



## ORF DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-04-29\_WELTjournal- Iran - Widerstand und Hoffnung im Krieg

Programme: ORF Programme | 2026-04-29 | Analysed on: 2026-05-21 10:40

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**5.3/10**

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

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**4.2 / 10**

*Balanced*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — [chesdata.eu](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) and ÖVP (51 seats) under FPÖ Federal Chancellor Herbert Kickl. 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's party)	Remigration, EU scepticism, neutrality, social benefits for Austrians
ÖVP	6.0	51	Government (junior partner)	Business location, strict asylum policy, openness to technology
SPÖ	3.0	41	Opposition	Wealth tax, workers' rights, pro-European, rent cap
NEOS	5.5	18	Opposition	Radical-liberal, education reform, strongly pro-European
Greens	2.5	16	Opposition	Climate neutrality, humane asylum policy, social security

The dominant line of conflict runs between the FPÖ-led government and the ORF, which the FPÖ has historically classified as politically left-leaning and whose reform it is pursuing. At the same time, there is a structural proximity between the ÖVP and the ORF Foundation Board, which has been criticised for years. In terms of content, migration policy, the neutrality debate and the question of Austria's positioning in the Ukraine war as well as in the Middle East shape the political discourse.

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 National Council parties). The programme is a documentary format dealing with the fictional or future scenario of a war against Iran — a topic of immediate foreign policy relevance for Austria as a neutral state.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Preliminary note on methodology: This programme is a documentary format about the Iran war from the perspective of Iranian civilians and regime opponents. It is not a political discussion programme featuring representatives of Austrian parties. Austrian party positions are not explicitly addressed. The assessment is therefore based on implicit framings that touch on Austrian party positions (neutrality, foreign policy, attitude towards US military operations, assessment of regime change by external actors).

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Programme portrayal vs. programme position
ÖVP	0	Not directly addressed. The ÖVP position (maintaining neutrality, security policy cooperation) is neither supported nor contradicted.
SPÖ	0	Not directly addressed. The SPÖ position (preserving neutrality, humanitarian tradition) is implicitly supported by the humanitarian framing of the programme, but not explicitly addressed.
FPÖ	-1	FPÖ core position: strict neutrality policy, against external interference, against sanctions. The programme shows Iranian civilians welcoming US military operations (04:08: "Thank you, Trump, thank you for helping us."), without critically contextualising this perspective or presenting the FPÖ-aligned neutrality position as a legitimate alternative. Slight distortion through omission.
Greens	+1	The Greens' position (humane asylum policy, civil protection, promotion of peace) is implicitly supported by the strong emphasis on civilian suffering. No active distortion.
NEOS	0	Not addressed. The NEOS position (European defence cooperation, neutrality debate) is neither supported nor contradicted.

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: SPÖ/Greens (score 0/+1) — humanitarian framing compatible with their positions
- Strongest distortion: FPÖ (score -1) — neutrality position as a legitimate foreign policy option is not represented
- Average deviation from 0: 0.4
- Conclusion: The programme is primarily a humanitarian documentary format without direct reference to Austrian parties. The implicit framing — US military operation welcomed by parts of the Iranian population, regime as clearly illegitimate — touches on the Austrian neutrality debate without addressing it. The FPÖ position (strict neutrality, no external interference) is slightly disadvantaged by omission, as no Austrian foreign policy perspective is introduced.



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Programme data

- Title: Not explicitly stated (documentary format about the Iran war from the perspective of Iranian civilians and regime opponents)
- Date: 29.04.2026
- Presenter/Reporter: Not named; voice-over commentary in German (ORF editorial team); subtitles: AUDIO2 on behalf of the ORF
- Persons interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Azora (pseudonym)	Civilian, Tehran, upscale neighbourhood	None — regime opponent	Opposition, liberal
Radiology assistant (anonymous)	Medical staff, hospital	None — regime opponent, underground network	Opposition
Fahrad (pseudonym)	Young journalist, Tehran	None — regime opponent	Opposition
Friend of Parisa (anonymous)	Civilian, south of Iran	None — regime opponent	Opposition, sympathising with monarchism ("long live the Shah")
Activists (group, anonymous)	Regime opponents, city in the south	None — regime opponents	Opposition
Tehran family (anonymous)	Civilians, Tehran	None — ambivalent	Civil society, critical of war

### Main topic

The programme documents the lives of Iranian civilians and regime opponents during a war between Iran and a US-Israeli alliance in 2025, based on secretly recorded material.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard facts

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

##### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**Expert 1:** Azora (pseudonym) — civilian, Tehran

Timestamp: 00:45–01:08, 22:02–24:05

Statement: "Everything is unpredictable and frightening. I think it would take a miracle for something good to happen in the region." (01:24–01:29)

Classification: Regime opponent from Tehran's upscale neighbourhood — socioeconomically privileged perspective; no conflicts of interest in the classical sense, but clear political positioning against the regime.

Missing countervoice: Regime-aligned civilian from a comparable milieu.

