



ORF DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-04-29_ZIB 13-00 vom 29.04.2026

Programme: zib-tag | 2026-04-29 | Analysed on: 2026-05-04 11:08

Version 2.0-detail | K5+K13 — Auslöseereignis-Dokumentation | Konverter 3.3 (2026-05-14) | Massstab: §4 ORF-G

OVERALL SCORE

4.6/10

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

3.2 / 10

Left-favouring

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

← Left

Right →

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

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

I am analysing this ZIB 13 programme in full according to the prescribed format.

PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Programme data

- Title: ZIB 13 (Zeit im Bild 1 p.m.)
- Date: 29.04.2026
- Presenter / Reporter: Simone (presenter, surname not mentioned); Dieter (economics editor, surname not mentioned); Raffaella Schaidreiter (Brussels correspondent); Christoph Bendas (investigative reporter); Sandra Krieger (culture reporter)
- Channel: ORF 2

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
ÖVP Economics Minister (not named)	Federal Minister for Economic Affairs	ÖVP	Centre-right
SPÖ State Secretary (not named)	State Secretary	SPÖ	Centre-left
ÖVP State Secretary (female, not named)	State Secretary (female)	ÖVP	Centre-right
President of the Fiscal Council (not named)	Fiscal Council, independent expert body	No party	Neutral/Expert
Raffaella Schaidreiter	ORF correspondent Brussels	ORF	Journalistic
Christoph Bendas	ORF investigative reporter	ORF	Journalistic
Bettina Knötzl	Spokesperson ORF Transparency Advisory Board; Chair of Transparency International Austria	NGO/Civil society	Progressive-liberal
Energy Minister of the UAE (sound bite)	Government member UAE	State	International
Economic expert Eastern Europe (not named)	Economist/Analyst	Not mentioned	Expert
Film festival representative (not named)	Crossing Europe Festival	Cultural	Progressive-cultural

Main topic

The ZIB 13 reports on several current topics: internet fraud by Albanian call centres, the expiring fuel price brake of the government, employment consequences of the budget measures for older workers, Péter Magyar in Brussels, the



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

UAE's withdrawal from OPEC, King Charles in the US Congress, an ORF-internal transparency initiative, and a European climate report.



CHAPTER 1 — DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE 15 CRITERIA

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: President of the Fiscal Council (name not mentioned)

Timestamp	approx. 08:00
Statement	"I consider this paradoxical. This is a group that one particularly wanted to support and where one wants to keep costs rather low. I consider this a blemish of the reform."
Classification	The Fiscal Council is an independent advisory body of the Austrian Parliament; its independence is institutionally anchored.
Missing counter-voice	A labour market economist who assesses the overall effect of the reduction in non-wage labour costs positively is absent.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: The Fiscal Council is a legally established, parliamentarily funded body (Fiscal Council Act 2013). Funding through public funds.

Conflict of interest: Low; institutional mandate is fiscal oversight, not political partisanship.

(b) MANDATE: Compatible with neutral assessment of fiscal measures; criticism of budget measures corresponds to the core mandate.

- Conflict of interest present? NO (institutionally independent)
- Personal risk through position? INDIRECT (public criticism of a government measure)
- Does the organisation benefit from its assessment? NO
- Result: HIGH

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The assessment is correctly framed as expert criticism; no problematic fiction of neutrality.

Expert 2: Economic analyst Eastern Europe (name not mentioned)

Timestamp	approx. 14:30
Statement	"We are currently forecasting growth rates below 2%, but these will then approach 2% over the next two years..."
Classification	Institution not mentioned; affiliation unclear (bank, research institute, international organisation?).
Missing counter-voice	A more critical analyst regarding Hungary risks or the effects of the Iran war on Eastern Europe is absent.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Unknown — institution not mentioned. This is a journalistic deficiency.



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

(b) MANDATE: Cannot be assessed without institutional information.

- Conflict of interest present? INDIRECT (possibly a banking institution with Eastern Europe exposure)
- Personal risk through position? NO
- Does the organisation benefit from its assessment? POSSIBLY
- Result: MEDIUM (due to lack of transparency)

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The missing institutional information prevents a complete classification; this violates journalistic due diligence obligations.

Expert 3: Bettina Knötzl (ORF Transparency Advisory Board / Transparency International Austria)

Timestamp	approx. 21:00
Statement	"We will not work with blinkers on. But I have no mandate from the Foundation Council."
Classification	Knötzl is Chair of Transparency International Austria and was commissioned for the advisory board by ORF Director General Thurnher.
Missing counter-voice	A critical media law expert or Foundation Council member who identifies the limits of the advisory board is absent.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Transparency International Austria is an NGO, funded through membership fees, donations and public subsidies. No direct ORF funding, but commissioned by ORF management.

(b) MANDATE: The advisory board was established by Thurnher herself — structural dependence on the commissioning party.

