatively uncontroversial

Source Depth Check:

(a) FUNDING: IFP party funds

(b) MANDATE: Explicitly partisan

D1 Conflict of Interest: -2
D2 Personal Risk: -1
D3 Subject Competence: +1
D4 Opinion Consistency: +2
D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data: +1 — Measured language
D6 Source Level: -1

TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

Missing Expert Groups:

- Independent constitutional law expert
- Political scientist / electoral analyst
- Civil society representative (COSATU, business, civic)



Summary (Matrix Result):

- ANC Spokesperson: YELLOW (-2) — Partisan; presented without partisan label
- EFF Spokesperson: YELLOW (-2) — Partisan; most ideologically charged; presented without challenge
- DA Spokesperson: YELLOW (+1) — Partisan; measured; presented accurately
- IFP Spokesperson: YELLOW (0) — Partisan; procedural; presented accurately
- Overall finding: The broadcast contains exclusively partisan sources. No independent expert voice is present. All four sources have direct conflicts of interest. The absence of any independent analytical voice is the primary expert selection failure.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: ANC Party Statement

Timestamp 00:00–00:30 — Statement: "The ANC has entered these discussions with an open mind"

- (a) **Funding and governance:** ANC party funds; ANC National Executive Committee
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** ANC is the primary actor in coalition negotiations; its statement is a negotiating position, not a neutral assessment
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** An independent political analyst assessing whether the ANC's "open mind" claim is consistent with its actual negotiating behaviour

Source 2: EFF Party Statement

Timestamp 01:05–01:58 — Statement: "We do not want to form any part of a government with representatives of the white colonial and apartheid system"

- (a) **Funding:** EFF party funds
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** EFF has a direct interest in framing the DA and FF+ as illegitimate coalition partners; this statement advances that interest
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** DA or FF+ response to the "apartheid system" characterisation; historical expert on the 1994 GNU

Rumour Check (Penalty Points): The EFF statement contains no unverified rumours in the strict sense; the historical claims (FW de Klerk as Deputy President, etc.) are factually accurate. No penalty points applied for rumour.

Source 3: DA Party Statement

Timestamp 02:08–03:14 — Statement: "In our upcoming meetings with the ANC we will also seek further details on what the proposed government of national unity is"

- (a) **Funding:** DA party funds
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** DA has a direct interest in presenting itself as constructive and constitutionally committed
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** EFF or MK response to DA's constitutional conditions

Source 4: IFP Coalition Task Team Statement

Timestamp 03:15–04:15 — Statement: "Three scenarios were presented: a grand coalition, government of national unity, and the minority government"

- (a) **Funding:** IFP party funds
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** IFP has an interest in appearing as a responsible, deliberative actor
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** None specifically critical

Source 5: EFF (additional statement on KwaZulu-Natal)



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

Timestamp

04:16–04:27 — Statement: "The EFF has also called on parties to allow the MK party to get their first preference to form government in KwaZulu-Natal as they are the majority party in the legislature"

(a) Funding: EFF party funds

(b) Structural conflict of interest: EFF and MK have aligned interests in KwaZulu-Natal; this statement advances MK's provincial claim

(c) Missing counter-source: ANC or DA response to MK's KwaZulu-Natal claim; IFP (which also has significant KwaZulu-Natal presence) response

Summary: All five sources are party political statements with direct conflicts of interest. No independent, non-partisan source is cited in the entire broadcast. The source selection is structurally homogeneous — exclusively partisan — which constitutes a significant departure from BCCSA Code Clause 18 requirements for balanced presentation on controversial issues of public importance.



3. AIRTIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated airtime (based on transcript word count and timestamp analysis):

- ANC statement: 00:00–00:30 — approximately 30 seconds (11%)
- Reporter narration / framing: 00:31–01:04 — approximately 34 seconds (13%)
- EFF statement (main): 01:05–01:58 — approximately 53 seconds (20%)
- DA statement: 02:08–03:14 — approximately 66 seconds (25%)
- IFP statement: 03:15–04:15 — approximately 60 seconds (22%)
- EFF statement (KZN): 04:16–04:27 — approximately 11 seconds (4%)
- Reporter sign-off: 04:27–04:28 — approximately 5 seconds (2%)
- Reporter narration (interspersed): approximately 8 seconds (3%)

By party:

- ANC: ~30 seconds (11%)
- EFF: ~64 seconds (24%) — two separate statements
- DA: ~66 seconds (25%)
- IFP: ~60 seconds (22%)
- MK: 0 seconds (0%)
- FF+: 0 seconds (0%) — mentioned only in EFF's statement
- Reporter: ~47 seconds (18%)

Summary: Airtime distribution is broadly comparable between DA, IFP, and EFF (22–25% each), with the ANC receiving notably less direct voice (11%) despite being the central actor in negotiations. MK — the second-largest opposition party with 58 seats — receives zero airtime, which is the most significant distributional asymmetry. The EFF receives the most total airtime when both statements are combined (24%), and its statements are the most ideologically elaborated.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1: MK Party Position

Context

The MK party won 58 seats (14.6%) — the third-largest party in parliament and the largest opposition party outside the GNU. MK's position on coalition formation, particularly in KwaZulu-Natal, was one of the most consequential variables in the post-election negotiations.