#### Source in-depth check:

**(a) FUNDING:** No institutional funding; private individual. No classical conflict of interest, but security risk due to regime opposition influences willingness to make statements.

**(b) MANDATE:** No institutional role; personal accounts of experience — compatible with eyewitness testimony, not with expert analysis.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — Regime opponent, but no institutional conflict of interest

D2 Personal risk: +2 — Lives in Iran, risks arrest through statement

D3 Professional competence: 0 — Civilian, no specialist expertise; eyewitness testimony

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent stance throughout the programme

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Mixed: emotional accounts and factual observations

D6 Source level: +2 — Primary source (eyewitness)

**TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Framed as a neutral voice, but is a clearly positioned regime opponent. The programme does not explicitly identify this as a limitation.

**Expert 2:** Radiology assistant (anonymous)

Timestamp: 06:38–09:27

Statement: "At the moment, medical care in the country is a political act." (08:44–08:47)

Classification: Medical staff, active in the underground network for injured demonstrators — clear positioning against the regime.

Missing countervoice: Medical staff working under regime supervision and representing that perspective.

#### Source in-depth check:

**(a) FUNDING:** Employed by the state (hospital), but acts against state directives — structural contradiction increases credibility.



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

**(b) MANDATE:** Medical expertise for descriptions of injuries; political assessments go beyond professional competence.

- D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — Acts against own institutional interests
- D2 Personal risk: +2 — Risks arrest and professional ban
- D3 Professional competence: +2 — Medical statements within area of expertise
- D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly factual and data-based (descriptions of injuries)
- D6 Source level: +2 — Primary source

**TOTAL: +9 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** No problematic neutrality framing; positioning is transparent.

**Expert 3:** Fahrad (pseudonym) — journalist, Tehran

Timestamp: 10:04–10:55, 12:23–13:16, 19:16–20:01

Statement: "Now that it has happened, it feels as if the rules of the game have changed." (10:35–10:38)

Classification: Regime-opposing journalist; operates covertly among regime supporters — clear political positioning.

Missing countervoice: Regime-aligned journalist or state media representative.

**Source in-depth check:**

**(a) FUNDING:** Unclear; possibly supported by the ORF or external media organisations — not declared.

**(b) MANDATE:** Journalistic observation; compatible with reporting, but not with neutral analysis.

- D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Possible funding by Western media not declared
- D2 Personal risk: +2 — Risk of arrest (500 arrests mentioned, 19:24–19:29)
- D3 Professional competence: +1 — Journalistic observational competence
- D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly observational
- D6 Source level: +2 — Primary source

**TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Funding source not declared — methodological deficit.

*Missing expert groups:*

- International law expert (legitimacy of war, international humanitarian law)
- Independent Middle East analyst (geopolitical context)
- Representative of a humanitarian organisation with verified data (ICRC, UNHCR)

**Source indicator for participants:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Azora (pseudonym) — civilian, Tehran	+1	+2	0	+1	0	+2	+6	GREEN
Radiology assistant (anonymous)	+1	+2	+2	+1	+1	+2	+9	GREEN
Fahrad (pseudonym) — journalist, Tehran	0	+2	+1	+1	+1	+2	+7	GREEN

*Summary:*

All three main sources are primary witnesses with high personal risk (GREEN), which strengthens their credibility as eyewitness testimony. Problematic is the complete absence of analytical expert voices and the missing declaration of possible funding sources for Fahrad. The programme presents exclusively regime-opposing perspectives without countervoices.



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



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: Secretly filmed footage by activists

Timestamp: 00:16–00:19 — Statement: "In secretly filmed recordings, regime opponents report from the isolated country."

- (a) **Funding and sponsorship:** Unclear; activists without institutional affiliation. Transfer to ORF not made transparent.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Activists have an interest in portraying the regime negatively and generating international attention.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Official Iranian state media (IRNA, Press TV) or independent observers with access to both sides.

### Source 2: Iranian government (cited indirectly)

Timestamp: 18:39–18:50 — Statement: "The regime claims that civilian infrastructure is being targeted, such as schools, health centres and residential buildings."

- (a) **Funding:** State.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** The regime has an interest in being portrayed as a victim of civilian attacks.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Independent verification of damage reports (e.g. satellite images, ICRC reports).

### Source 3: Iranian government — casualty figures

Timestamp: 18:50–18:54 — Statement: "The Iranian government reports hundreds of civilian casualties."

- (a) **Funding:** State.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Casualty figures can be politically instrumentalised.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Independent verification; UN reports; ICRC data.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 18:39

Claim: "The regime claims that civilian infrastructure is being targeted, such as schools, health centres and residential buildings."

Word marker: "claims"

Primary source available: No — the claim is neither verified nor falsified. +1 penalty point.

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 18:50

Claim: "The Iranian government reports hundreds of civilian casualties."

Word marker: "reports" (without verification)

Primary source available: No — no independent verification. +1 penalty point.



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

Summary: The source selection is one-sidedly concentrated on regime-opposing primary sources. State sources are only introduced as unverifiable "claims". Independent verification sources (ICRC, UN, satellite images) are completely absent. Two penalty points for unverifiable claims.



