



## ORF DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-04-29\_Dok 1- Wir geloben\_ Wie sich das Heer in Stellung bring

Programme: ORF Programme | 2026-04-29 | Analysed on: 2026-05-21 11:53

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**4.4/10**

*Considerable imbalance*

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

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**5.8 / 10**

*Balanced*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

This section serves the purpose of 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 — a historic turning point with considerable implications for media policy.

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

The most important lines of conflict are: (1) Security and defence policy — rearmament vs. preservation of neutrality, with the FPÖ emphasising strict neutrality while the ÖVP supports security policy cooperation; (2) Migration policy — FPÖ/ÖVP in favour of hard border security, SPÖ/Greens in favour of a humanitarian approach; (3) ORF reform — the governing parties, in particular the FPÖ, are seeking a structural realignment of public broadcasting; (4) Budget policy — massive military expenditure meets a debate about spending pressure in other areas.

The ORF is Austria's public broadcaster and is subject to the ORF Act, in particular §4 (objectivity, impartiality, diversity of opinion) and §10 para. 7 (adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council). The historically close entanglement between the ÖVP and the ORF Foundation Board has been the subject of political criticism for years. The FPÖ under Kickl has repeatedly described the ORF as ideologically one-sided and is seeking structural reform — which increases the institutional pressure on editorial teams.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

| Party  | Score (-5..+5) | Programme portrayal vs. programme position   |
|--------|----------------|--|
| ÖVP    | 0              | Party not explicitly mentioned; the topic of extending military service is compatible with ÖVP, but no direct programme position presented — omitted   |
| SPÖ    | -1             | 12:14 "Incidentally, he is an SPÖ district councillor in Floridsdorf" — Phillip Böcskör as a critical voice on the armed forces; SPÖ position on defence (preserving neutrality, UN engagement) not presented; party affiliation is mentioned without programmatic context — slightly distorted by selective attribution |
| FPÖ    | 0              | Party not mentioned; FPÖ core position on strict neutrality and against rearmament would have been highly relevant — omitted   |
| Greens | 0              | Party not mentioned; Green position (no rearmament, active neutrality policy, promotion of peace) would have been relevant — omitted   |
| NEOS   | 0              | Party not mentioned; NEOS position on European defence cooperation and the neutrality debate — omitted   |

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: ÖVP (Score 0) — not portrayed, but also not distorted
- Strongest distortion: SPÖ (Score -1) — the only party mentioned by name, and exclusively through a critical witness, without programmatic context
- Average deviation from 0: 0.2
- Conclusion: The programme is largely kept non-partisan — no party is explicitly positioned. The only party attribution (SPÖ district councillor Böcskör, 12:14) is noteworthy because it links the critical voice on the armed forces to a party, without other voices being located in party-political terms. This creates a subtle association: criticism of the armed forces = SPÖ.



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Programme data

- Title: ORF reportage on the Austrian Armed Forces and the planned military service reform (working title from content: "How are our armed forces doing?")
- Date: 29.04.2026
- Presenter/Reporter: Female reporter (name not mentioned in the transcript; speaks in the first person, accompanies recruits)
- Persons interviewed:

| Actors                                  | Function   | Party/Affiliation           | Political spectrum    |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Norik Hoxha                             | Conscript, 19 years old, Burgenland  | Armed Forces                | neutral               |
| Unger                                   | Conscript  | Armed Forces                | neutral               |
| Eichberger                              | Conscript  | Armed Forces                | neutral               |
| René Muhr                               | Platoon commander, instructor  | Armed Forces                | pro-military          |
| Bruno Hofbauer                          | Lieutenant General   | Armed Forces                | pro-military          |
| Phillip Böcskör                         | former conscript, SPÖ district councillor                                      | SPÖ                         | centre-left, critical |
| Georg Hoffmann                          | Historian, Director of the Military History Museum                             | state                       | neutral-historical    |
| Walter Feichtinger                      | Military and security expert, Vice-Chairman of the Military Service Commission | Military Service Commission | pro-reform            |
| Franz Eder                              | Security policy expert, University of Innsbruck                                | University                  | nuanced               |
| Erich Cibulka                           | President of the Austrian Officers' Society, Brigadier                         | Officers' Society           | pro-military          |
| Irmgard Ehrenberger                     | Co-Managing Director of the Reconciliation League                              | Peace organisation          | pacifist              |
| Militia soldier (anonymous)             | Sergeant, border deployment  | Armed Forces                | pro-military          |
| Soldier at observation post (anonymous) | Border deployment  | Armed Forces                | neutral               |
| Sebastian Schagerl                      | Platoon commander, Pioneers, Melk  | Armed Forces                | pro-military          |
| Sophie                                  | Female conscript   | Armed Forces                | pro-military          |



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

|        |                     |              |              |
|--------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Bianca | Female conscript    | Armed Forces | pro-military |
| Marcel | Conscript, Pioneers | Armed Forces | pro-military |

### **Main topic**

---

The programme examines the state of the Austrian Armed Forces and discusses the planned extension of compulsory military service from six to eight months in the context of a changed global security situation.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard facts

#### Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

##### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**Expert 1:** Walter Feichtinger — Military and security expert, Vice-Chairman of the Military Service Commission

Timestamp: 14:46

Statement: "The armed forces were obviously a factor in the budget planning of governments for many years, where it was believed that savings could be made. The Austrian Armed Forces must be capable of defence. And there is a lot to be done."

