



ORF DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-04-30_ZIB 1 vom 30.04.2026

Programme: ORF Programme | 2026-04-30 | Analysed on: 2026-05-21 11:59

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

OVERALL SCORE

4.8/10

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 displayed 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)

3.8 / 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 political classification and does not feed into the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

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

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core position
FPÖ	8.5	57	Government (Chancellor)	Remigration, EU scepticism, neutrality, anti-sanctions
ÖVP	6.0	51	Government (Junior)	Business location, strict asylum policy, openness to technology
SPÖ	3.0	41	Opposition	Wealth tax, workers' rights, social climate policy
NEOS	5.5	18	Opposition	Radical-liberal, education reform, pro-EU
Greens	2.5	16	Opposition	Climate neutrality, humane asylum policy, Green Deal

The dominant line of conflict runs between the FPÖ-led government and the established media system — the FPÖ has historically classified the ORF as politically left-leaning and is pursuing structural reform. At the same time, a second line of tension exists between the government and the opposition on questions of social policy (fuel price brake, inflation) and security policy (military service, NATO proximity). The question of Austrian neutrality in the context of the Iran war and transatlantic rifts forms a third, foreign-policy axis of conflict.

The ORF is Austria's public broadcaster and is subject to the ORF Act, in particular §4 (objectivity, impartiality, diversity of opinion) and §10 para. 7 (adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council). The structural proximity between the ÖVP and the ORF Foundation Board has been the subject of public criticism for years. With the FPÖ as the chancellor's party, the ORF is under heightened scrutiny from both sides of the political spectrum.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Portrayal in programme vs. programme position
ÖVP	+1	01:21 "from ÖVP, SPÖ and NEOS it is said shortly afterwards: The fuel price brake remains" — Programme position: business location, cutting taxes — portrayed neutrally as coalition partner; no distortion, but also no substantive depth
SPÖ	+2	02:28 "The SPÖ energy spokesperson has no sympathy for petrol stations. There must be no crisis profiteers" — Programme position: workers' rights, against corporate profits — portrayed correctly; 04:01 "The SPÖ is under particular pressure, tomorrow is their high mass" — slightly ironic tone, but factual
FPÖ	-1	07:17 "The FPÖ is in favour of an extension [of military service]" — Programme position: strict neutrality policy, no NATO membership — mentioned without substantive context; the FPÖ as chancellor's party is not given substantive airtime on any topic, despite leading the government
Greens	0	07:17 "the Greens are open to talks" — Programme position: no rearmament, promotion of peace — marginal mention, no substantive portrayal; party not represented in the programme
NEOS	+2	02:16 "It is short-sighted..." / 14:04 "Life paths are decided in kindergarten" — Programme position: education reform, liberal, deregulation — portrayed correctly and in detail; NEOS receives disproportionately large amount of airtime

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: NEOS, Score +2
- Strongest distortion: FPÖ, Score -1
- Average deviation from 0: 1.2
- Conclusion: The most striking imbalance is the structural silence regarding the FPÖ as the chancellor's party. In a programme dealing with government measures (fuel price brake, military service), the leading governing party is not given substantive airtime — neither with a sound bite nor with contextualisation of its positions. NEOS, on the other hand, receives detailed coverage in two separate topic blocks (fuel price, education) including direct quotes. The SPÖ is portrayed correctly, but framed with a slightly ironic undertone ("high mass").



CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Programme data

- Title: Zeit im Bild (ZIB)
- Date: 30.04.2026
- Presenter: Not named in the transcript; subtitles: J. Wibmer and D. Kapfer
- Persons interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Helma Poschner	ZIB domestic politics editor	ORF-internal	Neutral (journalist)
Barbara Wolschek	ORF correspondent Washington	ORF-internal	Neutral (journalist)
NEOS representative (sound bite)	Not named	NEOS	Centre, liberal (5.5)
SPÖ energy spokesperson (sound bite)	Not named	SPÖ	Centre-left (3.0)
Commission head military service	Chair of the military service commission	Independent/state	Not classifiable
Minister (civilian service)	Responsible minister	ÖVP (coalition)	Centre-right (6.0)
NEOS education representative (sound bite)	Not named	NEOS	Centre, liberal

Main topic

The programme covers the extension of the Austrian fuel price brake as a response to the inflationary effects of the Iran war, supplemented by secondary topics on military service, transatlantic tensions, antisemitism in London and education policy.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts — 9 techniques that are quantifiable and scientifically robust

1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Helma Poschner, ZIB domestic politics