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Regime-opposing voices (Azora, Fahrads, friend Parisa, activists): (approx. 58%)
- Radiology assistant (medical-humanitarian, regime-opposing): (approx. 17%)
- Tehran family (ambivalent, critical of war): (approx. 13%)
- Voice-over commentary (ORF editorial team): (approx. 12%)
- Regime-aligned voices (independent): 0 min. (0%)
- Analytical expert voices: 0 min. (0%)

Summary: Speaking time is entirely concentrated on regime-opposing and civil society voices. Regime-aligned perspectives receive no independent speaking time; analytical expert voices are completely absent. For a documentary format about an active war, this is a considerable asymmetry.



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

##### Omission 1: Justification for war by the USA and Israel

###### Context

A war between the USA/Israel and Iran is treated as a fact, without presenting the justification for war by the attacking sides.

Relevant at: Entire programme, in particular 13:34–13:40: "Tehran had been heavily struck the day before by the strategic alliance of the USA and Israel."

###### Effect

The attack appears as a contextless act; the question of the legitimacy of the war (nuclear programme, terrorism financing, regional security) is not raised. This favours an uncritical reception of the attack.

##### Omission 2: Classification under international law

###### Context

An attack by two states on a third state without a UN mandate is only legal under strict conditions pursuant to UN Charter Art. 51.

Relevant at: 13:34–13:40 (bombing of Tehran), 18:11–18:20 (missile and drone attacks)

###### Effect

The programme normalises the attack without addressing its problems under international law. For Austria as a neutral state, this is particularly relevant.

##### Omission 3: Civilian casualties on the side of regime supporters

###### Context

The Iranian government reports "hundreds of civilian casualties" (18:50–18:54), but these are dismissed as unverifiable "claims".

Relevant at: 18:39–18:54

###### Effect

The suffering of civilians who are aligned with or neutral towards the regime is not portrayed on an equal footing. The programme implicitly suggests that civilian casualties on the regime's side are less relevant.

Summary: The programme systematically omits all perspectives that would critically contextualise the US-Israeli attack — justification for war, international law, civilian casualties on the regime's side. This is not a coincidental omission, but a structural pattern that makes the attack appear legitimate.

#### Missing voices

- International law expert/international legal expert: Would have contextualised the legality of the US-Israeli attack under UN Charter Art. 51 and shed light on the question of the legitimacy of the war.
- Austrian Foreign Ministry / neutrality expert: Would have presented the relevance of the conflict for Austria's neutrality policy and humanitarian tradition.
- Iranian diaspora in Austria: Would have introduced a European-Iranian perspective of immediate relevance to the Austrian audience.
- Independent Middle East analyst: Would have contextualised geopolitical backgrounds, the history of the nuclear programme and regional power dynamics.
- Humanitarian organisation (ICRC, UNHCR): Would have provided verified casualty figures and international humanitarian law.



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

- Regime-aligned Iranian voice (authentic): Would have presented the perspective of regime supporters beyond Fährad's observer perspective.
- Energy expert / economic analyst: Would have contextualised the consequences of the conflict for European energy supply and the Austrian economy.
- Iranian opposition politician in exile: Would have presented a structured political alternative to the regime, beyond the spontaneous popular mood.



## 5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 18:50–18:54

Figure: "The Iranian government reports hundreds of civilian casualties."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value: "hundreds" — vague, no precise figure. (b) Share: Missing — no ratio to total population, war zone, military casualties. (c) Trend: Missing — no temporal development.

#### Missing context

Independent verification; comparison with military casualties; geographical distribution.

#### Effect

The figure is framed as an unverifiable regime statement ("reports"), which implicitly undermines its credibility without refuting it.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 19:24–19:30

Figure: "over 500 persons had been arrested for passing information to the enemy."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value: 500+ — more precise. (b) Share: Missing — no ratio to total population or total number of arrests. (c) Trend: Missing.

#### Missing context

Source of the figure (police chief — state source); no independent verification.

#### Effect

The figure is presented as fact without source verification, even though it comes from a state authority that is otherwise framed as untrustworthy in the programme — inconsistent source treatment.

Summary: Two relevant figures are used without complete three-part verification. Particularly problematic is the inconsistent source treatment: regime figures on civilian casualties are framed as a "claim", while regime figures on arrests are presented as fact.



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Association 1:

Timestamp

13:25–13:29

Quote

*"Khamenei's son stands for a hard line and a regime that defends itself relentlessly."*

Technique: Mojtaba Khamenei is negatively connoted through association with his father ("son of his father", 12:03) and the term "relentlessly", without independent evidence for his personal policies.

Effect

Anticipation of a negative assessment without evidence; guilt by association through family association.

### Association 2:

Timestamp

20:12–20:17

Quote

*"In response, the Basij militia intensifies its operations."*

Technique: The Basij militia is associated with brutality through immediate contextualisation (20:18–20:23: "behave brutally and offensively towards people").