Relevant at: 01:05 — MK is mentioned only as "a bone of contention" in the reporter's narration

Effect

The broadcast creates the impression that the coalition negotiation involves ANC, DA, EFF, and IFP as the primary actors, while the party with the third-largest seat count is effectively invisible. This structurally marginalises MK's democratic weight.

Omission 2: FF+ Independent Voice

Context

The FF+ won 6 seats and was subsequently included in the GNU. Its position on coalition formation — particularly its concerns about Afrikaner minority interests and property rights — was directly relevant to the negotiations.

Relevant at: 02:15 — FF+ mentioned only as a party the EFF refuses to work with

Effect

FF+ appears exclusively as a negative reference point in EFF's ideological framing. The broadcast presents EFF's characterisation of FF+ as an "apartheid system" representative without any FF+ response, creating an unchallenged negative portrayal.

Omission 3: Independent Contextualisation of EFF's Historical Claims

Context

The EFF's statement (01:21–01:55) makes specific historical claims about the 1994 GNU — naming FW de Klerk, "Big B" (likely Pik Botha), André Fourie, and others as ministers from "the apartheid establishment." These claims are factually accurate in a narrow sense but are presented in a politically loaded framing that equates 1994 GNU participation with the proposed 2024 GNU.

Relevant at: 01:21–01:55

Effect

The historical analogy goes entirely unchallenged. No historian, constitutional expert, or counter-voice is provided to contextualise the differences between the 1994 and 2024 situations. The EFF's framing is presented as historical fact rather than political argument.

Summary: The broadcast's most significant omissions are structural: the absence of MK (third-largest party), the absence of any independent expert voice, and the absence of any challenge to EFF's historically loaded framing. These omissions collectively skew the broadcast toward a narrative in which the GNU debate is primarily a contest between the ANC's centrist proposal, the DA's constitutional conditions, and the EFF's ideological objections — while the MK party's pivotal role is invisible.

Missing Voices

- MK Party spokesperson: Would have contributed MK's coalition demands, KwaZulu-Natal position, and Zuma's conditions — critical given MK's 58 seats
- FF+ spokesperson: Would have provided the Afrikaner minority perspective on GNU participation and responded to EFF's characterisation



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

- Constitutional law expert (e.g., University of Cape Town or Wits law faculty): Would have contextualised the legal framework for coalition formation and assessed the GNU's constitutional basis
- Political scientist / electoral analyst: Would have provided independent analysis of what the election result mandates and what coalition scenarios are viable
- Civil society representative (e.g., COSATU, business federation, civic organisation): Would have represented non-party stakeholder interests in the coalition outcome
- Historian: Would have fact-checked and contextualised EFF's characterisation of the 1994 GNU and its legacy
- Voter/citizen voice: Would have grounded the abstract coalition negotiations in the lived experience of the electorate
- Economic analyst: Would have assessed the market and investment implications of different coalition outcomes



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 04:22–04:26

Number: "as they are the majority party in the legislature" (referring to MK in KwaZulu-Natal)

Dimensions: (a) Absolute claim — "majority party" stated; (b) Proportion — no seat count or percentage given; (c) Trend — no context on how MK achieved this position

Missing Context: MK's exact seat count in the KwaZulu-Natal legislature and whether "majority party" means an outright majority or merely the largest single party (plurality) is not specified. The distinction is constitutionally significant.

Effect

The claim "majority party" could be interpreted as an outright majority (>50%), which would make MK's claim to form government stronger, or as a plurality, which would not automatically entitle MK to form government. The ambiguity is not resolved.

Summary: Numerical manipulation is minimal in this broadcast, which is primarily a compilation of party statements rather than a data-driven report. The single finding relates to an ambiguous use of "majority" in the KwaZulu-Natal context. No significant statistical manipulation is present.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION									5/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Association 1:	
Timestamp	01:05–01:58
Quote	<i>"We do not want to form any part of a government with representatives of the white colonial and apartheid system"</i>
Technique: The EFF statement explicitly associates the DA and FF+ with "the white colonial and apartheid system" — a direct guilt-by-association technique linking contemporary parties to the apartheid regime	
Effect	The DA and FF+ are framed as ideological successors to apartheid, which is a serious political charge. The broadcast presents this framing without challenge, effectively amplifying it.

Source Check for Parties Framed as "Apartheid System Representatives":

- DA: Works with primary sources (policy documents, constitutional arguments); its core positions are falsifiable; it has consistently positioned itself as a constitutional, post-apartheid party. Category A — Systemically critical party with documented methodology.
- FF+: Works with primary sources; its positions on Afrikaner minority rights are documented and falsifiable; it participated in the 1994 democratic transition. Category A — Documented policy positions.