Timestamp	02:56
Statement	"The negotiations have shown that these are three very different parties."
Classification	ORF-internal editor; structurally part of the ORF editorial system; no external independence
Missing countervoice	An independent political scientist would have provided a more detached contextualisation

Source in-depth check:

- (a) **FUNDING:** ORF — public broadcaster, partly state-funded via GIS/broadcasting fee; conflict of interest: ORF reports on the government that is seeking ORF reform
- (b) **MANDATE:** Domestic political reporting — compatible with contextualisation, but not with a neutral expert role
- D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — ORF-internal, institutional interest in a particular portrayal of the government
 - D2 Personal risk: 0 — standard reporting, no personal risk
 - D3 Subject expertise: +1 — specialisation in domestic politics present
 - D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — not verifiable
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — predominantly factual
 - D6 Source level: 0 — secondary source (journalist, not a primary researcher)
- TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- (c) **SUBJECT EXPERTISE:** Poschner is presented as a neutral contextualising authority, but is ORF-internal — the framing as "expert" conceals the institutional affiliation.

Expert 2: Barbara Wolschek, ORF correspondent Washington

Timestamp	09:06
Statement	"One could go ahead and say that this is the reaction of a president who is notoriously sensitive to statements in which he perceives an insult."
Classification	ORF correspondent; the same institutional limitation as Poschner; statement contains an implicit characterisation of Trump

Source in-depth check:

- (a) **FUNDING:** ORF — public broadcaster
- (b) **MANDATE:** Foreign reporting — compatible, but not neutral in the sense of external expertise
- D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — ORF-internal
 - D2 Personal risk: 0 — standard reporting
 - D3 Subject expertise: +1 — Washington correspondence, knowledge of US politics



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

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — not verifiable

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "notoriously sensitive" is evaluative, not data-based

D6 Source level: 0 — secondary source

TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) SUBJECT EXPERTISE: Wolschek is presented as a neutral contextualising authority; the characterisation of Trump as "sensitive" is a value judgement that is framed as fact.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent economic economist (inflation and market analysis)
- Security policy expert (military service, NATO context)
- US political scientist (Trump-Merz conflict from an academic perspective)

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Traffic light
Helma Poschner, ZIB domestic politics	-1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	YELLOW
Barbara Wolschek, ORF correspondent Washington	-1	0	+1	0	-1	0	-1	YELLOW

Summary: Both "experts" deployed are ORF-internal journalists — no external, independent specialists. The source traffic light shows YELLOW for both. The programme dispenses entirely with external scientific or economic expertise.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: "Economists" (anonymous)

Timestamp 05:08 — Statement: "It dampens inflation, economists also say so."

- (a) **Funding and sponsorship:** Not stated — no source identifiable
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Not verifiable, as no source is named
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Economists who criticise price brakes as market-distorting (e.g. IHS, critical voices from WIFO)

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 05:08

Claim: "economists also say so"

Word marker: implicit ("economists also" without naming them)

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

Source 2: Media reports (anonymous)

Timestamp 01:16 — Statement: "Later in the afternoon, media report the collapse of the talks."

- (a) **Funding:** Not stated
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Not verifiable
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** No source cited — journalistic standard not met

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 01:16

Claim: "media report a collapse"

Word marker: "media" (without specification)

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

Source 3: EU comparative data (anonymous)

Timestamp 05:22 — Statement: "Across the EU, it was possible to see that Austria was among the countries where fuel prices rose less sharply."

- (a) **Funding:** Not stated — no source (Eurostat? IEA? Own survey?)
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Data are used to confirm the fuel price brake
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Countries without a price brake with a similar price development

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 05:22

Claim: EU comparison in Austria's favour

Word marker: "it was possible to see" (without citing a source)

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



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

Summary: The programme consistently works with anonymous sources ("economists", "media", "across the EU it was possible to see") without citing primary sources. Three penalty points are awarded. All cited data serve to confirm the fuel price brake; critical counter-sources are entirely absent.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- NEOS (sound bite + report): (15%) — two separate topic blocks
- SPÖ (sound bite): (5%)
- ÖVP (sound bite): approx. 0:30 min. (2.5%)
- FPÖ: approx. 0:05 min. (0.4%) — one mention without sound bite
- Greens: approx. 0:05 min. (0.4%) — one mention without sound bite
- Commission head (military service): approx. 0:30 min. (2.5%)
- ORF journalists (contextualisation): (20%)
- Presenter/report: (55%)

Summary: The time distribution shows a clear asymmetry in favour of NEOS (15% speaking time, two topic blocks) compared to FPÖ (0.4%, no substantive portrayal). The chancellor's party is effectively not represented in a 20-minute news programme dealing with government measures — a structurally problematic finding pursuant to §10 para. 7 of the ORF Act.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Omission 1:

Context FPÖ position on the fuel price brake

Relevant at: 00:37–05:34 (entire fuel price brake block)

Effect The chancellor's party does not exist in the reporting on a government measure — viewers get the impression that the measure is a project of SPÖ, ÖVP and NEOS, without the government position of the FPÖ being known.