Effect

Legitimate security forces (from the regime's perspective) are portrayed exclusively through the victim's perspective.

Summary: Guilt by association is structurally embedded in this programme — the regime and its representatives are consistently portrayed through the perspective of their opponents. This is partly unavoidable for a humanitarian documentary format, but the missing counter-perspective considerably amplifies the effect.



<b>7. TIMING</b>									<b>5/10</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	6	7	8	9	10

#### Finding 1:

Position: 00:16–00:27 (beginning)

Content: "In secretly filmed recordings, regime opponents report from the isolated country. Rare insights into the daily lives of people from the first weeks of the war."

#### Timing effect

The programme begins with the framing "isolated country" and "regime opponents" — this sets the interpretive framework for the entire programme. The regime is positioned as an oppressor from the outset, before a single fact is presented.

#### Finding 2:

Position: 04:08–04:19 (early, after first emotional sequence)

Content: "Thank you, Trump, thank you for helping us. Thank you for restoring the balance of power in my country."

#### Timing effect

The positive assessment of US intervention is placed immediately after the emotional sequence about the killed demonstrator Parisa — emotional conditioning before rational contextualisation.

#### Finding 3:

Position: 23:45–24:05 (end)

Content: "I always thought no one had the right to march into another country and impose their decisions on it. Now Trump wants to determine who the next leader will be."

#### Timing effect

The only critical voice regarding US intervention is placed at the end of the programme — after 23 minutes of predominantly positive framing of the attack. This placement formally gives the criticism space, without treating it as structurally equivalent.

Summary: The timing follows a clear pattern: emotional conditioning at the beginning, positive framing of US intervention in the middle, critical countervoice at the end as a formal signal of balance. This is a classic technique for steering reception.



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

4/10

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 principle K11+K8: Document the triggering event — asymmetry is only demonstrable with a comparable trigger without an analogous reaction from other guests/positions.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 07:54–09:07

Triggering event: Description of gunshot wounds to demonstrators by the regime's security forces.

Reaction: Detailed, emotional account of the injuries; voice-over commentary: "At her workplace, she secures evidence of the injuries sustained by the demonstrators, risking her life in doing so." (07:46–07:51)

### Comparison

Analogous event — civilian casualties from US-Israeli bombardments (18:39–18:54) — reaction: regime portrayal is framed as a "claim"; no emotional account.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. Injuries caused by regime forces are portrayed in detail and emotionally; civilian casualties from US-Israeli attacks are dismissed as an unverifiable regime statement. Comparable suffering is treated unequally.

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 3/5 — Asymmetry clearly demonstrable, but not consistently intense.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 20:18–20:23

Triggering event: Basij militia stops cars, searches vehicles.

Reaction: "behave brutally and offensively towards people" — evaluative language in the voice-over commentary.

### Comparison

Analogous event — US-Israeli bombing of an oil depot (13:34–14:52) — reaction: factual description without evaluative language in the voice-over commentary.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. Regime security forces are described with evaluative language ("brutally"); US-Israeli military actions are described in a factual and neutral manner.

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Summary: Selective outrage is demonstrable in two cases: injuries caused by regime forces are portrayed emotionally and in detail, while civilian casualties from US-Israeli attacks are framed as an unverifiable regime statement. The asymmetry is structural, not coincidental.



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

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

Entire programme

Missing perspective/fact: Justification for war by the USA and Israel (nuclear programme, regional security, terrorism financing by Iran).

Relevance: A war between states always has a justification structure on the part of the attacking side. This is completely absent.

Impact: The attack appears as a contextless act of liberation; the question of proportionality and legality is not raised.

### Finding 2:

#### Timestamp

Entire programme

Missing perspective/fact: Classification of the attack under international law.

Relevance: For Austria as a neutral state, the question of the legitimacy of war under the UN Charter is central.

Impact: The programme normalises a war of aggression without legal contextualisation — problematic for a public broadcaster of a neutral state.

### Finding 3:

#### Timestamp

18:39–18:54

Missing perspective/fact: Independent verification of civilian casualties from US-Israeli attacks.

Relevance: Civilian casualties caused by all parties to the conflict are of equal humanitarian relevance.

Impact: The suffering of civilians who are aligned with or neutral towards the regime is structurally devalued.

Summary: The programme is thematically focused on the victim perspective of regime opponents and systematically omits all perspectives that would critically contextualise the US-Israeli attack. This is a structural completeness deficit that goes beyond editorial prioritisation.

## Soft facts

In the programme, Iran is in an active state of war with the USA and Israel ("strategic alliance of the USA and Israel", 13:37). The regime under Ali Khamenei was killed (02:52–02:55), and his son Mojtaba Khamenei was appointed the new Supreme Leader (12:16–12:20). The programme is set in a fictional or future scenario (time reference 2025/2026) that goes beyond the actual state of affairs at the time of the analysis. The societal significance is considerable: Iran is a key actor in the Middle East, and a war would have global implications for energy supply, refugee movements and international security — topics of direct relevance to Austria.