Assessment: Feichtinger is Vice-Chairman of the very commission that explicitly recommended extending military service. He is structurally not neutral.

Missing counter-voice: An independent security policy expert without an institutional mandate for the reform could have provided a different assessment.

#### Source in-depth check:

**(a) FUNDING:** The Military Service Commission is appointed by the state; Feichtinger is a former Armed Forces officer and institute director in the environment close to the National Defence Academy. Structural conflict of interest: The commission was appointed to recommend a reform — its Vice-Chairman has an institutional interest in its implementation.

**(b) MANDATE:** Not compatible with a neutral assessment. The commission has already issued a recommendation; Feichtinger represents this recommendation.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Vice-Chairman of the reform-recommending commission

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Career and reputation linked to the reform recommendation

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Long-standing expertise in security policy

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent position, but within the institutional framework

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly factual, but without counter-evidence

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source (own expertise)

**TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** A partisan source is framed as a neutral expert authority.

**Expert 2:** Franz Eder — Security policy expert, University of Innsbruck

Timestamp: 15:45

Statement: "We are not in a position to fly Austrians out of crisis areas in a short time."

Assessment: University researcher without an institutional mandate for the reform; more nuanced position than other experts.

Missing counter-voice: Eder already brings a more nuanced perspective; his voice is the most balanced in the programme.



**Source in-depth check:**

(a) **FUNDING:** University of Innsbruck, state-funded. No direct conflict of interest on defence topics.

(b) **MANDATE:** Compatible with a neutral assessment; the research mandate is analysis, not policy recommendation.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No institutional conflict of interest discernible

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Academic position, moderate security

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Security policy is his field of research

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Nuanced, non-ideological position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Data-based, acknowledges uncertainties

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source

**TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN**

**Expert 3:** Erich Cibulka — President of the Austrian Officers' Society, Brigadier

Timestamp: 16:53

Statement: "The point is to increase the operational readiness of the Austrian Armed Forces."

Assessment: President of an interest group representing officers; structurally pro-military and pro-reform.

Missing counter-voice: Representatives of civilian service organisations or conscientious objector associations.

**Source in-depth check:**

(a) **FUNDING:** Austrian Officers' Society — interest group, partly state-funded, partly membership fees. Clear conflict of interest: the organisation benefits from the strengthening of the military.

(b) **MANDATE:** Not compatible with a neutral assessment. An interest group is by definition partisan.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — President of a military interest group

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Reputation linked to military strengthening

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Military expertise present

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent pro-military position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Factual, but without critical reflection

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source

**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Introduced as "Brigadier and militia officer" without naming the conflict of interest as president of a lobby organisation.

**Expert 4:** Irmgard Ehrenberger — Co-Managing Director of the Reconciliation League

Timestamp: 34:05

Statement: "Every euro spent on rearmament is one euro too many."

Assessment: Representative of an explicitly pacifist peace organisation; structurally against rearmament.

Missing counter-voice: Her position is the only explicitly critical one — she stands alone against several pro-reform voices.

**Source in-depth check:**

(a) **FUNDING:** Reconciliation League — international Christian-pacifist organisation, founded in 1914. Funding through membership fees and donations; no state funding discernible. No conflict of interest in the financial sense, but a clear ideological mandate.

(b) **MANDATE:** Explicitly pacifist — not neutral, but transparently partisan.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Ideological mandate for disarmament

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Publicly represents a minority opinion

D3 Professional competence: 0 — Advocacy expertise, no military science competence

D4 Consistency of opinion: +2 — Consistent, long-standing position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "Every euro too many" is appellative; but cites a global figure (10% increase)

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (cites SIPRI data without reference)

**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**



*Missing expert groups:*

- Constitutional lawyer (neutrality law, fundamental rights)
- Independent economist (defence spending, opportunity costs)
- Peace and conflict researcher with empirical methodology

**Source traffic light for participants:**

| Source  | D1 | D2 | D3 | D4 | D5 | D6 | Total | Traffic light |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|---------------|
| Walter Feichtinger — Military and security expert, Vice-Chairman of the Military Service Commission | -2 | -1 | +2 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +2    | YELLOW        |
| Franz Eder — Security policy expert, University of Innsbruck  | +1 | 0  | +2 | +1 | +2 | +1 | +7    | GREEN         |
| Erich Cibulka — President of the Austrian Officers' Society, Brigadier                              | -2 | -1 | +2 | +1 | 0  | +1 | +1    | YELLOW        |
| Irmgard Ehrenberger — Co-Managing Director of the Reconciliation League                             | -1 | +1 | 0  | +2 | -1 | 0  | +1    | YELLOW        |

*Summary:*

| Expert      | Source traffic light | Conflict of interest     | Introduction in programme                     |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Feichtinger | YELLOW               | High (commission member) | Framed as neutral expert                      |
| Eder        | GREEN                | Low                      | Correctly introduced as university researcher |
| Cibulka     | YELLOW               | High (interest group)    | Conflict of interest not named                |
| Ehrenberger | YELLOW               | Medium (ideological)     | Correctly introduced as peace organisation    |

The expert selection is structurally pro-reform: three of four experts have an institutional interest in extending military service and rearmament; only Eder is structurally independent.



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: Survey — 27% willingness to defend

Timestamp: 22:52

Statement: "According to a survey, only 27 percent, i.e. not even a third of people in Austria, would be willing to defend their country with weapons."

**(a) Funding and sponsorship:** Survey not named, no institute, no client, no date, no methodology.

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Cannot be assessed without source information; the figure is used as an argument for the need for reform.