Omission 2:

Context Fiscal costs of the fuel price brake

Relevant at: 01:44–05:34

Effect The measure is presented exclusively as relief; the question of who bears the costs (taxpayers, state budget) is not raised — a one-sided picture of the measure.

Omission 3:

Context Austrian neutrality position on the Iran war

Relevant at: 00:52 ("inflation due to the Iran war"), 07:23–11:14 (transatlantic tensions)

Effect The Iran war is treated as a contextual factor for inflation and transatlantic tensions, without Austria's foreign policy position (neutrality, energy dependency) even being mentioned — a central omission in a foreign-policy-relevant context.

Summary: The three most serious omissions concern the chancellor's party FPÖ, the fiscal dimension of the fuel price brake and Austria's neutrality position. All three omissions work in the same direction: they prevent a critical contextualisation of the government measure and the foreign policy situation.

Missing voices

- Independent economic economist: Would have contextualised the market-distorting effects and fiscal costs of the price brake
- FPÖ government representative: Would have set out the chancellor's party's position on the measure — central to a balanced portrayal
- Oil company representative: Would have brought in the business perspective on margin interventions
- Small petrol station operator: Would have described the economic impact first-hand
- Security policy expert (military service): Would have independently contextualised the strategic rationale for the extension
- Austrian Foreign Ministry: Would have set out Austria's neutrality position in the context of the Iran war
- EU Commission representative: Would have explained the European framework for national price interventions
- Consumer association: Would have substantiated the actual relief effect for households with data



5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 01:44

Figure: "Diesel and petrol prices will no longer be reduced by 10 cents per litre as before, but only by 7 cents in the coming two weeks."

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

Missing context

No comparison to the market price (7 cents on what basis?), no indication of the total costs of the measure, no comparison to the inflation rate

Effect

The figure appears precise, but without a reference framework it cannot be contextualised — suggests effectiveness without evidence.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 13:31

Figure: "Of the 14,000 children who began instruction in a German support class in the 2022/23 school year, a third could already speak significantly better German just one semester later."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value ✓ — (b) Share ✓ (third) — (c) Trend ✓ (progression over two years)

Missing context

No comparison to a control group without a support class; "significantly better" without definition

Effect

The statistic appears positive, but without a benchmark "a third" cannot be contextualised.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 08:30

Figure: "Nowhere else in Europe are as many US troops stationed as in Germany, currently around 39,000."

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

Missing context

No comparison to the total strength of US forces in Europe (approx. 100,000); no historical trend (reduction since the Cold War)

Effect

The figure appears imposing, without its relative significance being contextualised.

Summary: The programme uses figures selectively to underpin the respective narratives (fuel price brake works, educational support works, US troops are significant), without systematically providing all three dimensions (absolute value, share, trend). Particularly problematic is the missing source citation for the EU comparison on fuel prices.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

04:35

Quote

"The previous government did not intervene in inflation after the Ukraine war. At that time, inflation was partly in double digits. They don't want to be accused of that again now."

Technique: The "previous government" (implicitly: ÖVP-Greens coalition, but also associable with FPÖ proximity) is associated with failure in combating inflation — without explicit naming, but recognisable from context.

Effect

The current measure is upgraded through negative contrast with the predecessor; implicit criticism of earlier government policy without naming it.

Summary: Guilt by association is not a dominant pattern in this programme. The only relevant association concerns the implicit negative contrast with the previous government, which is however not explicitly named. Score remains low.



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:10 (opening)

Content: "The fuel price brake is being extended — in a weakened form."

Timing effect

The extension is presented as the first item of news — even before the qualification ("weakened form"). The positive message (extension) comes before the negative one (weakening), which colours the overall impression positively.

Finding 2:

Position: 04:35 (middle of the fuel price brake block)

Content: "The previous government did not intervene in inflation after the Ukraine war."

Timing effect

The comparison with the previous government is placed after the presentation of the current measure — as subsequent legitimisation, not as critical contextualisation.

Finding 3:

Position: 05:34 (end of the fuel price brake block)

Content: "On what this measure means politically, NEOS parliamentary club chairman Yannick Shetty will be a guest on ZIB 2."

Timing effect

The reference to NEOS as commentator on the measure at the end of the block sets NEOS as the political interpretive authority — without an analogous announcement for FPÖ or other parties.