### Share of perspectives covered

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

[A] Perspective of Iranian civilians who support the regime or are ambivalent

[B] Perspective of the Iranian regime / state portrayal of events

[C] Perspective of US foreign policy and justification for war



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

[D] Perspective of Israeli foreign policy and justification for war

[E] Humanitarian consequences of the war for the civilian population (casualty figures, infrastructure)

[F] International reactions (UN, EU, neutral states such as Austria)

**[G] Historical context:** Iranian Revolution 1979, nuclear programme, history of sanctions

[H] Perspective of the Iranian diaspora in Austria/Europe

**[I] Legal classification:** International law, laws of war, legitimacy of the attack

[J] Economic and energy policy consequences for Europe/Austria

**[A] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 12:23–13:16 — Quote: "Today, thousands have gathered at Enghelab Square to pledge allegiance to Mojtaba Khamenei." — Assessment: Regime supporters are briefly shown, but framed exclusively through Fahrad's critical observer perspective; no independent voice.

**[B] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 18:39–18:50 — Quote: "The regime claims that civilian infrastructure is being targeted, such as schools, health centres and residential buildings." — Assessment: The regime's portrayal is framed as a "claim" and not verified; no independent voice from the regime.

**[C] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The US justification for war (nuclear programme, regional security, terrorism financing) is not presented at any point.

**[D] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The Israeli perspective and justification for war are completely absent.

**[E] COVERED**

Timestamp: 07:54–09:07 — Quote: "He was hit by eight bullets. Two hit the eye..." — Assessment: Humanitarian consequences are portrayed in detail and emotionally; the focus of the programme.

**[F] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: International reactions, UN positions, EU stance and Austrian foreign policy are completely absent.

**[G] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 05:57–06:06 — Quote: "This is a tradition since the 'Woman, Life, Freedom' movement of 2022, which stands for women's rights and social justice." — Assessment: Historical context is introduced at specific points, but not systematically addressed.

**[H] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The Iranian diaspora in Austria/Europe is not given a voice.

**[I] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Classification of the attack under international law is completely absent.

**[J] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Economic and energy policy consequences for Europe are not addressed.



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

### Completeness score: 3/10

---

Justification: The programme covers exclusively the perspective of Iranian regime opponents and civilians. Five out of ten relevant perspectives are completely absent, two are only indicated. The US-Israeli conduct of the war, questions of international law, international reactions and the Austrian foreign policy perspective are completely absent. For an ORF documentary format with foreign policy relevance, this is a considerable completeness deficit.



## Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:16–00:27
Quote	<i>"In secretly filmed recordings, regime opponents report from the isolated country."</i>
Manipulation	The word "isolated" sets the frame: Iran = closed, repressive system. "Regime opponents" as the primary source of information is established as self-evident.
Why problematic	The frame "isolated country" implies that only regime opponents know the truth. Regime-aligned perspectives are thereby structurally delegitimised before they are even presented.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	13:34–13:40
Quote	<i>"Tehran had been heavily struck the day before by the strategic alliance of the USA and Israel."</i>
Manipulation	The term "strategic alliance" frames the US-Israeli attack as a coordinated, legitimate military operation — not as a war of aggression or bombardment.
Why problematic	"Strategic alliance" is a militarily neutral term that implicitly affirms the legitimacy of the attack. "Bombardment by the USA and Israel" would be more neutral.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	11:11–11:22
Quote	<i>"What frightens us most is this noise. But we hope that those who have oppressed us and caused us suffering will be eliminated."</i>
Manipulation	The term "eliminated" for the killing of regime representatives is presented without commentary — normalises the killing of political opponents as a legitimate goal.
Why problematic	For a public broadcaster, the uncritical presentation of wishes for the killing of political opponents is problematic, regardless of the political assessment of the regime.

Summary: The framing of the programme is consistent: Iran = repressive, isolated regime; US-Israeli attack = strategic operation; regime opponents = legitimate voices of truth. This framing is not neutral, but corresponds to a Western-liberal foreign policy perspective.



## 11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

13:25–13:29

#### Quote

*"Khamenei's son stands for a hard line and a regime that defends itself relentlessly."*

#### Manipulation

"Relentlessly" is an evaluative connotation — implies stubbornness and illegitimacy of the resistance.

#### Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "Khamenei's son stands for a continuation of the previous course and a regime that offers resistance."

### Finding 2:

#### Timestamp

20:18–20:23

#### Quote

*"behave brutally and offensively towards people"*

#### Manipulation

"Brutally" is an evaluative qualification in the voice-over commentary — not as a quote from a source, but as an editorial assessment.

#### Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "Eyewitnesses report violent checks and verbal abuse." The editorial evaluation "brutally" is not a journalistic description, but an assessment.

### Finding 3:

#### Timestamp

03:18–03:33

#### Quote

*"In the name of all the martyrs and righteous of the beloved, proud people of Iran, the grace of martyrdom was granted to the Prince of the Nation and leading martyr of the Islamic Revolution, His Eminence Grand Ayatollah Imam Khamenei."*

#### Manipulation

The official regime announcement is quoted in full and without commentary — including the religious framing ("martyrdom", "grace"). This stands in contrast to the critical framing of other regime statements.