**(c) Is a source missing that would substantiate a counter-view:** Yes — surveys on security perception often show more nuanced results; no comparative data from other neutral states.

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 22:52

Claim: "According to a survey, only 27 percent [...] in Austria would be willing to defend their country with weapons."

Word marker: "according to a survey" (without naming the institute, date, methodology)

Primary source available: NO — penalty point (+1)

### Source 2: Rearmament figure — "10 percent higher than 2023"

Timestamp: 34:12

Statement: "Global rearmament in 2024 was ten percent higher than in 2023."

**(a) Funding:** Ehrenberger cites this figure without a source reference; probably SIPRI data, but not explicitly named.

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Figure is used by a peace organisation as an argument against rearmament.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** SIPRI data should be named as the primary source.

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 34:12

Claim: "Global rearmament in 2024 was ten percent higher than in 2023."

Word marker: No explicit source reference

Primary source available: NO — penalty point (+1)

### Source 3: Development plan 16 billion euros

Timestamp: 14:14

Statement: "The development plan for the armed forces adopted in 2022 provides for additional investments of 16 billion euros by 2032."

**(a) Funding:** Government resolution, publicly documented.



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

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** State source on a state topic — no direct conflict, but no critical contextualisation.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** No assessment of whether this amount is realistically financeable; no budget expert consulted.

Summary: The source selection contains two unsubstantiated numerical claims (survey 27%, rearmament figure 10%); state sources are adopted uncritically; no independent economic or budget sources.



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Armed Forces personnel (Muhr, Hofbauer, Cibulka, Schagerl, soldiers): (26%)
- Pro-reform experts (Feichtinger, Hoffmann): (11%)
- Nuanced expert (Eder): (7%)
- Recruits/conscripts (Hoxha, Unger, Eichberger, Marcel, Sophie, Bianca): (17%)
- Critical voice Böcskör: (7%)
- Peace organisation (Ehrenberger): approx. 1.5 min. (3%)
- Reporter (moderation, transitions, commentary): (22%)
- Other (street survey, historical insert): approx. 3.5 min. (7%)

Summary: Pro-reform and military voices together receive approx. 54% of speaking time; the only explicitly pacifist voice (Ehrenberger) receives approx. 3%. This asymmetry is structurally significant and reflects the underlying tendency of the programme.



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1: Impact on civilian service and social infrastructure

###### Context

An extension of compulsory military service to eight months would automatically also extend civilian service (which is three months longer than military service). Civilian service personnel are systemically relevant in Austria for rescue services, care and social institutions.

Relevant at: 02:05 (discussion on extension), 13:21 (Böcskör chooses armed forces because of shorter duration)

###### Effect

Omitting this dimension suggests that the extension only affects the military — the social follow-on costs for the social sector are concealed.

##### Omission 2: The dimension of neutrality law in relation to rearmament

###### Context

Austria's neutrality is anchored in international law (State Treaty 1955, Neutrality Act 1955). The question of whether massive rearmament and drone defence systems are compatible with the obligation of neutrality is legally non-trivial.

Relevant at: 06:33 (Hoffmann mentions neutrality), 33:08 (drone defence, Skyshield)

###### Effect

The programme treats rearmament as self-evidently necessary, without addressing the constitutional tension with neutrality.

##### Omission 3: Political dimension — government position

###### Context

The military service reform is a political project of the current FPÖ-ÖVP government. No government representatives are interviewed; no opposition representatives are given a voice. The political responsibility for the reform remains invisible.

Relevant at: entire programme

###### Effect

The reform appears as a technical-military necessity, not as a political decision — which renders the democratic debate about it invisible.

Summary: The three central omissions — civilian service, neutrality law, political dimension — result in the programme presenting the extension of military service as an unavoidable technical necessity, rather than treating it as a politically contested decision with far-reaching social consequences.

#### Missing voices

- Constitutional lawyer: Would have analysed the legal compatibility of an extension of military service with fundamental rights and the obligation of neutrality
- Civilian service organisation (e.g. Caritas, Red Cross): Would have presented the impact of an extension on civilian service and social infrastructure
- Economist (independent): Would have analysed the opportunity costs of defence spending and the macroeconomic consequences of an extension
- Peace and conflict researcher (university): Would have provided empirical evidence on deterrence effect vs. escalation risk
- Trade union/Chamber of Labour: Would have presented the impact on workers' rights, loss of earnings and the entry of young people into the workforce



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

- Political scientist on the neutrality debate: Would have contextualised the current political debate on neutrality and European security architecture
- Representative of an opposition party (FPÖ, Greens): Would have presented the party-political dimension of the military service reform
- Psychologist or social worker: Would have addressed the psychological burdens of military service and reintegration problems after service



## 5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1: 27% willingness to defend

Timestamp 22:52

Figure: "only 27 percent [...] willing to defend their country with weapons"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: stated (27%)
- (b) Share: stated (not even a third)
- (c) Trend: MISSING — How has this value developed over the years? Has it risen or fallen?

Missing context

No comparison with other neutral states (Switzerland, Sweden before NATO accession); no methodology stated; no comparison year.

Effect

The figure is presented as an alarm signal, without contextualising whether 27% is historically low or normal. In international comparisons (Gallup World Poll), Austria is in the European middle range — this context is entirely absent.

### Finding 2: 16 billion euro development plan

Timestamp 14:14

Figure: "additional investments of 16 billion euros by 2032"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: stated
- (b) Share: MISSING — share of GDP, of the state budget not stated
- (c) Trend: MISSING — baseline level in 2022 not stated; how much has actually already been invested?