Risk Matrix for EFF's Framing:

- What has the DA/FF+ lost through their positions? DA has lost ANC-aligned voters; FF+ has a narrow but stable constituency. Neither gains from being labelled "apartheid system."
- What does EFF gain from this framing? Political mobilisation, differentiation from ANC, voter base consolidation.
- Net: The framing serves EFF's political interests; the parties being framed have no equivalent platform in this broadcast to respond.

Tonality: The EFF statement is emotionally charged ("white colonial and apartheid system") rather than analytically grounded. It does not acknowledge uncertainty or nuance.

Association Chain: DA/FF+ → "apartheid establishment" → "white colonial system" → illegitimate coalition partners

Summary (Category Assignment):

- DA: Category A (documented, falsifiable positions) — framed by EFF as Category C (apartheid legacy); broadcast does not challenge this framing
- FF+: Category A (documented, falsifiable positions) — framed by EFF as Category C; broadcast does not challenge this framing
- Overall finding: The broadcast amplifies a guilt-by-association technique without providing the targeted parties an opportunity to respond, and without independent contextualisation. This constitutes a significant bias finding.



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 01:05–01:58 (middle of broadcast)

Content: EFF's ideologically charged statement associating DA and FF+ with "the white colonial and apartheid system"

Timing Effect: The EFF statement is placed after the ANC's neutral framing and before the DA's procedural response. This sequencing means the EFF's ideological charge is the emotional centrepiece of the broadcast — it follows the ANC's "open mind" framing (which sets a cooperative tone) and precedes the DA's measured procedural response. The DA's response does not directly address the EFF's charge, creating an asymmetry where the charge lands without rebuttal.

Finding 2:

Position: 04:16–04:27 (end of broadcast)

Content: "The EFF has also called on parties to allow the MK party to get their first preference to form government in KwaZulu-Natal"

Timing Effect: The broadcast ends with an EFF statement supporting MK's provincial claim. This is the final impression left with the audience — an EFF/MK aligned position on KwaZulu-Natal governance. No ANC, DA, or IFP response to this claim is provided. Ending on this note gives the EFF/MK position disproportionate salience as the broadcast's closing message.

Finding 3:

Position: 00:00–00:30 (opening)

Content: ANC statement framing itself as neutral and open-minded

Timing Effect: Opening with the ANC's self-characterisation as a neutral broker sets the interpretive frame for the entire broadcast. The ANC's claim to centrism is the first thing the audience hears, establishing it as the default reference point against which other parties' positions are measured.

Summary: The broadcast's structure — ANC neutrality claim → EFF ideological charge → DA procedural response → IFP caution → EFF/MK KwaZulu-Natal claim — creates a narrative arc that begins with ANC centrism, is emotionally dominated by EFF's ideological framing, and ends with an EFF/MK aligned position. This sequencing is not neutral.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

2/10

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 Standard (v3.0): The trigger 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 01:05–01:58

Trigger Event: EFF statement associating DA and FF+ with "the white colonial and apartheid system"

Reaction: Reporter presents the statement without any editorial challenge, contextualisation, or counter-voice

Comparison

ANC statement at 00:00–00:30 — also presented without challenge; DA statement at 02:08–03:14 — also presented without challenge; IFP statement at 03:15–04:15 — also presented without challenge

Asymmetry: The absence of editorial challenge is consistent across all party statements. The EFF's statement is the most politically charged and historically loaded, yet receives the same unchallenged treatment as the more procedural statements of other parties. This is not selective outrage in the strict sense — the reporter applies consistent non-intervention across all statements. However, the failure to challenge the most inflammatory statement (EFF's) while also failing to challenge the more measured statements creates a de facto asymmetry in impact: the most charged statement benefits most from the absence of challenge.

Outrage Level: 0/5 — No editorial outrage expressed by reporter

Selectivity: 2/5 — Mild asymmetry in impact (not in treatment) due to consistent non-intervention applied to statements of varying inflammatory content

Summary: No explicit selective outrage is present in this broadcast. The reporter maintains consistent non-intervention across all party statements. However, the consistent non-intervention approach disproportionately benefits the most inflammatory statement (EFF's guilt-by-association framing), since that statement requires the most contextualisation to be fairly presented. The absence of challenge is formally consistent but substantively asymmetric in effect.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp Throughout broadcast

Missing Perspective/Fact: MK party's position on coalition formation

Relevance: MK won 58 seats — the third-largest party in parliament. Its position on the GNU was one of the most consequential variables in the negotiations. Jacob Zuma's personal conditions for any coalition were widely reported at the time.