#### Why problematic

The uncritical reproduction of regime language at this point is inconsistent with the critical distance that the programme otherwise maintains towards regime statements. Possible effect: irony through contrast with the jubilation of regime opponents — but without an editorial note.

Summary: The choice of words is clearly evaluative in two cases in favour of the regime-opponent perspective ("relentlessly", "brutally"). The uncritical reproduction of the regime announcement in religious language is inconsistent and possibly intended ironically, but not made transparent.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Methodological principle K11+K8: Document the triggering event.*

Preliminary note: The programme is a documentary format without classical moderation. There are two direct questions from an unnamed journalist to interview partners.

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 06:38–06:44

Triggering event: Conversation with radiology assistant about working conditions during the war.

**Quote (journalist)** "Are you afraid to come to work every day?"

**Comparison** No analogous question to regime-aligned persons or neutral civilians.

Asymmetry: The question is formulated in an empathetic and confirmatory manner — it invites confirmation of fear, not an open account. No comparable empathetic question to other groups is demonstrable, as no other groups are interviewed.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 16:19–16:22

Triggering event: Conversation with Tehran family about wartime experiences.

**Quote (journalist)** "Can you hear the bombardments and do you also see them?"

**Comparison** Factual, open question — less suggestive than Finding 1.

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable for this question.

Summary: Moderation behaviour is difficult to assess due to the documentary format. The only clearly suggestive question (06:38) is directed at a regime-opposing source and invites confirmation. Since no regime-aligned persons are interviewed, a complete asymmetry assessment is methodologically limited.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

To radiology  
assistant, 06

38: "Are you afraid to come to work every day?" — soft/empathetic/confirmatory

To Tehran  
family, 36

36: "How do you think this war will end?" — open/neutral

To Tehran  
family, 22

42: "Do you believe that by now everyone is in favour of a war against Iran?" — open, slightly critical

Comparison

The question to the radiology assistant is suggestive and empathetic; the questions to the family are more open. No hard questions to regime-opposing sources (e.g.: "Do you approve of the death of civilians from US-Israeli attacks?").

#### Asymmetry 2:

To no regime-  
aligned person

No questions asked.

Comparison

The complete absence of questions to regime-aligned persons is the strongest asymmetry — it is structural, not merely in the formulation of questions.

Summary: The question asymmetry is primarily structural: regime-aligned persons are not interviewed. The only suggestive question is directed at a regime-opposing source. Critical follow-up questions to regime-opposing sources (e.g. regarding their attitude towards civilian casualties from US-Israeli attacks) are completely absent.



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

23:45–24:05

Construct: The only critical voice regarding US intervention ("I always thought no one had the right to march into another country and impose their decisions on it") is placed at the end of the programme.

#### Analysis

This placement could be interpreted as a formal signal of balance — one voice against 23 minutes of predominantly positive framing of the attack. However, the programme is not a classical discussion format, but a documentary format; false balance in the classical sense (two equally presented but unequally substantiated positions) is not present.

Summary: False balance in the classical sense is not the dominant problem in this programme — the problem is rather the opposite: missing balance through the complete omission of opposing perspectives. The placement of the only critical voice at the end could be assessed as a formal signal of balance, but is too weak to count as genuine balance.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The US-Israeli attack on Iran is a legitimate act that is welcomed by parts of the Iranian population.

#### Timestamp

04:08–04:19 — Evidence: "Thank you, Trump, thank you for helping us. Thank you for restoring the balance of power in my country."

Alternative agenda: The question of the legitimacy of the war, classification under international law, Austrian neutrality policy — these perspectives do not make it onto the agenda.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The Iranian regime is clearly illegitimate and its representatives are legitimate targets of military force.

#### Timestamp

11:11–11:22 — Evidence: "But we hope that those who have oppressed us and caused us suffering will be eliminated." (presented uncritically)

Alternative agenda: The question of the legitimacy of regime change through external military force; the perspective of Iranians who support the regime or are ambivalent.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The "Woman, Life, Freedom" movement represents the will of the Iranian people.

#### Timestamp

05:57–06:06 — Evidence: "This is a tradition since the 'Woman, Life, Freedom' movement of 2022, which stands for women's rights and social justice."

Alternative agenda: The question of how representative this movement is of the Iranian population as a whole; the perspective of religiously conservative Iranians.

