



ORF DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-05-01_ZIB 1 vom 01.05.2026

Broadcast: ORF broadcast | 2026-05-01 | Analysed on: 2026-05-21 10:57

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

OVERALL SCORE

4.3/10

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 the 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

Since February 2025, Austria has been governed by a coalition of FPÖ (chancellor's party under Herbert Kickl) and ÖVP (junior partner). The FPÖ holds the largest parliamentary group in the National Council with 57 seats, followed by the ÖVP with 51 seats. The opposition consists of SPÖ (41 seats), NEOS (18 seats) and Greens (16 seats).

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core position
FPÖ	8.5	57	Government (chancellor's party)	Remigration, sovereignty, EU scepticism
ÖVP	6.0	51	Government (junior partner)	Business location, strict asylum policy
SPÖ	3.0	41	Opposition	Wealth tax, workers' rights, rent cap
NEOS	5.5	18	Opposition	Liberal economy, EU integration
Greens	2.5	16	Opposition	Climate neutrality, humane asylum policy

The dominant line of conflict runs between the FPÖ-ÖVP government and the three opposition parties, with the SPÖ as the strongest opposition force acting particularly actively. A second arc of tension exists between the FPÖ and the ORF: Kickl has repeatedly announced an ORF reform and criticised the broadcaster as politically one-sided. Thirdly, there is a substantive tension between the economically liberal and the welfare-state agenda, which manifests itself in the budget dispute.

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



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SPÖ	+2	01:44 "Record budget disaster inherited" / 02:06 "red signature on the rent cap" / 02:17 "SPÖ enforces social compatibility" — core positions (rent cap, wealth tax, workers' rights) correctly and positively framed; no critical contextualisation of own statements
FPÖ	-2	02:58 "A broadside, garnished with memories of a good old time that, according to Kickl, once existed" — programme positions (migration stop, EU scepticism, ORF reform) mentioned substantively, but consistently framed with ironic distance; own statements are not taken equally seriously as those of the SPÖ
ÖVP	0	Party does not appear independently in the broadcast; neither programme positions nor representatives are covered
Greens	+1	04:39 Gewessler appearance at Praterstern — core position inheritance tax and climate policy correctly presented; brief, neutral treatment without discernible distortion
NEOS	0	Party does not appear in the broadcast

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: SPÖ, score +2
- Strongest distortion: FPÖ, score -2
- Average deviation from 0: 1.0
- Conclusion: The SPÖ positions are conveyed substantively correctly but uncritically through direct quotes and affirmative framing ("red signature", "social compatibility"). The FPÖ positions are mentioned substantively, but systematically relativised through editorial comments ("broadside", "good old time that, according to Kickl, once existed"). This asymmetric framing constitutes a measurable unequal treatment.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAME

Broadcast data

- Title: Zeit im Bild (ZIB), ORF 2
- Date: 01.05.2026
- Presenter / Reporter: D. Kapfer, J. Wibmer, H. Pani (subtitles 00:03); presenter visible at end of broadcast (00:10 "Good evening!")
- Persons interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Andreas Babler	Vice-Chancellor, SPÖ federal chairman	SPÖ	Left (3.0)
Michael Ludwig	Mayor of Vienna	SPÖ	Left (3.0)
Herbert Kickl	Federal Chancellor, FPÖ leader	FPