



ORF DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-04-24_ZIB Magazin- Länger leben_ gesund altern in Österreich

Programme: ORF Programme | 2026-04-24 | Analysed on: 2026-05-21 11:22

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Masstab: §4 ORF-G

**OVERALL
SCORE**

3.3/10

Slight Bias

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

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to 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	Greens	SPÖ	NEOS	ÖVP	FPÖ
CHES	2.13	3.08	5.40	6.73	8.83
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

5.5 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 **5** 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

This section serves for political classification and does not feed into the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Since February 2025, Austria has been governed by a coalition of FPÖ (57 seats, chancellor's party under Herbert Kickl) and ÖVP (51 seats). The opposition consists of SPÖ (41 seats), NEOS (18 seats) and Greens (16 seats). The FPÖ is for the first time the chancellor's party in the Second Republic.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core position
FPÖ	8.5	57	Government (Chancellor)	Remigration, sovereignty, against EU regulation
ÖVP	6.0	51	Government (Junior)	Business location, strict asylum policy, performance
SPÖ	3.0	41	Opposition	Wealth tax, workers' rights, public investment
NEOS	5.5	18	Opposition	Radically liberal, education reform, pro-European
Greens	2.5	16	Opposition	Climate neutrality, humane asylum policy, basic income

The dominant line of conflict runs between the FPÖ-led government and the left opposition camp on questions of migration, social policy and attitude towards the EU. In the area of pensions, there is a classic left-right tension: left-wing parties emphasise redistribution and security, right-wing parties performance orientation and system reform. The question of the retirement age is highly political and directly linked to the government's agenda.

The ORF is Austria's public broadcaster and is subject to the requirements of objectivity, impartiality and diversity of opinion pursuant to §4 of the ORF Act. §10 para. 7 requires adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council. The FPÖ has historically classified the ORF as politically left-leaning and is seeking structural reform; the structural proximity between the ÖVP and the ORF Foundation Board has been the subject of public criticism for years.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Preliminary note on programme structure: The programme is a short science/society format () without direct party references, without politicians as guests and without explicit party-political debate. The party bias assessment therefore relates to implicit framings that touch on party positions — particularly in the area of pensions.

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Programme portrayal vs. party programme position
ÖVP	0	Not directly mentioned. The implicit message (raise the retirement age, extend working life) is compatible with the ÖVP programme (reform the pension system, reward performance) — neither correctly portrayed nor distorted, as no explicit attribution is made.
SPÖ	-1	01:14–01:55: The programme frames the pension system as structurally deficient and cites Scandinavian models with longer working lives as the solution. The SPÖ position (securing pensions without raising the retirement age, social security) is not mentioned and is implicitly framed as part of the problem. Slight distortion through omission.
FPÖ	0	Not mentioned. The FPÖ position (securing pensions, prioritising social benefits for Austrians) is neither supported nor attacked. Score 0 due to lack of relevance.
Greens	0	Not mentioned. The Greens' position (social security, basic income) is not addressed.
NEOS	+1	01:44–01:58: The Scandinavian model (longer working life, formula for dividing gained years of life) structurally corresponds to the NEOS position (personal responsibility, system reform, lean state). This perspective is presented as a factual solution without being identified as a political position. Slight implicit favouring.

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: FPÖ / Greens (Score 0 — not addressed, no distortion)
- Strongest distortion: SPÖ (Score -1 — implicit framing disadvantages SPÖ position through omission)
- Average deviation from 0: 0.4
- Conclusion: The programme contains no explicit party politics, but through the uncritical presentation of the Scandinavian model (longer working life) sets an implicit frame that favours reform-oriented positions (ÖVP, NEOS) and structurally disadvantages the SPÖ position (securing pensions without raising the retirement age) through non-mention. The deviations are minor and not unusual for a short format.



CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMING

Programme data

- Title: Not explicitly stated (science/society format, presumably "Österreich Heute" or comparable ORF short format)
- Date: 24.04.2026
- Presenter / Reporter: Not named; subtitles: Kathrin Wallbrecher (00:17)
- Persons interviewed: Two unnamed experts (identifiable by ">" marker in the transcript)

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Expert 1 (anonymous)	Economist/pension expert (inferred from context 01:14–02:12)	Not stated	Not assignable
Expert 2 (anonymous)	Medical researcher, Med- Uni Graz (inferred from 03:02–04:07)	Academia	Not assignable
Presenter (voice)	Editor/Presenter	ORF	—

Main topic

The programme addresses the social and health challenges of an ageing population in Austria, with a focus on pension system financing and healthy ageing.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts

Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. EXPERT SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Expert 1: Anonymous (economist/pension expert, inferred)

Timestamp: 01:14–02:12

Statement: "In the 1970s, the average retirement age was practically the same as today. At the same time, remaining life expectancy at the age of 60 has improved by 12 years. [...] Other countries such as Denmark, Sweden or Finland have developed a formula whereby the years gained are distributed across the various phases of life. This also results in a somewhat longer working life."