Missing context

No assessment of whether this amount is realistically financeable; no comparison with NATO target (2% of GDP).

Effect

The figure sounds large, but cannot be contextualised without the GDP share and implementation status.

### Finding 3: 250–300 million euros annual additional costs

Timestamp 35:35

Figure: "Extending compulsory military service alone would cost approximately 250 to 300 million euros per year."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: stated
- (b) Share: MISSING — share of total budget, of the armed forces budget not stated
- (c) Trend: not relevant

Missing context

No contextualisation of opportunity costs (what could alternatively be financed with this?).

Effect

Figure is presented without contextualisation; unclear whether this is considered a lot or a little.



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

Summary: The programme uses figures selectively and without a complete three-part check; in particular, trend data and GDP shares are missing, which would be indispensable for a factual contextualisation of defence spending.



|                                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| <b>6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | <b>2/10</b> |
| 1                              | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10          |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Association 1: SPÖ district councillor as critic of the armed forces</b> |  |
| <b>Timestamp</b>  | 12:14  |
| <b>Quote</b>  | <i>"Incidentally, he is an SPÖ district councillor in Floridsdorf."</i>  |
|   | Technique: Phillip Böcskör is the only actor in the programme whose party affiliation is explicitly named. He is simultaneously the most critical voice on the armed forces ("serving time", "skiving off duty"). All other interviewees are introduced without party affiliation. |
| <b>Effect</b>   | The association criticism of the armed forces = SPÖ is subtly established, without this being explicitly stated. Viewers can conclude that scepticism towards the armed forces is a left-wing party opinion.   |

Summary: The guilt-by-association technique is used only once and subtly in this programme; the score is correspondingly low. The effect is nonetheless measurable: the only party attribution links criticism to an opposition party.



## 7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1: Opening sequence — emotional framing before factual information

Position: 00:09–01:43 (beginning)

Content: "No matter where you look. War is currently omnipresent." / "Before our eyes, a rules-based world order is disintegrating."

#### Timing effect

The programme begins with an emotional threat framing before any factual information is presented. This sets the interpretive framework for the entire programme: Austria is threatened, the armed forces must be strengthened. All subsequent information is filtered through this framework.

### Finding 2: Peace voice at the end — structural marginalisation

Position: 33:49–35:00 (approx. 75% of the programme)

Content: Irmgard Ehrenberger, Reconciliation League: "Every euro spent on rearmament is one euro too many."

#### Timing effect

The only explicitly critical counter-voice is not introduced until three-quarters of the way through the programme, after the pro-reform perspective has already been extensively established. Moreover, immediately afterwards (35:05) positive footage of pioneer training follows again — the critical voice is structurally framed and weakened by the timing.

### Finding 3: Conclusion with a qualifying expert statement

Position: 45:41–46:04 (end)

Content: Franz Eder: "This danger has indeed grown in recent months and years, but I still consider it, fortunately, to be relatively small."

#### Timing effect

The programme ends with a reassuring statement that attenuates the threat perception built up beforehand. This creates a kind of "false closure" — the threat was extensively portrayed, at the end it is relativised, without the consequences for the reform debate being drawn.

Summary: The timing of the programme follows a clear pattern: emotional threat framing at the beginning, extensive pro-reform presentation in the middle, marginal counter-voice in the final third, reassuring conclusion. This structure favours the proponents of reform.



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

2/10

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)*

### Finding 1: Criticism of lack of appreciation in the armed forces

**Timestamp** 12:50

Triggering event: Phillip Böckör describes a lack of appreciation and "kicking downwards" in the armed forces.

Reaction: Reporter listens, no follow-up question, no contextualisation, no qualification.

### Comparison

With Lieutenant General Hofbauer (10:34), who concedes "I don't need to deny that it's perhaps not like that everywhere" (regarding poor training), no follow-up question about specific grievances.

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable as selective outrage — the reporter responds to both statements without discernible emotional asymmetry. Score remains low.

Degree of outrage: 1/5

Selectivity: 1/5

Summary: Selective outrage is not a dominant pattern in this programme; the reporter largely holds back emotionally. The slight asymmetry arises more from time distribution than from emotional reaction.



## 9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1: No presentation of the political decision-making level

**Timestamp** entire programme

Missing perspective: No government representative (Minister of Defence), no opposition politician is interviewed.

Relevance: The military service reform is a political decision that must be passed in the National Council. The democratic dimension is entirely absent.

Impact: The reform appears as a technical-military necessity, not as a politically contested decision — which limits viewers in forming their democratic judgement.

### Finding 2: No presentation of the impact on those affected outside the military

**Timestamp** 02:05 (discussion on extension)

Missing perspective: Employers, training companies, universities, civilian service organisations.

Relevance: An extension by two months affects approximately 16,000 young men and their employers/trainers annually.

Impact: The social costs of the reform are not presented.

### Finding 3: No empirical evidence on the effectiveness of longer military service periods

**Timestamp** 26:43 (Muhr: "Two months would already be enough")

Missing perspective: International comparative studies on the effectiveness of different lengths of military service.

Relevance: The claim that eight months is significantly more effective than six is substantiated exclusively by the opinions of armed forces personnel, not by empirical evidence.

Impact: The reform recommendation appears evidence-based, even though no scientific evidence is presented.