Impact

The broadcast creates a structurally incomplete picture of the coalition landscape, in which the third-largest party is effectively invisible. This is not a minor omission — it is the omission of a primary actor.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 01:21–01:55

Missing Perspective/Fact: Independent historical contextualisation of EFF's 1994 GNU claims

Relevance: The EFF makes specific historical claims about the 1994 GNU that are factually accurate in a narrow sense but politically loaded in their application to 2024. The differences between the 1994 and 2024 contexts (negotiated transition vs. electoral outcome; sunset clauses vs. voluntary coalition; etc.) are material to assessing the analogy's validity.

Impact

The audience receives EFF's historical framing as uncontested fact, which strengthens the EFF's political argument without the audience being equipped to evaluate it critically.

Finding 3:

Timestamp Throughout broadcast

Missing Perspective/Fact: Any independent expert, civil society, or voter voice

Relevance: A broadcast on a matter of the highest public importance — the formation of a new government — that contains exclusively partisan party statements provides no independent analytical framework for the audience.

Impact

The audience is left with competing party claims and no tools to evaluate them. This is a structural completeness failure that affects the entire broadcast.

Summary: The broadcast's completeness failures are systematic rather than incidental. The absence of MK, the absence of independent expertise, and the absence of historical contextualisation collectively produce a picture of the coalition negotiations that is structurally incomplete and structurally advantageous to the parties that are represented (particularly the EFF, whose most contestable claims go unchallenged).

Share of covered perspectives

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

[A] ANC's rationale for the GNU proposal and its vision for coalition governance

[B] DA's conditions for participation and its constitutional red lines

[C] EFF's ideological objections and its alternative vision for post-election governance



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

- [D] MK party's position on coalition formation and its demands, particularly in KwaZulu-Natal
 - [E] IFP's pragmatic assessment of the three scenarios (grand coalition, GNU, minority government)
 - [F] FF+'s position on the GNU and its concerns about Afrikaner minority interests
 - [G] Civil society and constitutional law expert analysis of the GNU's legal and democratic implications
 - [H] Historical context of the 1994 GNU:** accuracy of EFF's characterisation
 - [I] Voter perspective:** what the electorate's fragmented vote actually mandated
 - [J] International/investor perspective on political stability implications of different coalition outcomes
- ### Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

[A] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 00:00–00:30 — Quote: "The ANC has entered these discussions with an open mind and a commitment to speak to all parties that have a stated intention to advance the interests of the people of South Africa" — Assessment: ANC position presented but limited to procedural framing; substantive policy rationale for GNU absent.

[B] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 02:08–03:14 — Quote: "The Democratic Alliance welcomes the fact that negotiations can now proceed into a more substantial phase" — Assessment: DA's procedural welcome and constitutional conditions noted; substantive policy demands not elaborated.

[C] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 01:05–01:58 — Quote: "We do not want to form any part of a government with representatives of the white colonial and apartheid system" — Assessment: EFF's ideological objection presented in the most detail of any party; historical argument included.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — MK mentioned at 01:05 only as "a bone of contention" — Assessment: No MK voice, no MK position, no explanation of MK's demands; critical omission given MK's 58 seats and KwaZulu-Natal significance.

[E] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 03:15–04:15 — Quote: "Three scenarios were presented: a grand coalition, government of national unity, and the minority government" — Assessment: IFP's procedural position adequately represented.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — FF+ mentioned only as a party the EFF refuses to work with — Assessment: No FF+ voice; no FF+ position on GNU; party appears only as a negative reference.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No constitutional law expert, political scientist, or civil society voice included — Assessment: Significant gap; all voices are partisan; no independent analytical perspective provided.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — EFF's historical characterisation of the 1994 GNU (01:21–01:55) is presented without fact-check or contextualisation — Assessment: EFF's claim that the 1994 GNU included "representatives of the apartheid establishment" is historically accurate in a narrow sense but politically loaded; no counter-perspective offered.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No reference to what voters actually voted for or what the fragmented result means democratically — Assessment: The democratic mandate question is entirely absent.



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

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: N/A — No economic, investor, or international perspective on coalition stability — Assessment: Relevant given South Africa's economic vulnerabilities; absent.

Completeness Score: 4/10

Reasoning: The broadcast addresses four of ten relevant perspectives (ANC, DA, EFF, IFP), all of which are partisan party statements. Six perspectives are entirely absent, including the second-largest opposition party (MK), the FF+ (a GNU member), any independent expert analysis, historical fact-checking of EFF's claims, voter mandate context, and economic/stability implications. The broadcast functions as a compilation of party press statements rather than a contextualised news analysis.



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:31–01:04

Quote

"The ANC has decided to remain central and not to choose any of the left or right leaning ideological parties for the formation of a coalition"

Manipulation

The reporter frames the ANC as a neutral centrist actor that has deliberately chosen not to align with ideological extremes. This framing accepts the ANC's self-characterisation as objective fact rather than political claim.