Assessment: Presents a specific reform perspective (extension of working life according to the Scandinavian model) as factual analysis. No counter-position is sought.

Missing counter-voice: A trade union economist or social law expert would have introduced the limitations of the Scandinavian model (different working conditions, higher wages, stronger social partnership) and alternative financing approaches.

Source in-depth check Expert 1:

(a) FUNDING: Not identifiable, as anonymous. No classification possible.

(b) MANDATE: Not identifiable.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Not assessable (anonymity)

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Not assessable

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Statements sound professionally sound, comparative data plausible

D4 Opinion consistency: 0 — Not assessable

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Factual, data-based

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary (no primary source cited)

TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The assessment is framed as neutral analysis, although it implicitly supports a specific reform position (raising the retirement age). This is structurally partisan without being identified as such.

Expert 2: Anonymous (medical researcher, Med-Uni Graz)

Timestamp: 03:02–04:07

Statement: "Ageing is a process that begins in the cell. [...] In Austria we reach a life expectancy of over 80 years. But we only spend just under 60 years in good health. So we spend 20 years with chronic illnesses. That is why it is so important to extend the healthy lifespan."

Assessment: Medical-scientific perspective, unproblematic in content. No discernible conflicts of interest.

Missing counter-voice: None necessary for the medical part; for the social part (lifestyle and social determinants) a social medicine specialist with a focus on structural inequality would be complementary.



Source in-depth check Expert 2:

(a) FUNDING: Med-Uni Graz — state-funded university. No direct conflict of interest discernible on the topic of healthy ageing.

(b) MANDATE: Research mandate compatible with neutral assessment on health issues.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — State-funded, no direct conflict on the topic

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Standard statements in the field

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Clear correspondence between field of expertise (ageing research) and area of statement

D4 Opinion consistency: 0 — Not assessable

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Clearly data-based, concrete figures

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary researcher, own research

TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: No problematic framing discernible.

Missing expert groups:

- Trade union economist / Chamber of Labour expert (counter-perspective on extension of working life)
- Social medicine specialist with focus on working conditions and health (physically demanding occupations)
- Demographic economist with focus on immigration as a solution approach

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Anonymous (economist/pension expert, inferred)	0	0	+1	0	+1	0	+2	YELLOW
Anonymous (medical researcher, Med-Uni Graz)	+1	0	+2	0	+2	+1	+6	GREEN

Summary:

Expert	Source indicator	Key finding
Expert 1 (economist, anonymous)	YELLOW (+2)	Reform position implicit, no counter-voice
Expert 2 (Med-Uni Graz, anonymous)	GREEN (+6)	Professionally sound, no conflict of interest

The expert selection is one-sided: only one reform perspective (extension of working life) is represented; alternative economic approaches are entirely absent.



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: Statistics Austria / Eurostat (implicit)

Timestamp: 00:19–00:37 — Statement: "Women born in 1994 still had a life expectancy of 80 years. In 2024 it was already 84 years. For men, life expectancy was approximately 73 years and in 2024 approximately 80."

(a) Funding: State (Statistics Austria) or EU (Eurostat) — no source cited in the transcript.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Low; life expectancy data are methodologically robust.

(c) Missing counter-source: None necessary for factual data; the missing source citation is problematic.

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 00:37

Claim: "This trend appears to be continuing."

Word marker: "appears" — qualified statement without source reference

Primary source available: No — no reference to a projection study. Penalty point: +1

Source 2: Scandinavian countries as a model (cited anonymously)

Timestamp: 01:44–01:58 — Statement: "Other countries such as Denmark, Sweden or Finland have developed a formula..."

(a) Funding: Not identifiable — no source cited.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The statement supports a specific reform position without citing alternative models.

(c) Missing counter-source: Countries with other solution approaches (e.g. Germany with pension reform, Switzerland with funded system) are not mentioned.

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 01:59–02:03

Claim: "If this does not happen, one faces a social problem affecting older and younger people."

Word marker: No explicit markers, but causal claim without source reference.