Summary: The programme sets a clear agenda: the Iranian regime is illegitimate, the US-Israeli attack is legitimised at least by parts of the population, and the regime opponents represent the will of the people. Contrary agenda items (international law, neutrality, representativeness of regime opponents) do not appear.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 5.8 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 4.8 / 10

### Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (score 8):** The programme systematically omits all perspectives that would critically contextualise the US-Israeli attack — justification for war, international law, civilian casualties on the regime's side. This is the strongest manipulation pattern in the programme and runs through all 24 minutes.
- 2. Completeness / Selective Omission overall picture (score 8):** Five out of ten relevant perspectives are completely absent; the programme depicts the conflict exclusively from the perspective of one side. For an ORF documentary format about an active war, this is a structural deficit that goes beyond editorial prioritisation.
- 3. Framing (score 7) and agenda-setting (score 7):** The programme sets a consistent interpretive framework — Iran = repressive/isolated, US-Israeli attack = strategic/legitimate, regime opponents = will of the people — which is not questioned. This framework corresponds to a Western-liberal foreign policy perspective and is problematic for a public broadcaster of a neutral state.

### Core messages of the programme

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "The Iranian regime is an illegitimate system of oppression, the overthrow of which is longed for by the population."

**Technique:** Exclusive portrayal of regime-opposing voices; emotional accounts of repression and suffering. — Evidence: 07:54–09:07, 04:40–05:34

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "The people in Iran are courageous resistance fighters who risk their lives to report the truth."

**Technique:** Personalisation through pseudonyms (Azora, Fahrads), emphasis on personal risk, emotional close-ups. — Evidence: 07:46–07:51, 19:16–19:51

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "The US-Israeli military operation is, at least from the perspective of the oppressed, a legitimate intervention, even if it generates ambivalence."

**Technique:** Positive quotes about Trump/USA (04:08–04:19) placed early; critical voice (23:45–24:05) placed at the end; no criticism of the justification for war. — Evidence: 04:08–04:19, 23:45–24:05

**Justification:** The programme achieves an overall score of 5.4/10, which corresponds to a clear one-sidedness. The dominant techniques — systematic omission of opposing perspectives, consistent framing in favour of regime opponents and the US-Israeli attack, complete absence of analytical expert voices — are not coincidental, but structural. Pursuant to §4 of the ORF Act, objectivity and impartiality of reporting as well as consideration of diversity of opinion are required. The programme violates these requirements through the one-sided source selection and the systematic omission of perspectives that would critically contextualise the US-Israeli attack. For Austria as a neutral state, the missing classification of a war of aggression under international law is particularly problematic. The programme is recognisable as a humanitarian documentary format and has a legitimate journalistic core (eyewitness testimony from a war zone), but exceeds the limits of §4 of the ORF Act through structural one-sidedness.

### CONCLUSION

The programme is a carefully crafted documentary format that presents authentic eyewitness accounts from Iran during a fictional or future war scenario. The journalistic core — primary sources with high personal risk, emotional proximity to events — is credible and has a legitimate informational value. Problematic, however, is the structural one-sidedness: the programme presents exclusively regime-opposing perspectives, systematically omits the justification for war, international law and civilian casualties from US-Israeli attacks, and sets an interpretive framework that makes the US-Israeli attack appear legitimised at least by parts of the population. Pursuant to §4 of the ORF Act (objectivity, impartiality, diversity of opinion), this structural one-sidedness is a demonstrable violation that goes beyond editorial prioritisation. For Austria as a neutral state, the missing classification of a war of aggression under international law



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

and the absence of an Austrian foreign policy perspective in particular represent a specific deficit that touches on §4 of the ORF Act in conjunction with the neutrality requirement.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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

**5.8/10**

*Considerable bias*

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

**4.8/10**

*Considerable bias*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.3/10**

*Considerable bias*

*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 irregularity identified.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor irregularity without significant impairment of balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Recognisable tendency; relevance of impact low to moderate.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with relevance of impact</b>	Relevant bias that influences the opinion-forming potential of the audience.
<b>6</b>	<b>Considerable finding (threshold)</b>	Scores from 6 onwards are identified as "considerable findings".
<b>7</b>	<b>Considerable finding</b>	Clear, well-substantiated bias with significant relevance of impact.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Serious finding</b>	Pronounced bias; multiple substantiable individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum manifestation</b>	Systematic, pervasive bias in this criterion.

### Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No significant patterns discernible; programme meets the requirement of factual accuracy.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Slight bias</b>	Isolated irregularities; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Considerable bias</b>	Multiple 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 treated worse in portrayal, speaking time or framing.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognisable, but weak disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No discernible preference or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favoured</b>	Recognisable, but weak preference.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favoured</b>	Party is clearly preferred in portrayal, speaking time or framing.



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

### Assessment pursuant to §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 ORF Act (objectivity and impartiality)

Facts: The programme presents exclusively regime-opposing perspectives and systematically omits the justification for war by the USA and Israel, classifications under international law and civilian casualties from US-Israeli attacks.

Evidence: Timestamp 13:34–13:40 — Quote: "Tehran had been heavily struck the day before by the strategic alliance of the USA and Israel." — No justification for war, no classification under international law.

Assessment: The one-sided portrayal of an active war conflict without consideration of the perspective of the attacking sides and without classification under international law violates the requirement of objectivity and impartiality. A public broadcaster of a neutral state is particularly obliged to portray war conflicts without taking sides.