Summary: The programme provides an incomplete picture of the military service reform debate: political, social and empirical dimensions are largely absent; the presentation is narrowed to the internal military perspective.

## Soft facts

The debate on extending military service and rearmament is taking place in a geopolitically charged environment: war in Ukraine, conflicts in the Middle East, growing scepticism towards the rules-based world order. In Austria, this debate collides with the constitutionally anchored neutrality and a historically deeply rooted scepticism towards militarism. The question of whether Austria protects or undermines its neutrality through rearmament is highly politically contested. At the same time, the question arises as to whether billions for armaments can be socially legitimised in times of austerity measures in other areas.

### Share of perspectives covered

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

**[A] Military necessity:** Arguments for extending military service and rearmament from a defence perspective

**[B] Neutrality law perspective:** Compatibility of rearmament with Austrian neutrality (international law)

**[C] Peace policy/pacifist perspective:** Rearmament as a security risk, diplomacy as an alternative

**[D] Economic perspective:** Cost-benefit analysis, opportunity costs of defence spending



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

**[E] Civilian service perspective:** Impact of an extension on civilian service and social services

**[F] Constitutional law perspective:** Legal limits of conscription, fundamental rights

**[G] Gender policy perspective:** Conscription only for men — question of equality

**[H] Youth/education perspective:** Impact on education, entry into the workforce, life planning of young people

**[I] European defence cooperation:** NATO accession vs. EU defence vs. neutrality

**[J] Historical perspective:** Austria's neutrality as a guarantor of peace since 1955

#### **[A] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 14:50 — Quote: "The Austrian Armed Forces must be capable of defence. And there is a lot to be done." — Assessment: Extensively and repeatedly presented by military experts and armed forces personnel; dominant perspective of the programme.

#### **[B] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 06:33 — Quote: "When conscription was introduced, one of the basic preconditions was that Austria adopted neutrality. This neutrality must be defended." — Assessment: Neutrality is mentioned historically, but the current tension between rearmament and the obligation of neutrality is not explored further; no analysis under international law.

#### **[C] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 34:08 — Quote: "Every euro spent on rearmament is one euro too many." — Assessment: The only explicitly pacifist voice, receives approx. 90 seconds of speaking time compared to several minutes for military experts; structurally marginalised.

#### **[D] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 33:49 — Quote: "The fact that billions are flowing into the military in times of massive spending pressure also causes considerable criticism in some quarters." — Assessment: Only mentioned as a transition to the peace organisation; no independent economic analysis, no economists consulted.

#### **[E] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Civilian service is only briefly mentioned as an alternative (04:48, 13:21); the impact of an extension on civilian service organisations, the care sector, social services is not addressed.

#### **[F] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Constitutional and fundamental rights questions on conscription (equal treatment, freedom of conscience) are not addressed.

#### **[G] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 41:50 — Quote: "Whether it also means conscription for women? We have raised the idea." — Assessment: Briefly addressed by Lieutenant General Hofbauer, but not explored further; feminist or gender equality analysis is absent.

#### **[H] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 40:58 — Quote: "I am personally glad now that it is only six months for me. I can then get back to civilian life more quickly." — Assessment: Addressed from the recruit's perspective, but no systematic analysis of the impact on education and entry into the workforce.

#### **[I] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 32:28 — Quote: "Why don't we leave this task to other states within a European framework?" — Assessment: Franz Eder introduces the European cooperation perspective; the NATO question is not explicitly raised.



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

#### [J] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 06:10 — Quote: "In its current form, conscription has existed since 1955. The year in which the State Treaty was signed." — Assessment: Historical embedding present, but more as background information than as an independent perspective.

#### Completeness score: 5/10

---

**Justification:** The programme addresses the military necessity perspective extensively and with multiple voices, while critical counter-perspectives (pacifism, constitutional law, civilian service, economics) are either omitted or strongly underrepresented. The structural asymmetry — many military voices, one peace voice — considerably reduces completeness. European and neutrality law dimensions are indicated but not sufficiently explored.



## Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1: Threat framing as the programme's framework

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Timestamp       | 00:09  |
| Quote           | <i>"No matter where you look. War is currently omnipresent. Before our eyes, a rules-based world order is disintegrating."</i>   |
| Manipulation    | The programme begins with an apocalyptic framing that sets threat as a self-evident reality. "Omnipresent" and "disintegrating" are evaluative terms, not a factual description.   |
| Why problematic | This framework prejudices all subsequent statements: anyone speaking about armed forces reform in an environment of omnipresent threat must almost inevitably support the reform. An alternative framework would be possible: "How is Austria responding to a changed security situation?" — without presupposing the threat as a given. |

#### Finding 2: Reform framed as an unavoidable constraint

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Timestamp       | 01:04   |
| Quote           | <i>"Military experts are calling for drastic steps to be taken quickly."</i>  |
| Manipulation    | "Quickly" and "drastic" imply urgency and necessity. "Military experts" (plural, without differentiation) suggests consensus among specialists. |
| Why problematic | There is no uniform expert opinion; Franz Eder represents a more nuanced position. The framing as expert consensus is misleading.               |

#### Finding 3: Austria as the "promised land" — normality framing

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Timestamp       | 24:14  |
| Quote           | <i>"We are in Austria, in the promised land."</i>  |
| Manipulation    | René Muhr uses this term, and the reporter implicitly adopts it by failing to ask a follow-up question. The framing "promised land" sets Austria's security as a normal state that must be defended. |
| Why problematic | This framing reinforces the threat perception: the "promised land" is threatened, so it must be defended. A critical follow-up question ("Is Austria really threatened?") is absent.                 |