Primary source available: No — no study or projection cited. Penalty point: +1

Summary: The source selection is poorly documented — not a single source is named. The use of the Scandinavian model as the only reference example without source citation and without alternative models is a structural problem. Two penalty points for unsubstantiated causal claims.



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Presenter (off-commentary): approx. 2:30 min. (approx. 50%)
- Expert 1 (economist/pension expert): approx. 1:00 min. (approx. 20%)
- Expert 2 (Med-Uni Graz): approx. 1:10 min. (approx. 23%)
- Other (intro/outro): approx. 0:20 min. (approx. 7%)

Summary: The time distribution between the two experts is relatively balanced. The structural problem lies not in the time distribution between persons, but in the fact that only two experts with compatible (not contrary) positions are given a voice. A counter-perspective receives zero speaking time.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

Alternative financing models for the pension system (wealth tax, robot tax, funded system)

Relevant at: 00:55–02:14 (entire pension financing block)

Effect

The programme suggests that extension of working life is the only or most obvious solution. Left-wing and social-democratic counter-models are structurally excluded.

Omission 2:

Context

Immigration as a demographic response to low birth rate

Relevant at: 00:40–00:45 — Quote: "Combined with a low birth rate, this could have negative effects."

Effect

The programme identifies the problem (low birth rate) but completely omits the politically controversial solution approach of immigration. This is particularly striking in the context of the FPÖ-led government, which severely restricts immigration.

Omission 3:

Context

Physically demanding occupations and the limits of extending working life

Relevant at: 01:44–01:58 (Scandinavian model)

Effect

The Scandinavian model is presented without noting that it was developed in countries with better working conditions, higher wages and stronger social partnership. For Austrian shift workers, nursing staff or construction workers, an extension of working life is problematic from a health perspective — an aspect that, despite a brief mention of social inequality (04:16), is not linked to the pension block.

Summary: The systematic omissions concern primarily left-wing/social-democratic counter-models and the politically sensitive area of immigration. The omission of these perspectives creates a structurally one-sided picture that makes reform positions (extension of working life) appear to have no alternative.

Missing voices

- Economist with focus on redistribution/wealth tax: Would have introduced alternative financing models for the pension system and relativised the one-sided focus on extension of working life.
- Trade union representative (ÖGB): Would have introduced the perspective of physically demanding occupational groups, for whom an extension of working life is problematic from a health perspective.
- Migration economist: Would have shed light on the connection between immigration and demographic development — an aspect completely omitted in the programme.
- Care expert/care organisation: Would have addressed the care crisis as an independent challenge of an ageing society.
- Pensioner/person affected: Would have conveyed the lived reality of older people beyond statistics.
- Young worker/trade union youth: Would have introduced the perspective of the contribution-paying generation.
- Social law expert: Would have explained the legal framework and limits of pension system reform.



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



5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:19–00:32

Figure: "Women born in 1994 still had a life expectancy of 80 years. In 2024 it was already 84 years. For men, life expectancy was approximately 73 years and in 2024 approximately 80."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value ✓ — (b) Share X — (c) Trend ✓

Missing context

The figures are presented without source citation. It is unclear whether they refer to life expectancy at birth or at a specific age (methodologically relevant). The EU comparison is also missing at this point (comes later for healthy years).

Effect

Minor misleading impression; the figures are plausible and are correctly presented as a trend.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 03:30–03:41

Figure: "In Austria we reach a life expectancy of over 80 years. But we only spend just under 60 years in good health. So we spend 20 years with chronic illnesses."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value ✓ — (b) Share ✓ (implicit: 20 out of 80 years = 25%) — (c) Trend X

Missing context

No trend given — has the healthy lifespan improved or deteriorated? The EU comparison (63 years of healthy lifespan in the EU average vs. 60 in Austria) comes only at 04:37, without trend data.

Effect

Slight distortion due to missing trend; the figure appears more alarming without context as to whether the situation is improving or deteriorating.

Summary: No serious manipulation of figures identified. The figures used are plausible and are predominantly applied correctly. Minor gaps (missing source citations, missing trend data) reduce the quality of contextualisation without actively deceiving.



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

6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

0/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

No guilt-by-association technique identified. The programme contains no discrediting through association, no framing of persons as "conspiracy theorists" and no chains of association.

Summary: Criterion not relevant for this programme. Score 0.



7. TIMING

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:00–00:14 (programme opening)

Content: "Someone born in Austria in 2023 has on average 60 healthy years of life ahead of them."