- Conflict of interest present? YES (commissioned by the institution to be examined)
- Personal risk through position? NO
- Does the organisation benefit from its assessment? YES (visibility, relevance)
- Result: MEDIUM

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Knötzl is presented as a neutral expert body, although she was appointed by the management under review — this is a problematic fiction of neutrality.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent labour market economist on the FLAF question
- Critical media law expert on ORF transparency
- Energy economist on the fuel price brake



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: Fiscal Council

Timestamp approx. 08:00 — Statement: "I consider this paradoxical... a blemish of the reform."

(a) Funding and sponsorship: Parliamentarily funded, legally independent.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Low; mandate is fiscal oversight.

(c) Is a source missing that would substantiate a counter-view? Yes — a labour market economist who assesses the overall effect of the non-wage labour cost reform positively is absent.

Missing counter-source IHS, WIFO or WKO economist.

Source 2: Copernicus / WMO (climate report)

Timestamp approx. 24:00 — Statement: Climate report on record year.

(a) Funding: EU-funded (Copernicus), UN-funded (WMO).

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Low for scientific data; however, an institutional interest in the relevance of climate research exists.

(c) Is a source missing that would substantiate a counter-view? Yes — critical contextualisation of the methodology or divergent forecasts are absent.

Missing counter-source Not necessary given scientific consensus; however, contextualisation of areas of uncertainty would be desirable.

Source 3: SPÖ State Secretary (on the fuel price brake)

Timestamp approx. 05:20 — Statement: "That is also what institutions that have assessed this say."

(a) Funding: Government member, SPÖ party.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: High — defending own government measure.

(c) Is a source missing that would substantiate a counter-view? Yes — which institutions have assessed the fuel price brake? The statement remains vague and is not followed up.

Missing counter-source WIFO, IHS or independent energy economists.

Austria-specific: The social partners (AK, WKO, ÖGB) are completely absent from the FLAF topic — even though they are the central actors in labour market issues in Austria. This is a structural deficiency in the source selection.

Summary: The source selection is one-sided in favour of government representatives and institutional expert bodies; social partners, opposition parties and critical economic experts are systematically absent. The vague reference to "institutions" by the SPÖ State Secretary is not followed up.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time (from transcript length):

- Government representatives (ÖVP + SPÖ + NEOS total): (approx. 13–16%)
- Independent experts (Fiscal Council, economic analyst): approx. 1–1.5 min. (approx. 4–6%)
- ORF reporters/correspondents (Schaidreiter, Bendas, Krieger): (approx. 20–24%)
- Moderation/introduction: (approx. 24–28%)
- International sound bites (UAE minister, film festival): approx. 1–1.5 min. (approx. 4–6%)
- FPÖ: 0 min. (0%) — mentioned only as a negative reference in another party's sound bite
- Greens: 0 min. (0%)
- Other (police, Epstein lawyer etc.): (approx. 4–8%)

Summary: The FPÖ as Austria's strongest party receives no speaking time of its own, but is characterised negatively exclusively through an SPÖ State Secretary. The Greens also do not appear. This is in tension with ORF-G §10 para. 7 (adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council), although a certain degree of latitude exists for an individual programme.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1:

Context

The FPÖ's counter-proposals to the fuel price brake are described as "unaffordable" without being presented in terms of content.

Relevant at: approx. 05:20

Effect

Viewers cannot form their own picture of the FPÖ's position; the party is discredited without being given the opportunity to present itself. This violates ORF-G §10 para. 7 (adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council).

Omission 2:

Context

In the FLAF discussion, employers' associations (WKO) and employee representatives (AK/ÖGB) are completely absent. The Fiscal Council is the only critical voice; the State Secretary is the only counter-voice.

Relevant at: approx. 07:30–09:30

Effect

The debate is reduced to a government-vs.-expert-council constellation; the actually affected social partners are absent, even though they are traditionally the central actors in labour market issues in Austria.

Omission 3:

Context

In the ORF transparency segment, the affected employee who accuses Weißmann of sexual harassment is mentioned only as a suspect (investigations against her), not as a victim with her own voice.

Relevant at: approx. 21:50

Effect

The framing implicitly reverses the victim-perpetrator constellation; the woman appears primarily as a suspect, not as the person who filed the complaint. This is journalistically and ethically problematic.

Summary: The programme shows systematic omissions regarding opposition positions (FPÖ), social partners and the victim's perspective in the Weißmann case. These omissions are not coincidental, but follow a pattern that favours government action and ORF management.

Missing voices

- FPÖ representative: Would have explained in substance the counter-proposals to the fuel price brake described as "unaffordable" and introduced the opposition perspective on the budget measures.
- WKO representative (Chamber of Commerce): Would have quantified the specific employment effects of the FLAF change from the employer's perspective and substantiated or qualified the Fiscal Council's criticism.
- AK/ÖGB representative: Would have represented the employee side in the FLAF discussion and illuminated the question of employment security for older workers from a trade union perspective.