#### Violation 2:

Norm: §4 para. 1 ORF Act (consideration of diversity of opinion)

Facts: The programme gives space exclusively to regime-opposing voices; regime-aligned perspectives receive no independent speaking time; analytical expert voices are completely absent.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:00–24:16 — Entire programme: 0% speaking time for regime-aligned voices, 0% for analytical experts.

Assessment: The complete absence of opposing perspectives violates the requirement of diversity of opinion. This also applies to a documentary format: §4 of the ORF Act does not distinguish between programme formats, but requires balance of programmes overall.

#### Violation 3:

Norm: §4 para. 1 ORF Act (objectivity) in conjunction with journalistic duties of care

Facts: Two claims are presented without a primary source and without verification (regime casualty figures as a "claim"; arrest figures as fact).

Evidence: Timestamp 18:50–18:54 — Quote: "The Iranian government reports hundreds of civilian casualties." — No independent verification. Timestamp 19:24–19:30 — Quote: "over 500 persons had been arrested for passing information to the enemy" — Source: police chief (state), no verification.

Assessment: The inconsistent source treatment — regime casualty figures as unverifiable "claims", regime arrest figures as fact — violates the requirement of objectivity through selective source credibility.

### Overall assessment §4 ORF Act

---

The programme violates §4 of the ORF Act in three demonstrable respects: objectivity and impartiality through one-sided portrayal of a war conflict without consideration of the attacking sides; diversity of opinion through the complete absence of regime-aligned and analytical perspectives; journalistic duty of care through inconsistent source treatment. The violations are structural and cannot be attributed to individual editorial decisions. For Austria as a neutral state, the missing classification of a war of aggression under international law in particular is a specific deficit that, beyond the general requirements of §4 of the ORF Act, touches on Austrian neutrality policy. The programme has a legitimate journalistic core (eyewitness testimony from a war zone), which is, however, steered in a direction through structural one-sidedness that is incompatible with the requirement of balance under §4 of the ORF Act.



## CHAPTER 6 — Source In-Depth Check

Preliminary note: The programme does not cite classical specialist bodies, NGOs or advisory bodies. The relevant sources are primary witnesses (Azora, radiology assistant, Fahrhad, friend Parisa, Tehran family) as well as indirect sources (Iranian government, police chief). The source in-depth check is carried out for the two institutional sources.

### Source 1: Iranian government (cited indirectly, 18:39–18:54)

- FUNDING:** State — Iranian Islamic Republic.
- MANDATE:** State communication; not compatible with neutral assessment in a war conflict in which the state itself is a party to the war.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Considerable — the Iranian government has an institutional interest in emphasising civilian casualties from US-Israeli attacks and minimising its own losses.
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Party to the war with a direct interest in portrayal
  - D2 Personal risk: -1 — State institution without personal risk
  - D3 Professional competence: 0 — Access to data, but selective disclosure
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: -1 — Regime statements historically unreliable
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Propagandistic framing likely
  - D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (state announcement)**TOTAL: -5 → SOURCE INDICATOR: RED**
- COUNTERVOICE:** Independent verification (ICRC, UN, satellite images) is completely absent.

### Source 2: Iranian police chief (cited indirectly, 19:21–19:30)

- FUNDING:** State — Iranian security authorities.
- MANDATE:** Security authority; not compatible with neutral assessment on questions of its own arrest practices.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Considerable — the police chief has an interest in communicating arrest figures as a deterrent.
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct institutional partisanship
  - D2 Personal risk: -1 — No personal consequences for false statements
  - D3 Professional competence: +1 — Access to arrest data
  - D4 Consistency of opinion: -1 — State security authorities historically unreliable in self-portrayal
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Numerical statement, but without context
  - D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source**TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**
- COUNTERVOICE:** Independent verification of arrest figures is absent. Particularly problematic: this source is presented as fact, while the regime casualty figures are framed as a "claim" — inconsistent source treatment.

Overall finding source in-depth check:

The two institutional sources in the programme receive SOURCE INDICATOR RED (Iranian government) and YELLOW (police chief). Both are treated inconsistently in the programme: casualty figures (RED source) are framed as a "claim", arrest figures (YELLOW source) are presented as fact. This inconsistency is a methodological deficit that violates the journalistic duty of care. The primary sources (Azora, radiology assistant, Fahrhad) receive SOURCE INDICATOR GREEN due to their high personal risk and their primary source quality — their political positioning as regime opponents is, however, not sufficiently declared as a limitation of their perspective.

### Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Iranian government (cited indirectly, 18:39–18:54)	-2	-1	0	-1	-1	0	-5	RED



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

Iranian police chief (cited indirectly, 19:21–19:30)	-2	-1	+1	-1	0	0	-3	<b>YELLOW</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 ruling on intent</b>	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of programmes. A score of 7 means that a considerable bias 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 National Council parties
- 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 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 will 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](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. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, removal of context 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 all those who have a microphone in front of them and want 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 all those who are exposed and want 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 when difficulties arise



**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 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. Those who feel unfairly treated can lodge a complaint. There is even a body for this: the IGAC, the Independent Grievance 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 body that is supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it was supposed to control.

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