Timing effect

The opening immediately sets a positive frame (60 healthy years), which cushions the subsequent problem presentation (pension system in imbalance). This is a classic "good news first" technique that reduces awareness of the problem.

Finding 2:

Position: 01:44–01:58 (middle of the programme, after problem presentation)

Content: Scandinavian model as solution

Timing effect

The solution (extension of working life) is presented immediately after the problem presentation, without a pause for alternative solution approaches. This creates an impression of causality: problem → only solution.

Summary: The timing is not strongly manipulative, but is structurally set in such a way that the extension of working life appears as the logical and only response to the pension problem.



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

8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

0/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage reinforces the finding. Score = degree of outrage (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

Methodological preliminary note: The programme is a factual-informative format without studio guests, debate or emotional presentation moments. There are no moments of outrage that could be examined for asymmetry.

Degree of outrage: 0/5

Selectivity: 0/5

Summary: No selective outrage discernible. The programme is consistently factual and neutral in tone. Criterion not relevant.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:40–02:14 (entire pension block)

Missing perspective/fact: Alternative financing models (wealth tax, funded system, robot tax, EU solidarity fund)

Relevance: In the Austrian pension debate, these models are central counter-arguments to raising the retirement age. Their absence makes the programme structurally one-sided.

Impact: Viewers receive the impression that extension of working life is the only factually discussed solution.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 00:40–00:45

Missing perspective/fact: Immigration as a demographic response

Relevance: In every serious demographic study, immigration is a central factor in population development. The programme mentions "low birth rate" as a problem without naming the only short-term effective counter-trend (immigration).

Impact: In the political context (FPÖ government with immigration stop), this omission is particularly significant — it avoids a confrontation with government policy.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 04:16–04:29

Missing perspective/fact: Linking social inequality in ageing with the pension block

Relevance: The programme briefly mentions shift workers and social disadvantage in the health section, but does not link this to the question of extending working life. For physically demanding occupational groups, an extension of working life is harmful to health — this contradiction remains unnamed.

Impact: The social dimension of the pension reform debate is structurally treated separately from the reform proposal, making the contradiction invisible.

Summary: The programme is solid in the medical-scientific part, but considerably incomplete in the political-economic part. The systematic omissions concern primarily counter-models to the extension of working life and the politically sensitive area of immigration.

Soft facts

The topic of demographic change is highly political in Austria: the pension debate is one of the central lines of conflict between government and opposition. Internationally, there is scientific consensus on the demographic challenge, but considerable political dissent on the solutions (raising the retirement age vs. financing reform vs. immigration as a solution). The programme appears in a context in which the FPÖ-ÖVP government is discussing pension reforms, which makes the framing politically relevant.

Share of perspectives covered

Inverted: Original value measures coverage (higher = better). Displayed as deviation (higher = greater gaps).

[A] Demographic facts: Life expectancy, birth rate, age structure (objective)



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

- [B] **Pension system financing:** Revenue, expenditure, projections (economic)
- [C] Raising the retirement age as a solution (reform-oriented/liberal/conservative)
- [D] **Alternative financing models:** Wealth tax, robot tax, funded system (left/social-democratic)
- [E] Immigration as a demographic solution (politically controversial)
- [F] Health promotion and prevention (medical-scientific)
- [G] **Social inequality in ageing:** Shift workers, care professions, physically demanding work (social)
- [H] Care system and care costs as an independent challenge
- [I] **International comparisons:** Not only Scandinavia, but also other models (e.g. Germany, Switzerland)
- [J] **Perspective of those affected:** Older people, pensioners, young workers

[A] COVERED

Timestamp: 00:19–00:37 — Quote: "Women born in 1994 still had a life expectancy of 80 years. In 2024 it was already 84 years." — Assessment: Demographic basic data are presented correctly and comprehensibly.

[B] INDICATED

Timestamp: 00:55–01:13 — Quote: "Because when there are many older people in retirement who may also be ill, sufficient money is needed." — Assessment: The financing problem is named, but not substantiated with concrete figures or projections.

[C] COVERED

Timestamp: 01:44–01:58 — Quote: "Other countries such as Denmark, Sweden or Finland have developed a formula whereby the years gained are distributed across the various phases of life. This also results in a somewhat longer working life." — Assessment: Presented as a factual solution without political classification.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Alternative financing models (wealth tax, funded system, robot tax) are not mentioned at any point. Considerable gap.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Immigration as a possible demographic response is not mentioned despite direct relevance (low birth rate, labour shortage). A politically sensitive topic that is consciously or unconsciously excluded.