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

- Independent energy economist: Would have assessed the efficiency of the fuel price brake in comparison to alternative measures (direct payments, tax reductions).
- Affected employee in the Weißmann case: Would have contributed her perspective on the investigations and the reporting; her absence while simultaneously being mentioned as a suspect is journalistically problematic.
- Critical media law expert: Would have assessed the legal limits and the democratic legitimacy of the ORF transparency advisory board.
- Petroleum industry/petrol station association: Would have presented the market effects of the fuel price brake from an industry perspective.
- Older workers/those affected: Would have concretely illustrated the personal effects of the FLAF change on employment prospects for those over 60.



5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp approx. 08:00

Figure: "The Finance Minister wants to generate 500 million euros annually in this way."

Missing context

The figure of how much the simultaneous reduction in non-wage labour costs amounts to in total is missing, in order to assess the net burden on companies. The State Secretary claims that total non-wage labour costs would be "reduced much more strongly", without citing figures.

Effect

The 500 million euros stand in isolation as a burden; the overall balance remains unclear.

Finding 2:

Timestamp approx. 03:00

Figure: "50 million euros in damages" (internet fraud Europe-wide), "26 million euros" (Austria alone according to subtitle/introduction)

Missing context

The discrepancy between 26 million (Austria) and 50 million (Europe-wide) is not explained; either one figure is outdated or the delimitation is unclear.

Effect

Slight confusion about the actual extent of the damage; no serious manipulation effect.

Summary: Manipulation of figures is not systematic in this programme; the most conspicuous instance is the isolated presentation of the 500-million revenue figure without offsetting the reduction in non-wage labour costs.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

approx. 23:30

Quote

"...climate change, which some Republicans deny..."

Technique: US Republicans are associated with the term "deny", which has a strongly negative connotation in the German-speaking world (cf. "Holocaust denial"). King Charles's speech is framed as an implicit criticism of the Trump administration ("An allusion to the US government, which does not pay much attention to these points").

Effect

The Trump administration and climate sceptics are delegitimised through word choice and context, without their position being presented in substance.

Association 2:

Timestamp

approx. 05:20

Quote

"...the unaffordable counter-proposals of the FPÖ..."

Technique: The FPÖ is associated with the attribute "unaffordable" by an SPÖ State Secretary, without a counter-statement.

Effect

FPÖ positions are framed as economically irresponsible, without the FPÖ itself being given a voice.

The term "conspiracy theorist" is not explicitly used for any actors in this programme — this check point does not apply.

Summary: Guilt by association is moderately pronounced in this programme; the strongest cases concern the FPÖ (through the SPÖ sound bite) and the Trump administration/US Republicans (through word choice). A direct chain of association in the classical sense is not present.



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: approx. 05:20 (middle of the fuel price brake segment)

Content: "Compared to the doom-mongering that came when the model was presented, and to the unaffordable counter-proposals of the FPÖ, the fuel price brake has proven that it has worked very well."

Timing effect

The FPÖ criticism is placed in the middle of the segment, after the ÖVP minister has already praised the measure. The FPÖ position thereby appears as an already-refuted objection, not as a current opposition voice.

Finding 2:

Position: approx. 21:50 (end of the ORF transparency segment)

Content: "The Vienna Public Prosecutor's Office is now investigating the affected employee who accuses Weißmann of sexual harassment."

Timing effect

The information about the investigations against the employee is placed at the end of the segment, after Thurnher's transparency initiative has been presented positively. This weakens the victim's perspective and strengthens the narrative of a "clean-up" action.

Summary: The timing is conspicuous in two cases: the FPÖ criticism is positioned as an already-refuted objection, and the investigations against the Weißmann complainant are placed at the end of the ORF segment.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

3/10

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 (K5+K13): The triggering event must be documented before each assessment.

Finding 1:

Timestamp approx. 23:30

Triggering event: King Charles speaks about climate change, NATO and Ukraine — topics on which the Trump administration holds different positions.

Reaction: "An allusion to the US government, which does not pay much attention to these points."

Comparison

Analogous event: The FPÖ holds similar positions on Russia/Ukraine and climate scepticism — no analogous classification as "not paying much attention" in the case of the FPÖ.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — the Trump administration is criticised through editorial contextualisation; the FPÖ with similar positions is not given the same contextualisation in this programme, but is only criticised through the SPÖ sound bite.

Finding 2:

Timestamp approx. 11:30

Triggering event: Raffaella Schaidreiter describes Péter Magyar as a "beacon of hope".

Reaction: Positive framing without critical contextualisation.

Comparison

Analogous event: Herbert Kickl as the 2024 election winner was not described as a "beacon of hope" in ORF reporting.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable in comparison with overall ORF reporting, but not verifiable within this individual programme — therefore methodologically limited.

Summary: Selective outrage is moderately pronounced in this programme; the strongest asymmetry lies in the different treatment of the Trump administration (editorial criticism) compared to the FPÖ (no analogous editorial contextualisation despite similar positions).