Summary: The dominant framing of the programme is a threat-protection narrative: the world is dangerous, Austria is threatened, the armed forces must be strengthened. This framing is set from the outset and maintained throughout the entire programme.



|                                      |          |          |          |   |   |   |   |   |             |
|--------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| <b>11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS</b> |          |          |          |   |   |   |   |   | <b>4/10</b> |
| <b>1</b>                             | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10          |

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Finding 1: "Only 27 percent"</b> |   |
| <b>Timestamp</b>                    | 22:52   |
| <b>Quote</b>                        | <i>"According to a survey, only 27 percent [...] in Austria would be willing to defend their country with weapons."</i>   |
| <b>Manipulation</b>                 | "Only" is an evaluative adverb that frames the figure as alarmingly low.  |
| <b>Why problematic</b>              | A neutral alternative would be: "27 percent of those surveyed stated that they would be willing to defend their country with weapons." The word "only" is an editorial evaluation, not a factual description. |

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Finding 2: "Cannon fodder"</b> |  |
| <b>Timestamp</b>                  | 00:44  |
| <b>Quote</b>                      | <i>"If war were to break out, we would be cannon fodder just the same."</i>  |
| <b>Manipulation</b>               | This term from the introduction is used as an emotional hook, without being critically contextualised in the course of the programme.                                  |
| <b>Why problematic</b>            | "Cannon fodder" is an emotionally charged term that frames conscripts as passive victims — which reinforces the threat perception and implies the necessity of reform. |

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Finding 3: "Drastic steps"</b> |  |
| <b>Timestamp</b>                  | 01:04  |
| <b>Quote</b>                      | <i>"Military experts are calling for drastic steps to be taken quickly."</i>   |
| <b>Manipulation</b>               | "Drastic" implies that the situation is exceptionally serious and requires exceptional measures.   |
| <b>Why problematic</b>            | A neutral alternative would be: "Military experts recommend extending compulsory military service." The choice of the word "drastic" is an editorial evaluation. |

Summary: The reporter's choice of words is predominantly factual, but contains evaluative terms at several points that reinforce the threat framing. In particular, "only" in relation to the survey figure is a clear bias marker.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1: No follow-up question on Feichtinger's conflict of interest

Timestamp 14:46

Triggering event: Feichtinger criticises the budget policy of governments and calls for more investment — as Vice-Chairman of the commission that recommended the reform.

Quote (presenter) *[no follow-up question on conflict of interest]*

Comparison With Ehrenberger (34:35), the reporter asks critically: "Doesn't a stronger armed forces also provide a stronger sense of national security?" — a counter-question that challenges Ehrenberger's position.

Asymmetry: Feichtinger is not asked about his conflict of interest; Ehrenberger is confronted with a counter-question. This is a demonstrable asymmetry.

### Finding 2: Follow-up question to Ehrenberger, not to military experts

Timestamp 34:35

Triggering event: Ehrenberger argues against rearmament.

Quote (presenter) *"Doesn't a stronger armed forces also provide a stronger sense of national security?"*

Comparison With Feichtinger (14:46), Cibulka (16:53) or Muhr (26:30), no comparable counter-questions are posed ("Could more rearmament also lead to escalation?").

Asymmetry: The only critical follow-up question from the reporter is directed against the peace voice, not against the military voices.

Summary: The moderation behaviour shows a slight but demonstrable asymmetry: the peace voice is confronted with a counter-question, while military experts and proponents of reform receive no comparable critical follow-up questions.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

To Ehrenberger  
(Reconciliation  
League), 34

35: "Doesn't a stronger armed forces also provide a stronger sense of national security?" — hard/challenging

To Feichtinger  
(Military  
Service  
Commission),  
14

46: [no critical counter-question] — soft/affirmative

#### Comparison

The only explicitly critical question in the programme is directed against the peace voice. Proponents of reform are not asked: "Could rearmament also increase escalation risks?" or "Is the threat situation for Austria really so acute?"

#### Asymmetry 2:

To Böcskör  
(SPÖ district  
councillor), 12

22: Open questions about negative experiences with the armed forces — inviting criticism

To Muhr  
(platoon  
commander),  
09

43: "You don't only have a gentle side?" — mild, almost humorous

#### Comparison

Böcskör is invited to voice criticism; Muhr is confronted with an almost jocular question that presents no real challenge.

Summary: The question asymmetry is moderate but demonstrable: critical follow-up questions are directed against the peace voice and the critical witness, while military experts and proponents of reform are confronted with soft or affirmative questions.



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1: Apparent balance through unequal speaking time

Timestamp

45:16

Construct: "For some it is a necessary step to defend Austria. For others it is an unnecessary intrusion into the lives of young people."

Analysis

This concluding formulation suggests a balanced debate with two equally weighted sides. In reality, the programme presented the "necessary step" side with approx. 54% of speaking time and several experts, while the "unnecessary intrusion" side was barely given a voice. The concluding formula creates a false symmetry.

Why problematic

Viewers might gain the impression that the programme presented both sides equally — which is not the case.

Summary: The false balance technique is used at the end of the programme to suggest a balance that is not present given the actual distribution of speaking time and experts.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1: Rearmament set as the normal state

Agenda element set: That Austria must rearm is presupposed as self-evident; the only question is "how much" and "how quickly".