[F] COVERED

Timestamp: 03:26–04:07 — Quote: "More exercise in everyday life, plant-based eating, enough sleep, not smoking, alcohol only in moderation, managing stress and maintaining social contacts!" — Assessment: Health promotion is addressed in detail.

[G] INDICATED

Timestamp: 04:16–04:29 — Quote: "Sleep deprivation among shift workers, passive smoking among children, unbalanced nutrition due to financial disadvantage or the stress of caring relatives." — Assessment: Social inequality is briefly mentioned but not explored in depth.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The care system as an independent challenge (care costs, care staff, care allowance) is not addressed, although directly relevant.

[I] INDICATED

Timestamp: 01:44–01:48 — Quote: "Other countries such as Denmark, Sweden or Finland..." — Assessment: Only Scandinavian models are mentioned; other international comparisons (Germany, Switzerland, Japan only as an extreme example) are absent.



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

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No direct voice from those affected (pensioners, young workers, people in need of care). Purely expert-based perspective.

Completeness score: 5/10

Justification: The programme covers the demographic basic facts and the medical aspect of healthy ageing solidly. However, central political-economic perspectives are systematically absent: alternative financing models, immigration as a demographic response, the care system and voices of those affected are entirely absent. The short format (5 minutes) explains some of these gaps, but does not fully justify them, as the requirement of balance also applies to short formats.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:46–01:13
Quote	<i>"A long life, ideally in retirement and with good medical care: that sounds great, but brings challenges with it. Because when there are many older people in retirement who may also be ill, sufficient money is needed."</i>
Manipulation	A long life in retirement is framed as a problem ("brings challenges with it"). Older people are implicitly portrayed as a cost factor ("who may also be ill, sufficient money is needed").
Why problematic	This framing activates a generational conflict narrative (old vs. young) and sets the frame for the subsequent reform discussion. An alternative framing (older people as a social resource, volunteering, experiential knowledge) is entirely absent.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	02:06–02:13
Quote	<i>"This puts the pension system and other health and social security systems into an imbalance."</i>
Manipulation	"Imbalance" is a value-laden term that suggests urgency and crisis without citing concrete figures.
Why problematic	The term "imbalance" implies that the system is already dysfunctional or on the verge of becoming so. This is a political assessment that is presented as factual analysis.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	01:59–02:05
Quote	<i>"If this does not happen, one faces a social problem affecting older and younger people."</i>
Manipulation	"If this does not happen" refers to the extension of working life according to the Scandinavian model. The framing suggests: without this specific reform, a social problem threatens.
Why problematic	This is a causal claim without source reference, presenting a specific reform option as a necessary condition for social stability.

Summary: The dominant framing of the programme is the crisis image: ageing society as a burden, pension system in imbalance, solution through extension of working life. Alternative framings (opportunities of demographic change, alternative solution approaches) are absent.



11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS									4/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	02:12
Quote	<i>"into an imbalance"</i>
Manipulation	"Imbalance" is a politically connoted term that suggests crisis and need for action.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "come under pressure" or "face financing challenges". "Imbalance" already implies a diagnosis that is politically contested.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	00:51
Quote	<i>"That sounds great, but brings challenges with it."</i>
Manipulation	The concessive construction ("sounds great, but...") implicitly devalues a long life in retirement and sets it in opposition to social responsibility.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "This is a positive development that simultaneously places new demands on the social system." The chosen formulation activates a problem narrative.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	01:08
Quote	<i>"This is primarily borne by younger, working people."</i>
Manipulation	"Borne by" in the sense of "must pay" activates a generational conflict narrative. The formulation implies a burden on the young by the old.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "The pay-as-you-go system is funded by the contributions of those in employment." The chosen formulation is emotionally charged.

Summary: The choice of words is predominantly factual, but contains at several points emotionally charged terms ("imbalance", "borne by") that reinforce a crisis narrative and support the generational conflict framing.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Methodological preliminary note: The programme is an off-commentary format without live moderation, studio guests or interview situation. There are no moderation interventions, interruptions or follow-up questions that could be examined for asymmetry.

Finding 1:

Timestamp

01:14–02:12

Triggering event: Expert 1 presents the thesis of extending working life according to the Scandinavian model.

Quote (presenter, off)

"A solution must now be found for this." (02:14) — immediately after the expert statement

Comparison

No counter-expert is sought; no critical follow-up question is asked.

Asymmetry: Not assessable as classic moderation asymmetry (no live format), but the editorial decision not to seek a counter-voice is functionally equivalent.