9. COMPLETENESS

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

The programme falls in a phase of intensive budget negotiations of the ÖVP-SPÖ-NEOS coalition, in which austerity measures and at the same time economic policy interventions (fuel price brake) are being discussed. The FPÖ as the strongest opposition party is not in government despite its election victory and is mentioned in the programme exclusively as a negative reference. The international context (Iran war, OPEC, Hungary/Magyar) shapes the economic mood. The ORF-internal reporting on its own transparency advisory board is particularly sensitive from a media ethics perspective, as the broadcaster is reporting about itself.

Share of perspectives covered

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

Topic fuel price brake:

[A] Critical economic expert perspective: Market distortion through state price interventions, windfall effects, efficiency costs

[B] FPÖ position: Concrete presentation of the counter-proposals described as "unaffordable"

[C] Consumer protection perspective: Actual relief effect for low-income households

[D] Petroleum industry/petrol station operators: Effects on margins and security of supply

Topic older workers / FLAF:

[E] Employers' associations (WKO): Concrete assessment of employment effects

[F] AK/ÖGB: Trade union perspective on employment security for older workers

[G] Affected older workers: Accounts of experience from the labour market

Topic ORF transparency:

[H] Critical perspective on the transparency advisory board itself (independence, mandate, limits)

[I] Affected employee (victim's perspective in the Weißmann case)

[J] Foundation Council perspective: Political composition and interests

[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: approx. 04:30–06:00 — Quote: "Compared to the doom-mongering that came..." — Assessment: Critical economic expertise on market distortion is completely absent; the "doom-mongering" is presented as refuted without being identified in substance.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: approx. 05:20 — Quote: "...the unaffordable counter-proposals of the FPÖ..." — Assessment: The FPÖ position is dismissed as "unaffordable" without the FPÖ itself being given a voice or its proposals being presented in substance.

[C] INDICATED

Timestamp: approx. 04:45 — Quote: "...that prices are dampened..." — Assessment: Relief effect is claimed, but not substantiated with concrete figures for low-income households.

[D] OMITTED

No timestamp available — Assessment: The perspective of the petroleum industry or petrol station operators is completely absent.

[E] OMITTED

No timestamp available — Assessment: WKO perspective on employment effects of the FLAF change is absent, even though this is the central point of contention.



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

[F] OMITTED

No timestamp available — Assessment: AK/ÖGB perspective on older workers is absent despite high relevance for the target group.

[G] OMITTED

No timestamp available — Assessment: No voice from affected older workers or unemployed persons over 60.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: approx. 20:30–22:00 — Quote: "...to scrutinise without blinkers..." — Assessment: Critical questions about the independence of the advisory board (appointment by Thurnher herself, mandate, limits) are not raised.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: approx. 21:50 — Quote: "The Vienna Public Prosecutor's Office is now investigating the affected employee..." — Assessment: The perspective of the affected employee is completely absent; she is mentioned only as a suspect.

[J] OMITTED

No timestamp available — Assessment: The political composition of the Foundation Council and possible conflicts of interest are not addressed.

Completeness score: 2/10

Rationale: Of ten identified relevant perspectives, only two are indicated in rudimentary form; none is fully addressed. Particularly serious is the complete absence of the FPÖ perspective (despite direct mention), of employers' associations on the FLAF topic, and of any critical voices regarding the ORF transparency advisory board. The programme addresses several complex political topics without obtaining the respective counter-positions of those affected.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (setting the frame)

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	approx. 04:30
Quote	<i>"After the budget negotiations comes the negotiations on the fuel price brake."</i>
Manipulation	The fuel price brake is framed as a self-evident continuation; the question is not "whether" but "how" it will be extended. The basic principle of state price interventions is not questioned.
Why problematic	Viewers are placed in the expectation that an extension is desirable and likely; critical voices against the instrument itself do not appear.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	approx. 07:30
Quote	<i>"Experts fear that incentives for companies to employ older people will thereby disappear."</i>
Manipulation	The FLAF change is framed primarily as a threat to older workers, not as part of an overall package to reduce non-wage labour costs. The Fiscal Council is positioned as the only expert voice.
Why problematic	The framing "paradox" (Fiscal Council sound bite) sets the interpretive framework before the State Secretary can respond; her counter-argument thereby appears defensive.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	approx. 20:30
Quote	<i>"Ingrid Thurnher wants to clean up at the ORF."</i>
Manipulation	The verb "clean up" implies that the previous state was one of disorder/grievances and that Thurnher represents the solution. The reporting about the broadcaster's own affairs adopts a clearly affirmative stance towards the new Director General.
Why problematic	The ORF reports about itself in a way that frames the incumbent management positively, without maintaining critical distance; this violates the requirement of self-critical capacity of public service media.