Why problematic

The ANC is itself an ideological party with a specific political programme. Framing it as "central" and "not ideological" while describing other parties as "left or right leaning ideological parties" creates a false hierarchy in which the ANC occupies a privileged, neutral position. This framing is the ANC's own preferred self-presentation, not an independent journalistic assessment.

Finding 2:

Timestamp

01:00–01:05

Quote

"A government of national unity is the proposal on the table but there's a bone of contention on the part of the DA and the MK party"

Manipulation

The GNU is framed as the natural, default proposal ("on the table"), with the DA and MK framed as sources of "contention" — i.e., obstacles to the natural outcome.

Why problematic

This framing pre-judges the GNU as the correct outcome and frames parties that have reservations as problematic. The DA's constitutional conditions and MK's objections are legitimate political positions, not mere "bones of contention." The framing subtly delegitimises dissent from the GNU proposal.

Finding 3:

Timestamp

04:16–04:27

Quote

"The EFF has also called on parties to allow the MK party to get their first preference to form government in KwaZulu-Natal as they are the majority party in the legislature"

Manipulation

The word "allow" frames MK's claim to form government in KwaZulu-Natal as a matter of permission rather than negotiation. It implies that other parties are withholding something that rightfully belongs to MK.

Why problematic

Whether MK has a right to form government in KwaZulu-Natal is a contested political and constitutional question. The framing "allow" accepts EFF's framing of MK's entitlement without challenge.



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 a neutral centrist broker, the GNU as the natural default outcome, and parties with reservations as sources of "contention." This framing structure is not neutral — it reflects the ANC's preferred narrative and subtly delegitimises opposition to the GNU proposal.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY									5/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	00:53–00:58
Quote	<i>"not to choose any of the left or right leaning ideological parties"</i>
Manipulation	The term "ideological" is used exclusively to describe parties other than the ANC. This implies that the ANC is non-ideological or post-ideological, while other parties are driven by ideology.
Why problematic	All political parties are ideological. Applying "ideological" selectively to non-ANC parties is a rhetorical technique that elevates the ANC above the political fray. Neutral alternative: "parties with distinct ideological positions" applied consistently to all parties including the ANC.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	01:17–01:21
Quote	<i>"we are opposed to the government of national unity in as far as it resembles what was concocted in 1994"</i>
Manipulation	The word "concocted" (used by EFF spokesperson) carries strong negative connotations — it implies something artificial, deceptive, or conspiratorial. The broadcast presents this word without editorial comment.
Why problematic	"Concocted" is a loaded term that frames the 1994 GNU as a deceptive arrangement rather than a negotiated democratic settlement. Presenting it without challenge allows this characterisation to stand unchallenged. Neutral alternative: "negotiated" or "established."

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	02:02–02:07
Quote	<i>"representatives of the white colonial and apartheid system"</i>
Manipulation	This phrase (from EFF statement) is the most loaded terminology in the broadcast. It frames the DA and FF+ not as contemporary political parties with their own programmes but as representatives of a historical system of racial oppression.
Why problematic	The broadcast presents this characterisation without challenge, without counter-voice, and without editorial contextualisation. The terminology is presented as a legitimate political description rather than a contested political claim. Neutral alternative: The reporter could have noted that this characterisation is disputed by the parties named.

Summary: The broadcast's most significant word-choice findings relate to the unchallenged presentation of EFF's loaded terminology ("concocted," "white colonial and apartheid system") and the reporter's own use of "ideological" as a selective descriptor for non-ANC parties. These word choices collectively reinforce the ANC's centrist self-framing and the EFF's delegitimisation of right-of-centre parties.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Methodological Standard (v3.0): The trigger 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 01:05–01:58

Trigger Event: EFF spokesperson makes historically loaded claim associating DA and FF+ with "the white colonial and apartheid system" and characterising the 1994 GNU as "concocted"

Reporter Reaction: No challenge, no follow-up question, no contextualisation

Comparison

ANC statement at 00:00–00:30 (procedural, relatively uncontroversial) — no challenge; DA statement at 02:08–03:14 (procedural, relatively uncontroversial) — no challenge; IFP statement at 03:15–04:15 (procedural) — no challenge

Asymmetry: The reporter applies consistent non-intervention across all statements. However, the EFF's statement is qualitatively different from the others — it makes specific historical claims and uses inflammatory characterisations that would, in a balanced broadcast, warrant follow-up or contextualisation. The consistent non-intervention approach is formally symmetric but substantively asymmetric in its effect on the most charged statement.

Note: This is a radio/TV news report, not a live interview format. The reporter does not have the opportunity to ask follow-up questions in real time. The "moderation" in this context refers to editorial choices about what to include, contextualise, or challenge in the narration. The reporter's narration does not challenge any party statement.