Summary: The format does not permit classic moderation analysis. However, the editorial decision to leave expert statements uncommented and without a counter-voice is to be assessed as structural asymmetry.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Methodological preliminary note: The programme is an off-commentary format without an interview situation. No questions are asked. The criterion is therefore only applicable to a limited extent.

Asymmetry 1:

To Expert 1
(economist)

No questions asked — statements are adopted without comment.

To Expert 2
(Med-Uni Graz)

No questions asked — statements are adopted without comment.

Comparison

No asymmetry between the experts discernible, as the format does not provide for questions. The structural asymmetry lies in the selection of experts, not in the questioning technique.

Summary: Criterion not fully applicable for this format. No question asymmetry in the technical sense discernible; the structural one-sidedness lies in the expert selection (criterion 1).



14. FALSE BALANCE									2/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:08–04:29

Construct: "This is not always so easy to implement for everyone. The lived reality and everyday life of many people often do not allow for it: sleep deprivation among shift workers, passive smoking among children, unbalanced nutrition due to financial disadvantage or the stress of caring relatives."

Analysis

This passage mentions social inequality in the health section without linking it to the pension block. An apparent balance is created (we mention social problems), but this does not constitute a substantive engagement with the contradictions between extension of working life and physical strain.

Why problematic

The social dimension is placed as a marginal note at the end of the programme without questioning the core message (extension of working life as a solution).

Summary: No classic false balance (two equally presented but unequally substantiated positions). However, the programme contains a structural apparent balance: social problems are mentioned but not linked to the reform discussion.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Extension of working life as a factually required response to demographic change

Timestamp

01:44–02:05 — Evidence: "Other countries such as Denmark, Sweden or Finland have developed a formula [...] This also results in a somewhat longer working life. If this does not happen, one faces a social problem."

Alternative agenda: Alternative financing models, immigration policy, care system reform, reduction of working hours as a response to productivity gains — none of these topics are placed on the agenda.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Demographic change as a cost problem (not as a social opportunity)

Timestamp

00:46–01:13 — Evidence: "A long life [...] brings challenges with it. Because when there are many older people in retirement [...] sufficient money is needed."

Alternative agenda: Older people as a social resource, potential of the silver economy, volunteering, intergenerational solidarity — these perspectives do not appear.

Summary: The programme sets a clear agenda: demographic change = cost problem, solution = extension of working life. Alternative agendas (other financing models, immigration, opportunities of ageing) are structurally excluded.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 3.3 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 3.2 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 6):** The systematic omission of alternative financing models and the topic of immigration creates a structurally one-sided picture. Particularly striking is the complete absence of left-wing/social-democratic counter-models to the extension of working life.
- 2. Completeness / Selective Omission Overall Picture (Score 6):** The medical-scientific part is solid, but the political-economic part is considerably incomplete. The separation of social inequality (health block) and pension reform (economic block) makes a central contradiction invisible.
- 3. Framing (Score 5) and Agenda-Setting (Score 5):** The programme sets a clear frame: demographic change = cost problem, solution = extension of working life according to the Scandinavian model. This frame is reinforced by choice of words ("imbalance", "borne by") and timing (solution immediately after problem).

Core messages of the programme

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The pension system is being thrown into imbalance by the ageing population, and the solution lies in an extension of working life following the Scandinavian model."

Technique: Framing + agenda-setting + omission of counter-models — Evidence: 01:44, 01:59, 02:06

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Healthy ageing is largely a matter of personal responsibility — those who behave correctly live longer in good health."

Technique: Individualisation through lifestyle focus, structural factors as a marginal note — Evidence: 02:49, 03:54, 04:08

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "The ageing society is primarily a burden on younger generations and the social system."

Technique: Generational conflict framing, cost problem narrative — Evidence: 00:51, 01:08, 02:06

Justification: The overall score of 3.3/10 corresponds to a slight but demonstrable tendency. The programme is not a propaganda format, but contains structural one-sidednesses that touch on §4 of the ORF Act: the systematic omission of alternative financing models and the topic of immigration, as well as the uncritical presentation of the extension of working life as the only solution, do not correspond to the requirement of diversity of opinion. The short format (5 minutes) mitigates the finding but does not eliminate it, as the requirement of balance also applies to short formats. The tendency is reform-oriented (centre-right to liberal) and structurally disadvantages left-wing/social-democratic counter-models.