Summary: The framing of the programme tends to present government measures as fundamentally sensible (fuel price brake) and to treat internal ORF matters in an uncritically affirmative manner. Opposition positions are not framed independently, but only as a negative reference.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

approx. 05:20

Quote

"...the unaffordable counter-proposals of the FPÖ..."

Manipulation

The adjective "unaffordable" is a value judgement, not a statement of fact. It is broadcast as a sound bite from the SPÖ State Secretary, without the presenter following up or contextualising it.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "the counter-proposals of the FPÖ, whose affordability is disputed." The uncommented adoption of a party statement as fact violates ORF-G §4 para. 5 (separation of news/commentary).

Finding 2:

Timestamp

approx. 20:30

Quote

"Ingrid Thurnher wants to clean up at the ORF."

Manipulation

"Clean up" is a positively connoted metaphor (creating order, eliminating grievances) that implicitly discredits the predecessor Roland Weißmann.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "Ingrid Thurnher wants to initiate transparency measures." The chosen formulation is evaluative and violates the requirement of impartiality.

Finding 3:

Timestamp

approx. 23:30

Quote

"...which some Republicans deny..."

Manipulation

The verb "deny" (instead of "doubt", "question" or "reject") has a strong negative connotation and is associated in the German-speaking world with Holocaust denial.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "...which some Republicans do not regard as a priority political issue" or "...towards which some Republicans are sceptical." The word choice delegitimises a political position through language selection.

Summary: The word choice of the programme contains several evaluative terms that delegitimise political positions (FPÖ, US Republicans), while government measures are framed positively in linguistic terms. This is not fully compatible with the requirement of impartiality under ORF-G §4 para. 5.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

4/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Methodological principle (K5+K13): The triggering event must be documented before each assessment.

Finding 1:

Timestamp approx. 05:20

Triggering event: The SPÖ State Secretary describes FPÖ proposals as "unaffordable" — a political value judgement that would require a follow-up question.

Quote (presenter) *[No follow-up question discernible; the sound bite is broadcast without comment]*

Comparison Analogous event: The ÖVP Economics Minister says "We acted wisely" (approx. 04:45) — likewise no follow-up question.

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable in the direct comparison of these two cases; both government representatives are broadcast without critical follow-up questions. The asymmetry lies, however, in the fact that the FPÖ position (as a third party, not present) is not protected by a follow-up question.

Finding 2:

Timestamp approx. 08:30

Triggering event: The ÖVP State Secretary disputes negative employment effects of the FLAF change with the argument of the overall reduction in non-wage labour costs.

Quote (presenter) *[No discernible follow-up question regarding concrete figures or evidence]*

Comparison The Fiscal Council (approx. 08:00) is likewise broadcast without a follow-up question.

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable; both sides are broadcast without follow-up questions. Problematic, however, is that the State Secretary makes an unsubstantiated claim ("secure many jobs") that is not challenged.

Finding 3:

Timestamp approx. 20:30–22:00

Triggering event: Bettina Knötzl announces that she will work "without blinkers" — a self-presentation that would require a critical follow-up question about the independence of the advisory board.

Quote (presenter) *[No critical follow-up question regarding the fact that the advisory board was established by Thurnher herself]*

Comparison In the Christoph Bendas interview (approx. 18:00), substantive follow-up questions are indeed asked ("How did the ORF team become aware of the case?", "What is known about her, what is her relationship to Epstein?").

Asymmetry: Demonstrable: In the ORF-internal transparency reporting, no critical follow-up questions about the independence of the advisory board are asked, while on other topics (Epstein) follow-up questions are indeed posed.



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

Summary: The moderation behaviour shows no strong direct asymmetries between interlocutors present, but exhibits a structural weakness: government statements and ORF-internal self-presentations are not treated with the same density of critical follow-up questions as other topics.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

To Raffaella Schaidreiter (Brussels), approx. 11

30: "How can one imagine this exchange today in Brussels? How is Péter Magyar being received?" — soft/open

To State Secretary (FLAF), approx. 08

30: [No direct question discernible; sound bite is played in] — no confrontation

Comparison

Schaidreiter is asked for her assessment (opinion question), the State Secretary is not directly confronted with the Fiscal Council's criticism. The asymmetry lies not between persons of different political persuasions, but between journalistic assessment (permitted) and missing confrontation with expert criticism.

Asymmetry 2:

To Christoph Bendas (Epstein), approx. 18

00: "How did the ORF team become aware of the case?" and "What is known about her, what is her relationship to Epstein?" — substantive, follow-up

To Bettina Knötzl (transparency advisory board), approx. 21

00: [No direct question discernible; sound bite is played in] — no confrontation

Comparison

On the Epstein topic, active follow-up questions are asked; on the ORF-internal transparency topic, Knötzl is broadcast without critical follow-up questions. This is a demonstrable asymmetry in favour of ORF management.

Summary: The question asymmetry is moderate; the strongest asymmetry lies in the missing confrontation of ORF-internal actors (Thurnher, Knötzl) with critical questions, while on other topics follow-up questions are indeed asked.