#### Timestamp

00:09 — Evidence: "No matter where you look. War is currently omnipresent."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether Austria should rearm could also be answered in the negative — through diplomacy, European cooperation or strengthening neutrality policy. This alternative does not make it onto the agenda.

### Finding 2: Extension of military service set as an unavoidable constraint

Agenda element set: The extension from six to eight months is presented as a logical consequence of the security situation.

#### Timestamp

02:05 — Evidence: "An expert commission recommends the 'Austria Plus' model."

Alternative agenda: Alternatives to the extension (professional army, European defence cooperation, efficiency improvements without extension) are not placed on the agenda as equally valid options.

Summary: The agenda-setting of the programme is the strongest bias element: rearmament and extension of military service are set as unavoidable constraints, not as political options. Alternatives do not make it onto the agenda or are treated marginally.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 4.4 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 4.3 / 10

### Dominant techniques

- 1. Agenda-setting (Score 6):** The programme sets rearmament and extension of military service as unavoidable constraints, without treating alternatives equally. This is the most impactful technique because it defines the basic premises of the debate before any arguments are even exchanged.
- 2. Expert selection (Score 6):** Three of four experts have an institutional interest in the reform; the structural conflict of interest is not disclosed. The programme frames partisan sources as neutral expert authorities — which artificially increases the credibility of the pro-reform arguments.
- 3. Framing (Score 6):** The threat-protection narrative is set from the outset and maintained throughout the entire programme. All information is filtered through this framework, which makes a neutral assessment of the reform question more difficult for viewers.

### Core messages of the programme

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "The Austrian Armed Forces are underfunded and poorly equipped — an extension of military service and massive rearmament are necessary."

**Technique:** Agenda-setting, expert selection — Evidence: 14:46 (Feichtinger), 26:43 (Muhr), 14:14 (development plan)

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "Young men in the armed forces are motivated, professional and ready to defend their country — the service is meaningful and formative."

**Technique:** Framing, time distribution — Evidence: 03:49 (Unger: "It was definitely a good time"), 42:42 (Bianca: "I'm in the armed forces so that I can defend my country"), 36:06 (Marcel: "I want to sign up")

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "Austria must adapt to a changed, more dangerous world — anyone who does not see this is naive."

**Technique:** Threat framing, timing — Evidence: 00:09 ("War is currently omnipresent"), 23:40 ("Before our eyes, a rules-based world order is disintegrating"), 04:09 (programme conclusion: "We in Austria too will have to adapt to this")

**Justification:** The overall score of 4.4/10 is on the boundary between "slight tendency" and "clear one-sidedness". The programme is not crude propaganda, but a technically solid reportage with genuine journalistic work (access to barracks, multiple voices, nuanced expert Eder). The one-sidedness arises not from gross errors, but from structural decisions: expert selection, time distribution, agenda-setting and framing. In accordance with §4 of the ORF Act, which requires objectivity, impartiality and diversity of opinion, the underrepresentation of critical perspectives (peace policy, neutrality law, civilian service) and the failure to disclose conflicts of interest among experts is problematic. The programme only partially fulfils the statutory mandate.

### CONCLUSION

The programme is a journalistically engaged reportage on the Austrian Armed Forces that, through structural decisions, exhibits a slight but demonstrable tendency in favour of extending military service and rearmament. The dominant techniques — agenda-setting, expert selection and framing — result in the reform appearing as an unavoidable constraint, not as a politically contested decision. In accordance with §4 of the ORF Act, the underrepresentation of critical perspectives (peace policy, neutrality law, civilian service, political dimension) and the failure to disclose conflicts of interest among key experts (Feichtinger as a commission member, Cibulka as an interest group representative) are to be assessed as a violation of the requirement of diversity of opinion and impartiality. The programme is not an example of gross manipulation, but an example of structural bias through selection and framing — which is particularly problematic in public broadcasting because it institutionally embodies the claim of neutrality.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

#### HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

**4.4/10**

*Considerable imbalance*

#### SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

**4.3/10**

*Considerable imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**4.4/10**

*Considerable imbalance*

*Averaged from hard facts and soft facts*



## KEY — Meaning of scores

### Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

### Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

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

### Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

|                 |                               |  |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>-5 to -3</b> | <b>Strongly disadvantaged</b> | Party is clearly placed at a disadvantage in terms of portrayal, speaking time or framing. |
| <b>-2 to -1</b> | <b>Slightly disadvantaged</b> | Discernible, but weak disadvantage.  |
| <b>0</b>        | <b>Neutral</b>                | No discernible preference or disadvantage.   |
| <b>+1 to +2</b> | <b>Slightly favoured</b>      | Discernible, but weak preference.  |
| <b>+3 to +5</b> | <b>Strongly favoured</b>      | Party is clearly favoured in terms of portrayal, speaking time or framing.                 |



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (§4 ORF Act)

### Assessment under §4 ORF Act

---

#### Violation 1:

Norm: §4 para. 1 no. 3 ORF Act (impartiality of reporting)

Facts: Feichtinger is introduced as a "military and security expert" without disclosing his conflict of interest as Vice-Chairman of the Military Service Commission — the very commission that recommended the reform.

Evidence: Timestamp 14:46 — Quote: "Walter Feichtinger is a military and security expert. And he is Vice-Chairman of the Military Service Commission. That is, the commission that has spoken out in favour of extending military service."

Assessment: The programme does mention the commission membership, but frames Feichtinger as a neutral expert without naming the structural conflict of interest. Impartial reporting would require that this conflict of interest be explicitly addressed and balanced by an independent counter-voice.

#### Violation 2:

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

Facts: The programme presents the extension of military service and rearmament with approx. 54% of speaking time for pro-reform voices, while the only explicitly critical counter-voice (Reconciliation League) receives approx. 3% of speaking time. Political parties that advocate against rearmament or for the preservation of neutrality (FPÖ, Greens) are not given a voice.

Evidence: Timestamp 34:08 — Quote: "Every euro spent on rearmament is one euro too many." (the only explicitly critical statement in 46 minutes)

Assessment: Diversity of opinion is not adequately considered. §4 of the ORF Act does not require mathematical equal distribution, but a structural 54:3 asymmetry on a politically contested topic is not compatible with the requirement of diversity of opinion.

#### Violation 3:

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

Facts: The survey on willingness to defend (27%) is presented without a source reference, without a methodology statement and with the evaluative adverb "only".

Evidence: Timestamp 22:52 — Quote: "According to a survey, only 27 percent, i.e. not even a third of people in Austria, would be willing to defend their country with weapons."

Assessment: Objective reporting requires the naming of source, client, methodology and survey period for cited surveys. The omission of this information and the evaluative formulation "only" violate the requirement of objectivity.

### Overall assessment under §4 ORF Act

---

The programme exhibits three demonstrable violations of §4 of the ORF Act: failure to disclose conflicts of interest among key experts (impartiality), structural underrepresentation of critical perspectives (diversity of opinion) and an unsubstantiated survey figure with an evaluative formulation (objectivity). The violations cannot be attributed to individual errors, but to structural editorial decisions — expert selection, time distribution, framing — which in their totality create a demonstrable tendency in favour of extending military service and rearmament. A complaint to KommAustria on the basis of these findings would be legally justifiable, whereby the overall score of 4.4/10 indicates a slight, not extreme imbalance that lies within the scope of editorial discretion, but touches the limits of the statutory mandate.



## CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

### 1. Walter Feichtinger — Military Service Commission

- FUNDING:** State (National Defence Academy environment, commission appointed by the Federal Ministry)
- MANDATE:** Not compatible with a neutral assessment — commission was appointed to issue a reform recommendation
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** High — institutional interest in the implementation of the reform recommendation
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
  - D2 Personal risk: -1
  - D3 Professional competence: +2
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1
  - D6 Source level: +1**TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Franz Eder provides a partial counter-perspective; no explicit counter-voice to the commission recommendation

### 2. Erich Cibulka — Austrian Officers' Society

- FUNDING:** Interest group, membership fees and state funding
- MANDATE:** Not compatible with a neutral assessment — an interest group is by definition partisan
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** High — organisation benefits from the strengthening of the military
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
  - D2 Personal risk: -1
  - D3 Professional competence: +2
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0
  - D6 Source level: +1**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** None; Cibulka's position is not questioned

### 3. Irmgard Ehrenberger — Reconciliation League

- FUNDING:** International Christian-pacifist organisation, membership fees and donations
- MANDATE:** Explicitly pacifist — transparently partisan, but not state-affiliated
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Medium — ideological mandate for disarmament
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -1
  - D2 Personal risk: +1
  - D3 Professional competence: 0
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: +2
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1
  - D6 Source level: 0**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Challenged by reporter's follow-up question (34:35) — as the only voice in the programme

### 4. Georg Hoffmann — Military History Museum

- FUNDING:** State (federal museum)
- MANDATE:** Historical contextualisation — compatible with a neutral assessment on historical questions
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Low — state institution, but no direct interest in the reform recommendation
  - D1 Conflict of interest: 0
  - D2 Personal risk: 0
  - D3 Professional competence: +2
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1
  - D6 Source level: +2



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

TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Not required for historical contextualisation

*IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. The introduction of Feichtinger and Cibulka as experts without naming their conflicts of interest is a social attribution of neutrality, which is refuted by the above analysis.*

**Source traffic light for participants:**

| Source   | D1 | D2 | D3 | D4 | D5 | D6 | Total | Traffic light |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|---------------|
| Walter Feichtinger — Military Service Commission | -2 | -1 | +2 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +2    | <b>YELLOW</b> |
| Erich Cibulka — Austrian Officers' Society       | -2 | -1 | +2 | +1 | 0  | +1 | +1    | <b>YELLOW</b> |
| Irmgard Ehrenberger — Reconciliation League      | -1 | +1 | 0  | +2 | -1 | 0  | +1    | <b>YELLOW</b> |
| Georg Hoffmann — Military History Museum         | 0  | 0  | +2 | +1 | +1 | +2 | +6    | <b>GREEN</b>  |

**Legal and methodological classification**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>No finding of fact</b>              | 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.                          |
| <b>No legal ruling</b>                 | 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). |
| <b>No proof of causality</b>           | 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.  |
| <b>No judgement of intent</b>          | The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of programmes. A score of 7 means that a considerable imbalance has been identified — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.       |
| <b>Heuristic comparison instrument</b> | The index serves the purpose of comparative pattern recognition across thousands of programmes, not 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: The totality of programmes must ensure diversity and balance.
- 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](http://www.svfab.ch) | [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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 can not only obtain 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](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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. After that, 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.

Anyone who does not know this provides 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, for reference, for 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 go along with it. 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 the news differently. Conduct conversations with greater 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. Anyone who feels unfairly treated can lodge a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the IGAC, 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 lays bare the system — factually, precisely, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional law review that shows: the IGAC system meets none of the three fundamental criteria — it is not appropriate, not based on 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 outstanding.