CONCLUSION

The analysed ORF programme is a factual-informative short format that presents demographic facts and medical findings on healthy ageing in a solid manner. In the political-economic part — the pension system debate — however, the programme exhibits a demonstrable structural imbalance: the extension of working life according to the Scandinavian model is presented as the only factually discussed solution, while alternative financing models (wealth tax, funded system) and the demographically relevant factor of immigration are completely excluded. This does not correspond to the requirement of diversity of opinion and balance enshrined in §4 of the ORF Act. The omissions are not to be assessed as active manipulation, but as structural editorial decisions that in their overall effect favour a reform-oriented agenda. For a legally actionable complaint under §4 of the ORF Act, an accumulation of such programmes in the programme context would need to be documented; a single programme of this format and length lies at the borderline of what is contestable.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	5	●●●
2	SOURCE SELECTION	4	●●
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	3	●●
4	OMISSION (Selective Omission)	6	●●●
5	MANIPULATION OF FIGURES	3	●●
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	0	●
7	TIMING	3	●●
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	0	●
9	COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall Picture)	6	●●●
10	FRAMING (Setting the frame)	5	●●●
11	CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS	4	●●
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	2	●
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	1	●
14	FALSE BALANCE	2	●
15	AGENDA-SETTING	5	●●●

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

3.3/10

Slight Bias

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

3.2/10

Slight Bias

OVERALL SCORE

3.3/10

Slight Bias

Averaged from hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly identified.
1–2	Weak finding	Slight anomaly without material impairment of balance.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Discernible tendency; impact relevance low to moderate.
5	Moderate finding with impact relevance	Relevant imbalance that influences the opinion-forming potential of the audience.
6	Substantial finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 onwards are classified as "substantial findings".
7	Substantial finding	Clear, well-substantiated imbalance with significant impact relevance.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple substantiable individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum manifestation	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No material patterns discernible; programme meets the requirement of factual accuracy.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight bias	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Substantial bias	Multiple substantial findings; relevant impairment of diversity of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the requirement of balance. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, programme-wide patterns; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias	Maximum manifestation across almost all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is clearly treated worse in portrayal, speaking time or framing.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Discernible but weak disadvantaging.
0	Neutral	No discernible favouring or disadvantaging.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Discernible but weak favouring.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	Party is clearly favoured in portrayal, speaking time or framing.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (§4 ORF Act)

Assessment under §4 ORF Act

§4 ORF Act requires: objectivity and impartiality of reporting, consideration of diversity of opinion, balance of programmes.

Violation 1:

Norm: §4 para. 1 no. 3 ORF Act (diversity of opinion)

Facts: One-sided presentation of the pension system debate without consideration of alternative financing models

Evidence: Timestamp 01:44–02:05 — Quote: "Other countries such as Denmark, Sweden or Finland have developed a formula [...] If this does not happen, one faces a social problem."

Assessment: The programme presents extension of working life as the only factually discussed solution to the pension problem. Alternative models (wealth tax, funded system, robot tax), which are represented in Austrian political discourse by the SPÖ and Greens, do not appear. This violates the requirement of diversity of opinion, as a politically contested question is presented as factually settled.

Violation 2:

Norm: §4 para. 1 no. 1 ORF Act (objectivity)

Facts: Use of value-laden terms without factual basis

Evidence: Timestamp 02:06–02:13 — Quote: "This puts the pension system and other health and social security systems into an imbalance."

Assessment: The term "imbalance" is a political assessment that is presented as factual analysis. An objective presentation would cite concrete figures (financing gap, projections) and identify the term as an assessment, not as a fact.

Violation 3 (limited):

Norm: §4 para. 1 no. 3 ORF Act (diversity of opinion) in conjunction with §10 para. 7 (adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council)

Facts: Complete omission of the topic of immigration as a demographic response

Evidence: Timestamp 00:40–00:45 — Quote: "Combined with a low birth rate, this could have negative effects."

Assessment: The programme identifies the demographic problem (low birth rate) but conceals the solution approach of immigration, which is relevant in science and political discourse. In the context of the FPÖ-led government, which severely restricts immigration, this omission is politically significant. The violation is limited, as the short format cannot address all solution approaches; however, the complete omission without any reference is noteworthy.