Summary: The timing pattern favours a positive framing of the fuel price brake (positive news first, legitimisation through comparison with predecessor) and sets NEOS as the privileged interpretive authority at the end of the main topic.



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: Document the triggering event — asymmetry is only demonstrable with a comparable trigger without an analogous reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 02:28

Triggering event: SPÖ energy spokesperson criticises ÖVP and NEOS for lack of willingness to intervene in markets against corporations

Reaction: "The SPÖ energy spokesperson has no sympathy for petrol stations." — slightly ironic tone of the presenter/report

Comparison NEOS criticism of fuel price brake (02:16) — reaction: neutral, no ironic framing

Asymmetry: The SPÖ position is framed with slight irony ("no sympathy"), the NEOS criticism factually — demonstrable, but mild.

Degree of outrage: 1/5

Selectivity: 2/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp 07:54

Triggering event: Merz criticises US strategy in the Iran war: "The Americans have no strategy."

Reaction: Factual reporting, no evaluation by ORF

Comparison Trump's reaction to Merz (08:13) — "Trump shows irritation" — also reported factually

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable — both positions are presented factually.

Degree of outrage: 0/5

Selectivity: 0/5

Summary: Selective outrage is not a dominant pattern in this programme. The only demonstrable asymmetry is the slightly ironic framing of the SPÖ position ("no sympathy") compared to the factual presentation of the NEOS criticism — a mild finding.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:37–05:34

Missing perspective/fact: FPÖ government position on the fuel price brake

Relevance: The FPÖ is the chancellor's party and leads the government — its position on a central government measure is essential for viewers

Impact: Viewers receive a picture of the fuel price brake as a project of SPÖ, ÖVP and NEOS, without knowing how the chancellor's party views it — structurally misleading.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 05:08

Missing perspective/fact: Critical economists' voices on the effectiveness of price brakes

Relevance: The claim "economists also say so" is not substantiated; contrary economists' opinions exist (market distortion, windfall effects)

Impact: One-sided portrayal of economic effectiveness without scientific controversy.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 00:52 / 07:23

Missing perspective/fact: Austrian neutrality position on the Iran war

Relevance: The Iran war is treated as a cause of inflation and transatlantic tensions; Austria's foreign policy stance (neutrality, energy dependency, mediating role) is not addressed

Impact: Austria appears as a passive observer without its own foreign policy position — an omission that concerns state identity.

Summary: The programme exhibits systematic gaps that all work in the same direction: the chancellor's party FPÖ remains invisible, critical counter-perspectives are absent, and Austria's foreign policy independence is not addressed. The completeness score of 4/10 (step 2) is confirmed by this analysis.

The fuel price brake is a state intervention in the fuel market that has been discussed in Austria since the Ukraine war (2022) as an instrument for combating inflation. The Iran war (treated in the transcript as an ongoing event) has put energy prices under pressure again. Politically, the measure is controversial: proponents see it as socially necessary, critics as market-distorting and fiscally burdensome. The three-party coalition SPÖ-ÖVP-NEOS (opposition parties) is negotiating here jointly — an unusual picture, since the governing parties FPÖ and ÖVP apparently do not carry the measure alone.

Share of perspectives covered

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

[A] Economic-liberal criticism: State price interventions distort the market and delay adjustment

[B] FPÖ government position: How does the chancellor's party assess the fuel price brake?



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

- [C] **Consumer perspective:** How does the measure concretely affect households?
- [D] **Petrol station operators (small businesses):** Economic impact on small and medium-sized enterprises
- [E] **Economists' counter-perspective:** Critical voices on the effectiveness of price brakes
- [F] **Fiscal perspective:** Costs of the measure for the state budget
- [G] **European comparison:** How are other EU countries dealing with the price increase?
- [H] **Oil companies:** Reaction to margin interventions
- [I] **Extension of military service:** Security policy rationale and societal debate
- [J] **Iran war:** Background, Austrian neutrality position, impact on energy supply

[A] INDICATED

Timestamp: 02:16 — Quote: "It is short-sighted to say we will have cheap prices for the next two months." — Assessment: NEOS criticism is briefly shown, but not explored in depth; no economic counter-expertise.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The FPÖ as chancellor's party is not given substantive airtime on any topic throughout the entire programme; its position on the fuel price brake remains completely unknown.

[C] INDICATED

Timestamp: 05:13 — Quote: "At petrol stations, prices were seen to become somewhat cheaper. Not cheap, but cheaper." — Assessment: The consumer perspective is implicitly addressed, but no consumer is given a voice.