Summary: In the context of a pre-recorded news report (not a live interview), moderation behaviour manifests as editorial choices in narration. The reporter consistently presents all party statements without challenge or contextualisation. This is formally symmetric but substantively asymmetric in effect, since the most inflammatory and historically loaded statement (EFF's) benefits most from the absence of editorial challenge.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Note: This broadcast is a news report, not an interview programme. No questions are asked by the reporter. All content consists of party statements read or played. Question asymmetry as a criterion is therefore not directly applicable in its standard form. The assessment is adapted to examine whether the reporter's narration frames different parties' statements with different levels of critical distance.

Asymmetry 1:

Regarding ANC, 00:31–01:04: Reporter narration — "The ANC has decided to remain central and not to choose any of the left or right leaning ideological parties" — Framing: Accepts ANC's self-characterisation as neutral; no critical distance

Regarding EFF, 01:05–01:58: Reporter narration — "The EFF says they want no part in a government that has the DA and freedom front plus" — Framing: Neutral description of EFF's position; no critical distance

Comparison

Both parties receive uncritical narration framing. However, the ANC's framing is more favourable (presented as "central" and non-ideological) while the EFF's framing is neutral (presented as having a stated preference). The asymmetry is mild.

Summary: Question asymmetry is not directly applicable to this news report format. The adapted assessment finds mild asymmetry in the reporter's narration framing, with the ANC receiving slightly more favourable framing ("central," "open mind") than other parties. No systematic question asymmetry is present.



14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

Throughout broadcast

Construct: The broadcast presents four parties (ANC, EFF, DA, IFP) as if they represent the full spectrum of relevant positions in the coalition negotiations

Analysis

This creates a false balance in two respects. First, MK — the third-largest party — is absent, meaning the "balance" achieved is structurally incomplete. Second, the four parties represented span a range from far-left (EFF) to centre-right (DA/IFP), but the right-wing parties (FF+, PA) that are part of the GNU are either absent or appear only as negative references. The broadcast creates the impression of balance by including multiple parties while systematically excluding others.

Summary: The broadcast achieves a superficial appearance of balance by including four parties across the political spectrum, while systematically excluding the third-largest party (MK) and providing no independent voice. This is a mild false balance finding — the broadcast is not presenting two equally weighted sides on a factual question, but rather presenting a partial selection of partisan voices as if they constitute a complete picture.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda Element Set: The GNU is the natural, default, and desirable outcome of the coalition negotiations

Timestamp

01:00–01:05 — Evidence: "A government of national unity is the proposal on the table" — framed as the baseline against which other positions are measured

Alternative Agenda: A minority government, a grand coalition, or a different coalition configuration could equally be presented as viable options. The broadcast treats the GNU as the reference point and other options as deviations.

Finding 2:

Agenda Element Set: The coalition negotiation is primarily a matter of party-to-party negotiation, not a matter of democratic mandate or voter preference

Timestamp

Throughout broadcast — Evidence: No reference to what voters voted for, what the election result means democratically, or what the public interest requires

Alternative Agenda: The broadcast could have framed the coalition negotiations as a question of democratic mandate — what did the electorate vote for, and what coalition best reflects that mandate? This framing is entirely absent.

Finding 3:

Agenda Element Set: The EFF's historical framing of the DA and FF+ as "apartheid system" representatives is a legitimate political argument that belongs in the coalition debate

Timestamp

01:05–01:58 — Evidence: The EFF's statement is presented without challenge as a valid contribution to the coalition debate

Alternative Agenda: The broadcast could have set an agenda in which the constitutional legitimacy of all parties is treated as a given, and coalition negotiations are framed as a question of policy compatibility rather than historical legitimacy. By presenting EFF's historical delegitimation of DA/FF+ without challenge, the broadcast implicitly accepts this as a valid agenda item.

Summary: The broadcast's agenda-setting function is its most significant bias vector. By treating the GNU as the natural default, by framing the coalition debate as a party negotiation rather than a democratic mandate question, and by presenting EFF's historical delegitimation of right-of-centre parties as a legitimate agenda item, the broadcast shapes the audience's understanding of what the coalition debate is about in ways that are structurally favourable to the ANC's preferred narrative.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 1–9): 5.1 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 10–15): 4.2 / 10

Dominant Techniques

The three strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 8):** The systematic absence of MK — the third-largest party in parliament — from a broadcast about coalition formation negotiations is the single most significant bias finding. MK's 58 seats made it a pivotal actor in the negotiations, particularly in KwaZulu-Natal. Its complete absence as a voice, combined with the absence of any independent expert, produces a structurally incomplete picture that cannot be explained by time constraints alone.
- 2. Completeness Failure (Score 8):** The broadcast's completeness failures are systematic: no independent expert, no historical contextualisation of EFF's claims, no voter mandate perspective, no economic/stability analysis. The broadcast functions as a compilation of party press statements rather than a contextualised news report, which is a structural departure from the SABC's mandate under Broadcasting Act s. 6.
- 3. Framing (Score 6) and Agenda-Setting (Score 6) — joint third:** The broadcast's framing of the ANC as a neutral centrist broker and the GNU as the natural default outcome, combined with the agenda-setting function that treats EFF's historical delegitimisation of DA/FF+ as a legitimate debate item, collectively produce a narrative structure that is structurally favourable to the ANC's preferred coalition narrative. These two techniques operate in tandem and reinforce each other.

Core Messages of the Broadcast

****MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** ** "The Government of National Unity is the natural and desirable outcome of the 2024 elections, and the ANC is the responsible centrist actor making it happen."

Technique: Framing + Agenda-Setting — ANC presented as neutral broker; GNU framed as default; dissent framed as "contention"

Evidence: 00:31–01:04, 01:00–01:05

****MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL/POLITICAL):** ** "The DA and FF+ are tainted by their association with the apartheid system, and the EFF's refusal to work with them is historically grounded."

Technique: Guilt by Association + Omission — EFF's characterisation presented unchallenged; no DA/FF+ response; no historical contextualisation

Evidence: 01:05–01:58, 02:02–02:07

****MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** ** "The coalition negotiation is a matter for political parties to resolve among themselves, not a question of democratic mandate or public interest."

Technique: Agenda-Setting + Completeness Failure — no voter perspective, no civil society voice, no democratic mandate framing

Evidence: Throughout broadcast (absence of these perspectives)

Manipulation Level Classification

Reasoning: The overall score of 4.7/10 places this broadcast at the upper boundary of "mild tendency," approaching "clear one-sidedness." The broadcast's primary failures are structural — the systematic absence of MK, the absence of independent expertise, and the framing of the ANC as a neutral broker — rather than overt editorial manipulation. The broadcast does not actively distort the positions of the parties it covers; it accurately represents what those parties said. However, the selection of which parties to cover, the absence of independent contextualisation, and the framing choices collectively produce a broadcast that is structurally favourable to the ANC's preferred narrative and structurally disadvantageous to MK and right-of-centre parties. Under Broadcasting Act s. 6, the SABC is required to provide programming that meets the highest standards of journalism, including fairness and impartiality. A broadcast



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

that covers a matter of the highest public importance — government formation — using exclusively partisan sources and omitting the third-largest party fails to meet this standard.

CONCLUSION

This SABC news report on post-election coalition formation negotiations (approximately 4 June 2024) presents a structurally incomplete picture of a matter of the highest public importance. The broadcast accurately represents the positions of the four parties it covers (ANC, EFF, DA, IFP) but systematically omits the MK party — the third-largest party in parliament with 58 seats — as a voice, while providing no independent expert, civil society, or voter perspective. The framing of the ANC as a neutral centrist broker and the GNU as the natural default outcome reflects the ANC's preferred self-presentation rather than an independent journalistic assessment. The unchallenged presentation of EFF's historically loaded characterisation of DA and FF+ as "representatives of the white colonial and apartheid system" — without counter-voice, fact-check, or contextualisation — constitutes a failure of the impartiality standard required under BCCSA Code Clause 18. Under Broadcasting Act s. 6, the SABC is required to provide programming that meets the highest standards of journalism, including fairness, accuracy, and impartiality; this broadcast, while not overtly propagandistic, falls short of that standard through structural omissions and framing choices that collectively produce a narrative favourable to the ANC's coalition agenda and unfavourable to parties outside the GNU framework.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

5.1/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.2/10

Significant imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

4.7/10

Significant 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 18 — Opposing views on controversial issues of public importance

Offence: The broadcast presents EFF's characterisation of DA and FF+ as "representatives of the white colonial and apartheid system" without providing the targeted parties an opportunity to respond, and without any independent contextualisation of this historically loaded claim.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:05–01:58 — Quote: "We do not want to form any part of a government with representatives of the white colonial and apartheid system"

Assessment: The characterisation of contemporary political parties as representatives of the apartheid system is a controversial claim of significant public importance. Clause 18 requires that opposing views be presented. The DA and FF+ are not given any opportunity to respond to this characterisation within the broadcast. The absence of a counter-voice on this specific claim constitutes a failure to present opposing views on a controversial issue of public importance.

Violation 2:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6 — Highest standards of journalism, including impartiality; BCCSA Code Clause 16 — Correct context and balanced manner

Offence: The broadcast omits the MK party — the third-largest party in parliament with 58 seats — from a report on coalition formation negotiations in which MK was a primary actor.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:05 — MK mentioned only as "a bone of contention" in reporter narration; no MK voice, no MK position, no explanation of MK's demands or conditions

Assessment: A news report on government formation negotiations that omits the third-largest party as a voice cannot be said to be reported "in the correct context and in a balanced manner" as required by Clause 16. The omission is not incidental — MK's position was directly relevant to the negotiations, particularly regarding KwaZulu-Natal. The failure to include MK's perspective constitutes a failure of balance and context under Clause 16.

Violation 3:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6 — Highest standards of journalism; BCCSA Code Clause 16 — Correct context

Offence: The broadcast presents exclusively partisan party statements on a matter of the highest public importance without any independent expert, civil society, or analytical voice to provide context.