Overall assessment §4 ORF Act

The programme does not seriously violate §4 of the ORF Act in its entirety, but exhibits demonstrable tensions with the requirement of objectivity and diversity of opinion in two areas. The one-sided presentation of the pension debate (only extension of working life as a solution) and the use of value-laden terms ("imbalance") without factual basis do not meet the standard of a public service information format. For a formal complaint to KommAustria, the embedding of this programme in a programme pattern would need to be documented; as a single programme, the finding lies in the area of slight tendency, not systematic imbalance.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

Med-Uni Graz (Expert 2)

- 1. FUNDING:** State-funded university (Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research). No private or ecclesiastical funders discernible.
- 2. MANDATE:** Research mandate (ageing research) is compatible with neutral assessment on questions of healthy ageing.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No direct institutional conflict of interest discernible on the topic of healthy ageing. Possible indirect conflict: research funding by the Ministry of Health could favour prevention messages — low.
 - D1 Conflict of interest: +1 (state-funded, no direct conflict)
 - D2 Personal risk: 0 (standard statements)
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 (ageing research = field of expertise)
 - D4 Consistency: 0 (not assessable)
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: +2 (clearly data-based)
 - D6 Source level: +1 (primary researcher)**TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Not necessary for basic medical statements; for social determinants of ageing, a social medicine specialist would be complementary.

Expert 1 (economist/pension expert, anonymous)

- 1. FUNDING:** Not identifiable (anonymity). No classification possible.
- 2. MANDATE:** Not identifiable.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Not assessable. The substantive position (extension of working life) is compatible with positions of economic research institutes (WIFO, IHS), which are partly state-funded and represent reform-oriented positions.
 - D1 Conflict of interest: 0 (not assessable)
 - D2 Personal risk: 0 (not assessable)
 - D3 Professional competence: +1 (statements sound professionally sound)
 - D4 Consistency: 0 (not assessable)
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 (factual, but without source references)
 - D6 Source level: 0 (secondary, no primary source cited)**TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**
- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Entirely absent. A Chamber of Labour economist, trade union expert or social law expert would have introduced a counter-perspective.

IMPORTANT: The anonymity of both experts is problematic for a public service format. Viewers can neither check conflicts of interest nor institutional affiliation. This contradicts the transparency requirement that can be derived from §4 of the ORF Act.

Legal and methodological classification

No finding of fact

The results presented do not constitute findings of fact about individual persons, editorial teams or programmes. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.

No legal ruling

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of §4 ORF Act. The assessment of whether a specific programme violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular KommAustria).



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

No proof of causality

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values can be influenced by topic selection, news situation, political controversy or format logic.

No finding of intent

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of programmes. A score of 7 means that a substantial imbalance has been identified — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.

**Heuristic
comparison
instrument**

The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of programmes, not for the precise metric measurement of individual contributions. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Austria — ORF

Law

ORF Act (ORF-G, BGBl. No. 379/1984 as amended)

Relevant articles

- ORF-G §4 para. 5: Information must be comprehensive, independent, impartial and objective. All news and reports must be carefully checked for accuracy and origin; news and commentary must be clearly separated from each other.
- ORF-G §4 para. 5a: In the totality of programmes, diversity and balance must be ensured.
- ORF-G §10 para. 7: Adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council.
- ORF-G §4 para. 1: Mandate for a differentiated overall programme that is comprehensive, independent, impartial and objective.

Core obligations

- 1. Objectivity and impartiality:** Comprehensive, independent, impartial information
- 2. Separation of news/commentary:** Clear distinction
- 3. Consideration of parties:** Adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council
- 4. Overall programme diversity:** Diversity and balance across all programmes

Supervisory authority

- KommAustria (Communications Authority Austria): Media regulatory authority
- Federal Communications Senate: Appeals body
- Audience Council: Representation of listeners and viewers

Complaints procedure

1. ORF Audience Council
2. KommAustria
3. Federal Communications Senate
4. Administrative Court



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

APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS

Literature

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Research Centre Public Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 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). *Methods report v4.1: Countable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

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



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you not only receive further detailed evaluations, but can also have them produced for any programmes of your choice (we charge for this).

In order to make our work solid, we depend on membership and patron contributions.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Recipient: SVFAB, P.O. Box, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

You can obtain the following books from SVFAB

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



Unbalanced reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and source selection. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with many examples. In addition, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight 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 do not know this provide material. Good quotes that are cut incorrectly. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers that are framed as confessions.

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

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for everyone who is exposed and wants to understand how the game works. So that they stop playing along — and start shaping it.

In A5. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and in difficult situations



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

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Listen to news differently. Conduct conversations with more confidence. And can no longer so easily have a frame imposed on them that someone else has chosen.



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 lodge a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the UBI, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

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

This analysis exposes the system — factually, precisely, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional law review that shows: the UBI system meets none of the three fundamental criteria — it is not adequate, not subject to separation of powers, not market-based. The authority that is supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it was supposed to control.

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