[D] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 02:10 — Quote: "The competitiveness of small petrol stations is a major issue for NEOS" — Assessment: The topic is raised, but only through NEOS framing, not by those affected themselves.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Economists are cited wholesale as confirmation ("economists also say so"), without a critical countervoice; no independent economic-scientific contextualisation.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The fiscal costs of the fuel price brake are not addressed at any point.

[G] INDICATED

Timestamp: 05:22 — Quote: "Across the EU, it was possible to see that Austria was among the countries where fuel prices rose less sharply." — Assessment: Selective comparison without methodology or source citation.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Oil companies are framed as "crisis profiteers" (02:32), but are not themselves given a voice.

[I] INDICATED

Timestamp: 05:57–07:22 — Quote: "Then we need a referendum." — Assessment: The topic is addressed, but without security policy depth or citizens' perspective.

[J] INDICATED

Timestamp: 00:52 — Quote: "inflation is picking up due to the Iran war" — Assessment: The Iran war is mentioned as a contextual factor, but not independently analysed; Austria's neutrality position is entirely absent.



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

Completeness score: 4/10

Rationale: Of ten relevant perspectives, only two are fully addressed, four are indicated and four are entirely omitted. Particularly serious is the absence of the FPÖ government position, critical economists' voices and the fiscal dimension. The programme treats the fuel price brake primarily as socially positive and refrains from a structured juxtaposition of arguments.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	01:01
Quote	<i>"The fuel price brake can reduce the cost of living."</i>
Manipulation	This statement is presented as fact in the presenter's text, but is a politically contested claim. The subjunctive ("can") mitigates this slightly, but the context (presenter's text, not a quote) lends it the status of fact.
Why problematic	Viewers receive the impression that the effectiveness of the measure is uncontested — critical economists' voices are thereby pre-emptively delegitimised.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	04:35
Quote	<i>"The previous government did not intervene in inflation after the Ukraine war. At that time, inflation was partly in double digits. They don't want to be accused of that again now."</i>
Manipulation	The current measure is framed through negative contrast with the previous government — implicitly presented as a learning process and improvement.
Why problematic	This comparison comes from the ORF domestic politics editor, not from a party — it is thus presented as neutral contextualisation, but is a political value judgement in favour of the current government measure.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	02:32
Quote	<i>"There must be no crisis profiteers"</i>
Manipulation	The term "crisis profiteers" is a politically charged term used by the SPÖ, which is adopted in the presenter's text without quotation marks or distancing.
Why problematic	The adoption of political battle terms into the presenter's text without marking them as a quote is a classic framing instrument — the term sets the discursive framework without being recognisable as an opinion.

Summary: The framing of the programme favours the fuel price brake as a necessary and effective measure. Political battle terms ("crisis profiteers") are adopted into the presenter's text, and the measure is legitimised through negative contrast with the previous government — both without recognisable distancing.



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



11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

02:28

Quote

"The SPÖ energy spokesperson has no sympathy for petrol stations."

Manipulation

"No sympathy" is an emotional formulation that connotes the SPÖ position as hard or inconsiderate — even though the SPÖ is representing a factual economic policy position.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "The SPÖ energy spokesperson sees no need to spare petrol stations." — The chosen formulation sets an emotional value judgement.

Finding 2:

Timestamp

04:07

Quote

"The May celebrations at the Rathausplatz were one reason why it was not so easy."

Manipulation

The SPÖ May celebration is framed as an obstacle to negotiations — implicitly as party-political self-interest placed above substantive negotiations.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "The SPÖ had important party events the following day, which increased the time pressure." — The chosen formulation suggests a prioritisation to the detriment of substantive work.

Finding 3:

Timestamp

09:27

Quote

"that is the reaction of a president who is notoriously sensitive to statements in which he perceives an insult."

Manipulation

"Notoriously sensitive" is a characterising value judgement presented as fact. "Notoriously" is an authority marker without a source citation.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "Trump has in the past reacted to criticism from allies with threats." — The chosen formulation is a characterisation, not an analysis.

Summary: The choice of words shows a pattern of slight emotional loading: SPÖ positions are connoted with "no sympathy", Trump is characterised as "notoriously sensitive", and political battle terms ("crisis profiteers") are adopted without distancing. None of the formulations is in itself serious, but the pattern is consistent.



12. PRESENTER BEHAVIOUR

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Methodological principle: Document the triggering event — asymmetry is only demonstrable with a comparable trigger without an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:22

Triggering event: Presenter asks Poschner about the political significance of the fuel price brake

Quote (presenter) "How important is this measure politically?"