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

14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

approx. 08:00–09:30

Construct: Fiscal Council criticism vs. State Secretary defence on the FLAF topic.

Analysis

Here the opposite of false balance is more the case: there is no artificial balance, but a genuine controversy between expert criticism and government defence. The balance is substantively justified, even if further voices are absent.

Summary: False balance in the classical sense (equating majority and minority opinion) is not demonstrable in this programme. The programme tends more towards one-sided presentation than towards false balance.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The fuel price brake is regarded as a fundamentally sensible instrument; the question is only its extension, not its abolition or alternatives.

Timestamp

approx. 04:00 — Evidence: "Is the fuel price brake decided by the government going into an extension?"

Alternative agenda: The question could be: "Is the fuel price brake the right instrument, or would direct payments or tax reductions be more efficient?" This question does not make it onto the agenda.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Péter Magyar is regarded as a positive actor ("beacon of hope") who brings Hungary back into the EU.

Timestamp

approx. 11:30 — Evidence: "Péter Magyar is being received here as a beacon of hope, as the man who should and could manage to bring Hungary closer back into the EU framework."

Alternative agenda: Critical questions about Magyar's concrete reform plans, his party financing or possible conflicts of interest do not make it onto the agenda.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Global warming is an established fact that requires political action; sceptics "deny" it.

Timestamp

approx. 23:30 — Evidence: "...climate change, which some Republicans deny..."

Alternative agenda: The question of the optimal political instrument mix (prohibitions vs. market mechanisms vs. technological openness) does not make it onto the agenda; the debate is reduced to "acknowledgement vs. denial".

Summary: The agenda-setting of the programme presupposes several political positions as self-evident (fuel price brake as sensible, Magyar as beacon of hope, climate policy as consensus), without questioning the underlying premises. This corresponds to a left-progressive basic stance in the Austrian context.



CHAPTER 2 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

Dominant techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this programme:

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** The FPÖ as Austria's strongest party is mentioned exclusively as a negative reference by an SPÖ State Secretary, without its own speaking time or substantive presentation of its positions. Social partners are completely absent from the central labour market topic (FLAF), even though they are the traditional main actors in Austria.
- 2. Framing (Score 5) and Agenda-Setting (Score 6) — jointly dominant:** Government measures (fuel price brake) are framed as fundamentally sensible; the question is never "whether" but "how". Péter Magyar is set as a "beacon of hope" without critical contextualisation; climate policy is presented as consensus, sceptics are described as "deniers".
- 3. Source selection (Score 6):** The source selection systematically favours government representatives and institutional expert bodies; social partners, opposition parties and critical economic experts are absent. The ORF-internal reporting on the transparency advisory board dispenses with critical sources on the independence of the advisory board.

Core messages of the programme

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The government measures (fuel price brake, budget package) are fundamentally sensible and are confirmed by experts; criticism comes only from the irresponsible opposition."

Technique: Framing + Omission + Source selection — Evidence: approx. 04:45, approx. 05:20

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "The ORF under Ingrid Thurnher is cleaning up and creating transparency — the new management is the solution to past grievances."

Technique: Framing + Word choice + missing critical follow-up questions — Evidence: approx. 20:30, approx. 21:00

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "Climate change is an established fact; whoever doubts it 'denies' it — and Europe must act."

Technique: Agenda-setting + Word choice + image selection — Evidence: approx. 23:30, approx. 24:00

Rationale: The combined score of 3.6/10 corresponds to a slight but demonstrable tendency. The strongest findings lie in omission (Score 7) — in particular the complete absence of the FPÖ perspective despite direct mention — as well as in agenda-setting (Score 6) and source selection (Score 6). These patterns are not fully compatible with the requirement of comprehensive, impartial and objective information under ORF-G §4 para. 5. The tendency is left-progressive, but does not correspond to the level of a systematic imbalance; individual segments (Fiscal Council criticism of the government, Epstein investigation) do show a degree of journalistic independence.

CONCLUSION

This edition of ZIB 13 shows a slight but structurally demonstrable tendency in favour of the governing coalition (ÖVP-SPÖ-NEOS) and to the detriment of the FPÖ as the strongest opposition party. The most serious individual weakness is the complete absence of the FPÖ perspective while simultaneously using the attribute "unaffordable" by an SPÖ State Secretary, which touches on ORF-G §10 para. 7 (adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council). The ORF-internal reporting on the transparency advisory board violates the requirement of critical distance and is only partially compatible with ORF-G §4 para. 5 (impartial, objective information). Worthy of positive mention is the Epstein investigation as an example of investigative journalism, as well as the inclusion of the Fiscal Council as a critical expert voice vis-à-vis a government measure. Overall, the programme corresponds to the level of a slight editorial tendency, not a systematic imbalance.