Evidence: Throughout broadcast — all five sources are party political statements; no independent voice present

Assessment: A broadcast on government formation — one of the most consequential political events in South Africa's post-apartheid history — that relies exclusively on partisan sources fails to meet the standard of "correct context" required by Clause 16. The absence of independent expertise means the audience has no framework for evaluating the competing partisan claims. This is a structural failure of journalistic standards under Broadcasting Act s. 6.

Overall Assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 6

This broadcast contains three identifiable departures from the standards required under Broadcasting Act s. 6 and BCCSA Code Clauses 16 and 18. The most serious is the failure to present opposing views on EFF's historically loaded characterisation of DA and FF+ (Clause 18 violation), which is a direct and specific failure of the impartiality requirement. The second is the systematic omission of MK as a voice in a report on coalition negotiations in which MK



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

was a primary actor (Clause 16 violation). The third is the structural reliance on exclusively partisan sources without independent contextualisation (Broadcasting Act s. 6 standard). None of these violations rises to the level of deliberate propaganda or active distortion; the broadcast accurately represents what the parties it covers actually said. However, the cumulative effect of these structural failures — selective inclusion, absence of independent expertise, and unchallenged inflammatory framing — produces a broadcast that does not meet the SABC's statutory obligation to provide news and public affairs programming of the highest journalistic standards. A formal complaint to the BCCSA on the basis of Clause 18 (failure to present opposing views on EFF's characterisation of DA/FF+) and Clause 16 (failure to report in correct context given MK's omission) would have a reasonable prospect of success.



CHAPTER 6 — Source Depth Check

All sources cited in this broadcast are party political spokespersons. No NGOs, advisory bodies, or independent expert organisations are cited. The following assessment therefore applies to the party sources as institutional actors.

ANC (as institutional source):

- FUNDING:** ANC party funds; membership fees, donations, public funding via IEC formula
- MANDATE:** Explicitly partisan; mandate is to advance ANC's political interests
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct — ANC is the primary actor in the coalition negotiations it is commenting on
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 | D2 Personal Risk: -2 | D3 Subject Competence: +1 | D4 Consistency: +1 | D5 Emotion vs. Data: +1 | D6 Source Level: -1 → TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Independent political analyst; MK or EFF challenge to ANC's "open mind" claim — not cited

EFF (as institutional source):

- FUNDING:** EFF party funds; membership fees, donations, public funding via IEC formula
- MANDATE:** Explicitly partisan; mandate is to advance EFF's political and ideological interests
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct — EFF has a direct interest in delegitimising DA and FF+ as coalition partners
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 | D2 Personal Risk: -1 | D3 Subject Competence: +1 | D4 Consistency: +2 | D5 Emotion vs. Data: -1 | D6 Source Level: -1 → TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- COUNTER-VOICE:** DA/FF+ response to "apartheid system" characterisation; historical expert on 1994 GNU — not cited

DA (as institutional source):

- FUNDING:** DA party funds; membership fees, donations, public funding via IEC formula
- MANDATE:** Explicitly partisan
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct — DA has an interest in presenting itself as constructive and constitutionally committed
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 | D2 Personal Risk: -1 | D3 Subject Competence: +1 | D4 Consistency: +2 | D5 Emotion vs. Data: +2 | D6 Source Level: -1 → TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- COUNTER-VOICE:** EFF or MK response to DA's constitutional conditions — not cited

IFP (as institutional source):

- FUNDING:** IFP party funds; membership fees, donations, public funding via IEC formula
- MANDATE:** Explicitly partisan
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct — IFP has an interest in appearing as a responsible, deliberative actor
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 Conflict of Interest: -2 | D2 Personal Risk: -1 | D3 Subject Competence: +1 | D4 Consistency: +2 | D5 Emotion vs. Data: +1 | D6 Source Level: -1 → TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- COUNTER-VOICE:** None specifically critical

Overall Source Assessment: All four institutional sources receive a YELLOW rating on the credibility matrix. No source achieves GREEN status. The absence of any GREEN-rated (independent, low-conflict-of-interest) source in a broadcast on a matter of the highest public importance is itself a finding under Broadcasting Act s. 6. The SABC's reliance exclusively on YELLOW-rated partisan sources for a report on government formation does not meet the standard of "highest standards of journalism" required by the Act.



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

IMPORTANT NOTE: "Recognised party" or "major party" is not a journalistic qualification. It is a political status that does not confer neutrality or analytical credibility. All party sources in this broadcast are assessed as partisan actors with direct conflicts of interest, regardless of their electoral size or political recognition.

Analysis completed under SABC Broadcast Analysis Framework v3.0-detail

Methodological Standards: K11+K8 — Trigger Event Documentation | Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, s. 6 | BCCSA Code Clauses 16 & 18

Language: English throughout

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.



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.