Comparison No analogous question about possible disadvantages or costs of the measure

Asymmetry: The question is one-sidedly oriented towards significance/importance — a counter-question ("What speaks against the measure?") is absent. Demonstrable, but mild.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 09:10

Triggering event: Presenter asks Wolschek about the seriousness of Trump's threat

Quote (presenter) "How seriously must one take this threat from Donald Trump?"

Comparison No analogous question about the justification of Merz's criticism of the USA

Asymmetry: The question focuses on Trump's threat as a reaction, not on Merz's statement as a trigger — implicitly, Trump's behaviour is set as the element requiring explanation.

Summary: The presenter behaviour shows a slight asymmetry in the questioning: questions are oriented towards confirming the effectiveness of measures and towards contextualising Trump's behaviour, without systematic counter-questions. No serious interruptions or expressions of sympathy demonstrable.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

To Helma
Poschner
(domestic
politics), 04

22: "How important is this measure politically?" — soft (inviting, no critical dimension)

To Helma
Poschner, 04

57: "What has the fuel price brake achieved so far?" — soft (asks about successes, not failures)

Comparison

No hard questions to ORF-internal contextualising authorities; no question about costs, side effects or criticism of the measure.

Asymmetry 2:

To Barbara
Wolschek, 09

10: "How seriously must one take this threat from Donald Trump?" — neutral-soft (asks for assessment, not justification)

To Barbara
Wolschek, 10

41: "How would Congress behave?" — neutral (factual follow-up question)

Comparison

No question about the justification of Merz's criticism or about European co-responsibility for transatlantic tensions.

Summary: The questions to ORF-internal contextualising authorities are consistently soft and oriented towards confirmation. Critical counter-questions (costs of the measure, justification of Merz's criticism) are systematically absent. The asymmetry lies less between different guests than between the treatment of government measures (soft) and the treatment of Trump (neutral-critical).



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	02:10–02:45 — Construct: NEOS criticism (02:16) and SPÖ endorsement (02:28) are placed side by side as if they were equivalent positions in a balanced debate.
Analysis	The portrayal suggests a balanced debate between two positions, but omits the FPÖ government position and economic-liberal economists' criticism. The apparent balance between NEOS and SPÖ conceals the fact that both parties fundamentally support the extension — the difference lies only in the design.

Summary: False balance is not a dominant pattern, but the juxtaposition of NEOS and SPÖ as "two sides" of the debate is misleading, since both fundamentally support the measure. A genuine counter-perspective (FPÖ, economic-liberal criticism) is absent.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: State price interventions are a legitimate and effective response to inflation.

Timestamp 01:01 — Evidence: "The fuel price brake can reduce the cost of living."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether state price interventions combat or exacerbate inflation in the long term does not make it onto the agenda — the measure is set as self-evidently positive.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The Iran war is an external shock event to which Austria must react.

Timestamp 00:52 — Evidence: "inflation is picking up due to the Iran war"

Alternative agenda: Austria's role as a neutral state, possible mediating function, energy dependency on the Middle East — none of this makes it onto the agenda.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: NEOS is the relevant opposition party for economic and education topics.

Timestamp 02:16 / 14:04 / 05:34 — Evidence: NEOS is given space in three separate contexts

Alternative agenda: FPÖ as chancellor's party would be the natural first point of contact for government measures — its absence sets NEOS as the interpretive authority.

Summary: The programme sets three implicit agenda elements: price interventions are legitimate, the Iran war is an external shock without an Austrian option for action, and NEOS is the relevant economic policy voice. All three settings favour a particular political worldview and exclude alternative framings.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

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

Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** The systematic absence of the FPÖ as chancellor's party in a programme about government measures is the most serious individual finding. In none of the topics covered (fuel price brake, military service, education) does the leading governing party get substantive airtime — neither with a sound bite nor with contextualisation of its positions.
- 2. Completeness / Agenda-Setting (Score 7/6):** The programme sets implicit agenda elements (price interventions are legitimate, NEOS is the relevant economic voice) and systematically omits counter-perspectives. The combination of completeness gaps and agenda-setting produces a consistent one-sided picture that goes beyond individual formulations.
- 3. Expert selection (Score 6):** The exclusive use of ORF-internal journalists as contextualising authorities without external expertise is structurally problematic. Both source traffic lights show YELLOW — the programme presents institutionally bound opinions as neutral expertise.

Core messages of the programme

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The fuel price brake is a necessary and effective measure that the current government, in contrast to the previous government, is deploying correctly."

Technique: Framing + negative contrast — Evidence: 01:01, 04:35, 05:08

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "NEOS is the relevant economic and education policy voice in Austrian politics."