CHAPTER 3 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Concrete evidence (timestamp + brief quote)
SPÖ	+2	approx. 05:20 "Compared to the doom-mongering..." — SPÖ State Secretary is allowed to attack the FPÖ unchallenged; SPÖ position on the fuel price brake is presented positively without critical follow-up questions.
ÖVP	+1	approx. 04:45 "We acted wisely." — ÖVP minister is broadcast without follow-up questions; approx. 08:30 State Secretary is allowed to dismiss FLAF criticism unchallenged. Slightly positive, but Fiscal Council criticism of the government measure shows a degree of balance.
FPÖ	-3	approx. 05:20 "...the unaffordable counter-proposals of the FPÖ..." — the only mention of the FPÖ is a negative characterisation by another party; 0 speaking time despite election victory and opposition status; no counter-statement.
Greens	0	No mention in this programme; neither positive nor negative.
NEOS	0	No explicit mention; as a governing party implicitly part of the positively framed coalition, but no sound bite of its own.

Party bias summary

- Most favoured: SPÖ (Score +2) — allowed to attack opposition party unchallenged; own government measure is framed positively.
- Most disadvantaged: FPÖ (Score -3) — the only mention is a negative characterisation by another party; no speaking time despite status as the strongest party.
- Average deviation from 0: 1.2 (average of absolute values: $|+2|+|+1|+|-3|+|0|+|0| / 5 = 1.2$)
- Political spectrum that dominates: Centre-left to centre-right (governing coalition); opposition (in particular FPÖ) structurally disadvantaged.
- Conclusion: The programme shows a demonstrable bias in favour of the governing coalition and to the detriment of the FPÖ. Particularly problematic is the fact that the FPÖ as Austria's strongest party (29.2% in the 2024 National Council election) appears exclusively through a negative characterisation by another party. This is in tension with ORF-G §10 para. 7, which prescribes adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council.



CHAPTER 4 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION

Applicable legal basis

ORF-G (Federal Act on the Austrian Broadcasting Corporation)

Rationale: ZIB 13 is a news programme of the ORF (public service broadcasting), to which the ORF-G is fully applicable; in particular §4 para. 5 (information obligations) and §10 para. 7 (consideration of parties).

Assessment

Violation 1:

Norm: ORF-G §4 para. 5 — "Information must be comprehensive, independent, impartial and objective. [...] News and commentary must be clearly distinguished from one another."

Facts: The statement by the SPÖ State Secretary "...the unaffordable counter-proposals of the FPÖ..." is broadcast as a sound bite without the presenter identifying the value judgement "unaffordable" as a party statement or obtaining a counter-statement.

Evidence: approx. 05:20 — Quote: "Compared to the doom-mongering that came when the model was presented, and to the unaffordable counter-proposals of the FPÖ, the fuel price brake has proven that it has worked very well."

Assessment: The uncommented adoption of a party statement as a factual classification violates the requirement of separation of news and commentary as well as the requirement of impartiality. Correct journalistic treatment would have required identifying the value judgement as an SPÖ position and obtaining an FPÖ counter-statement.

Violation 2:

Norm: ORF-G §10 para. 7 — "Adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council"

Facts: The FPÖ as Austria's strongest party (29.2%, 57 seats) receives no speaking time of its own in this programme; its only mention is a negative characterisation by another party through a government representative.

Evidence: approx. 05:20 — Quote: "...the unaffordable counter-proposals of the FPÖ..." (SPÖ State Secretary, without FPÖ counter-statement)

Assessment: A certain degree of latitude exists for an individual programme; §10 para. 7 is primarily directed at the overall programme. Nevertheless, the combination of a direct mention of the FPÖ in a negative context without a counter-statement in the same programme is problematic and touches on the requirement of adequate consideration.

Violation 3:

Norm: ORF-G §4 para. 5 — Impartiality and objectivity; Press Council Code of Honour Principle 3 (distinction between news/commentary)

Facts: The ORF-internal reporting on the transparency advisory board ("Ingrid Thurnher wants to clean up at the ORF") uses evaluative language and dispenses with critical distance towards its own management.

Evidence: approx. 20:30 — Quote: "Ingrid Thurnher wants to clean up at the ORF."

Assessment: The ORF reports about itself in a way that frames the incumbent Director General positively, without raising critical questions about the independence of the advisory board she established. This violates the requirement of impartiality particularly, since the ORF here acts simultaneously as reporter and subject of reporting.

Overall assessment

This edition of ZIB 13 exhibits three demonstrable areas of tension with the ORF-G: (1) the uncommented adoption of a party statement as a factual classification (§4 para. 5 — separation of news/commentary), (2) the complete absence of the FPÖ perspective while simultaneously mentioning it negatively (§10 para. 7 — consideration of parties), and (3) the uncritical self-reporting on ORF-internal matters (§4 para. 5 — impartiality). None of these findings individually reaches the threshold of a clear legal violation; in their combination and regularity, however, they could form the basis of a complaint to the ORF Audience Council or a supervisory complaint to KommAustria. The programme moves in the borderline area between a permissible editorial line and the public service requirement of comprehensive, impartial information.



SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

1. Fiscal Council Austria

- FUNDING:** Parliamentarily funded; legally established by the Fiscal Council Act 2013 (BGBl. I No. 149/2013). No private or party-political funding.
- MANDATE:** Independent monitoring of fiscal policy; mandate is compatible with neutral assessment of fiscal measures.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Low; institutional interest in the relevance of fiscal oversight, but no direct conflict of interest in the FLAF assessment.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** Conflict of interest NO | Personal risk INDIRECT | Benefits NO → Credibility: HIGH
- COUNTER-VOICE:** A labour market economist (WIFO, IHS) with a positive overall assessment of the non-wage labour cost reform is absent.

2. Copernicus / WMO (climate report)

- FUNDING:** Copernicus: EU-funded (European Commission). WMO: UN-funded. Both are publicly-internationally funded.
- MANDATE:** Scientific climate observation; compatible with neutral data presentation.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in the relevance of climate research and policy; however, no direct financial conflict of interest in data presentation.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** Conflict of interest INDIRECT | Personal risk NO | Benefits INDIRECT → Credibility: HIGH (for data presentation), MEDIUM (for political conclusions)
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Not strictly necessary given scientific consensus; contextualisation of areas of uncertainty would be desirable.

3. Bettina Knötzl / Transparency International Austria

- FUNDING:** Transparency International Austria is an NGO, funded through membership fees, donations and public subsidies (including federal ministries). The transparency advisory board was established by ORF Director General Thurnher — no direct ORF funding, but dependence on the commissioning party.
- MANDATE:** Transparency International has a mandate for combating corruption and promoting transparency; compatible with the advisory board task. However: the advisory board was established by the management under review — structural dependence.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** YES — Knötzl was commissioned by Thurnher; institutional interest in visibility and relevance; possible restraint in criticising the commissioning party.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** Conflict of interest YES | Personal risk NO | Benefits YES → Credibility: MEDIUM
- COUNTER-VOICE:** A critical media law expert or an independent critic of the Foundation Council who identifies the limits of the advisory board is completely absent.

4. SPÖ State Secretary (on the fuel price brake)

- FUNDING:** Government member; SPÖ party. State-funded position.
- MANDATE:** Defence of own government measure — not compatible with neutral assessment.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** HIGH — defending own political decision; party interest in positive presentation of the coalition measure.
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** Conflict of interest YES | Personal risk NO | Benefits YES → Credibility: LOW (as a neutral expert source); legitimate as a political voice, but must be identified as such.
- COUNTER-VOICE:** FPÖ representative (absent), independent energy economist (absent), WKO (absent).

Austria-specific: The social partners (AK=SPÖ-aligned, WKO=ÖVP-aligned, ÖGB=SPÖ-aligned) are completely absent from the FLAF topic — even though they are the central actors in labour market issues in Austria. Their absence is a structural deficiency that makes the source selection one-sided.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.9/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.3/10

Significant imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

4.6/10

Significant imbalance

Averaged from hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of the scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

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

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is clearly placed at a disadvantage in terms of presentation, speaking time or framing.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Discernible, but weak disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No discernible favouring or disadvantaging.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Discernible, but weak favouring.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	Party is clearly favoured in terms of presentation, speaking time or framing.



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

Legal and methodological classification

No finding of fact	The results presented do not constitute findings of fact about individual persons, editorial teams or programmes. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.
No legal ruling	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of §4 ORF-G. The determination of whether a specific programme violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular KommAustria).
No proof of causality	Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news situation, political controversy or format logic.
No finding of intent	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of programmes. A score of 7 means that a significant imbalance has been identified — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.
Heuristic comparison instrument	The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of programmes, not for the precise metric measurement of individual contributions. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Austria — ORF

Act

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 distinguished from one another.
- ORF-G §4 para. 5a: Across the totality of programmes, diversity and balance must be ensured.
- ORF-G §10 para. 7: Adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council.
- ORF-G §4 para. 1: Mandate for a differentiated overall programme that is comprehensive, independent, impartial and objective.

Core obligations

- 1. Objectivity and impartiality:** Comprehensive, independent, impartial information
- 2. Separation of news/commentary:** Clear distinction
- 3. Consideration of parties:** Adequate consideration of all 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 Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methods report v4.1: Countable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | kontakt@svfab.ch | *Methods report March 2026 | Converter 3.3 (2026-05-14)*



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 | 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

The following books are available from SVFAB

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



Unbalanced reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and source selection. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with many examples. In addition, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage — and someone else has written the script.

Those who do not know this deliver 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 their face 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, 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 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.

For those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Hear news differently. Lead 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 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 subject to separation of powers, not market-based. The body that is supposed to protect citizens protects above all 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 outstanding.