Technique: Time distribution + agenda-setting — Evidence: 02:16, 05:34, 14:04

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Trump is an unpredictable, sensitive actor whose threats, while to be taken seriously, are limited by institutional constraints."

Technique: Choice of words + framing — Evidence: 09:27, 10:45

Rationale: The overall score of 4.8/10 is on the boundary between "slight tendency" and "clear one-sidedness". The classification as "clear one-sidedness" is justified because the dominant findings (absence of the chancellor's party FPÖ, systematic completeness gaps, one-sided expert selection) are attributable not to individual formulations but to structural decisions. Pursuant to §4 of the ORF Act, the consideration of diversity of opinion and the adequate portrayal of all parties represented in the National Council (§10 para. 7) is not fulfilled: the chancellor's party FPÖ does not appear substantively in a programme about government measures, while NEOS (opposition party, 18 seats) is disproportionately represented. The balance of programmes is thus structurally violated.

CONCLUSION

The analysed ZIB programme has an overall score of 4.8/10 and is to be classified as clearly one-sided. The most serious finding is the structural absence of the FPÖ as chancellor's party: in a programme dealing with central government measures (fuel price brake, military service), the leading governing party appears neither with a sound bite nor with substantive contextualisation of its positions — a finding that, pursuant to §10 para. 7 of the ORF Act, violates the requirement of adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council. At the same time, NEOS (opposition party, 18 seats) receives disproportionately large airtime in two separate topic blocks and is announced at the end of the main topic as the privileged interpretive authority for ZIB 2. The source selection is methodologically inadequate: three central claims are presented without citing primary sources, and the "experts" deployed are exclusively ORF-internal journalists (source traffic light: YELLOW). The framing of the fuel price brake as a self-evidently positive measure, the adoption of political battle terms ("crisis profiteers") into the presenter's text and the systematic omission of critical counter-perspectives (economists, fiscal costs, Austrian neutrality position) together produce a programme that does not fully satisfy §4 of the ORF Act (objectivity, impartiality, diversity of opinion).



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.8/10

Considerable bias

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.8/10

Considerable bias

OVERALL SCORE

4.8/10

Considerable bias

Averaged from hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No material patterns recognisable; programme meets the requirement of factual accuracy.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight bias	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Considerable bias	Several considerable findings; relevant impairment of diversity of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the requirement of balance. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, programme-wide patterns; high relevance of impact.
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 portrayal, speaking time or framing.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognisable, but weak disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No discernible preference or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Recognisable, but weak preference.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	Party is clearly favoured in portrayal, speaking time or framing.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (§4 ORF Act)

Assessment pursuant to §4 ORF Act

Violation 1:

Norm: §4 para. 1 ORF Act (objectivity and impartiality) in conjunction with §10 para. 7 (adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council)

Facts: The FPÖ as chancellor's party (57 seats, 29.2% National Council election 2024) does not appear substantively in a 20-minute programme about government measures. NEOS (18 seats, 9.2%) receives speaking time in two separate topic blocks and is announced as the interpretive authority for ZIB 2.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:37–05:34 (fuel price brake: no FPÖ sound bite, no FPÖ reference); 05:34 "NEOS parliamentary club chairman Yannick Shetty will be a guest on ZIB 2"; 14:04–15:17 (education: exclusively NEOS)

Assessment: The discrepancy between the parliamentary strength of the FPÖ (chancellor's party, largest parliamentary group) and its absence from the programme cannot be explained by editorial substantive reasons and violates the requirement of adequate consideration.

Violation 2:

Norm: §4 para. 1 ORF Act (objectivity) in conjunction with §4 para. 5 (diversity of opinion)

Facts: The fuel price brake is presented as effective and necessary ("economists also say so"), without critical economic-scientific counter-positions being given a voice. Three central claims are presented without citing primary sources.

Evidence: Timestamp 05:08 "economists also say so" (no source); 01:01 "The fuel price brake can reduce the cost of living" (presenter's text as fact); 05:22 "across the EU it was possible to see" (no source)

Assessment: The portrayal of a politically contested measure as scientifically established without source citation and without a counter-perspective violates the requirement of objectivity.

Violation 3:

Norm: §4 para. 1 ORF Act (impartiality)

Facts: Political battle terms of the SPÖ ("crisis profiteers", "no crisis profiteers") are adopted in the presenter's text without distancing; the SPÖ position is slightly ironically framed through the formulation "no sympathy for petrol stations", while NEOS positions are presented factually.

Evidence: Timestamp 02:28 "The SPÖ energy spokesperson has no sympathy for petrol stations"; 02:32 "There must be no crisis profiteers" (without quotation marks in context)

Assessment: The asymmetric treatment of party positions (ironic framing of SPÖ vs. factual portrayal of NEOS) and the adoption of political battle terms into the presenter's text violates the requirement of impartiality.

Overall assessment §4 ORF Act

The programme does not fully satisfy §4 of the ORF Act in three dimensions: the requirement of objectivity is violated by unsubstantiated claims and one-sided portrayal of the fuel price brake; the requirement of impartiality by asymmetric treatment of party positions and adoption of political battle terms; the requirement of diversity of opinion and adequate consideration of parties (§10 para. 7) by the structural absence of the chancellor's party FPÖ combined with the disproportionate portrayal of NEOS. The violations are not attributable to individual formulations but to structural editorial decisions (guest selection, topic framing, source selection), which points to a systematic pattern. A single programme does not in itself constitute a legally relevant violation of the ORF Act; however, in the context of a programme review across multiple programmes, the documented findings would be usable as evidence of a structural bias in court proceedings.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

Organisation 1: "Economists" (anonymous, 05:08)

- FUNDING:** Not stated — no organisation identifiable
 - MANDATE:** Not verifiable
 - CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Not verifiable; statement serves to confirm a government measure
 - CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** Not applicable (no identifiable source)
- SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: RED (no primary source, not verifiable)
- COUNTERVOICE:** Economists who criticise price brakes as market-distorting (e.g. IHS Vienna, Agenda Austria) are not cited

Organisation 2: ORF domestic politics editorial team (Helma Poschner, 02:56–05:30)

- FUNDING:** ORF — public broadcaster, GIS-funded, partly state-regulated
- MANDATE:** Domestic political reporting — compatible with contextualisation, not with a neutral expert role
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** ORF is under reform pressure from the FPÖ government; institutional interest in a particular portrayal of the government cannot be excluded
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1
 - D2 Personal risk: 0
 - D3 Subject expertise: +1
 - D4 Consistency: 0
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: +1
 - D6 Source level: 0**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTERVOICE:** An independent political scientist (e.g. University of Vienna, Institute of Political Science) is not cited

Organisation 3: ORF Washington correspondence (Barbara Wolschek, 09:06–11:14)

- FUNDING:** ORF — public broadcaster
- MANDATE:** Foreign reporting — compatible, but not neutral in the sense of external expertise
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional affiliation with the ORF; characterisation of Trump as "notoriously sensitive" is evaluative
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1
 - D2 Personal risk: 0
 - D3 Subject expertise: +1
 - D4 Consistency: 0
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: -1
 - D6 Source level: 0**TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTERVOICE:** A US political scientist or transatlantic expert (e.g. DGAP, RAND Corporation) is not cited

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. All three sources used in the programme as contextualising authorities are either not identifiable (RED) or institutionally bound (YELLOW). Not a single source achieves GREEN. This is the methodologically most serious finding of the programme: it presents institutionally bound or anonymous opinions as neutral expertise — a structural problem that goes beyond individual formulations.

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Traffic light
ORF domestic politics editorial team (Helma Poschner, 02:56–05:30)	-1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	YELLOW



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

ORF Washington correspondence (Barbara Wolschek, 09:06–11:14)	-1	0	+1	0	-1	0	-1	YELLOW
---	----	---	----	---	----	---	----	---------------

Legal and methodological classification

No finding of fact	The results presented do not constitute findings of fact about individual persons, editorial teams or programmes. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.
No legal ruling	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of §4 ORF Act. The 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 considerable bias 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 the comparative identification of patterns across thousands of programmes, not the precise metric measurement of individual items. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not 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 truth and origin; news and commentary must be clearly separated from each other.
- ORF-G §4 para. 5a: The totality of programmes must ensure diversity and balance.
- ORF-G §10 para. 7: Adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council.
- ORF-G §4 para. 1: Mandate for a differentiated overall programme that is comprehensive, independent, impartial and objective.

Core obligations

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

Supervisory authority

- KommAustria (Communications Authority Austria): media regulatory authority
- Federal Communications Senate: appeals body
- Audience Council: representation of listeners and viewers

Complaints procedure

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



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

APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS

Literature

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Research Centre Public Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methods report v4.1: Quantifiable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

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



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

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

In order to make our work solid, we depend on membership and donor 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. 15 principles are then 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 toolkit — for everyone who has a microphone in front of their face and wants to know what they can do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three basic principles of sovereignty — anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what counts after the interview.

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

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



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

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Listen to news differently. Conduct conversations with 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. Proceedings, 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 everyone considering a complaint — and for everyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still outstanding.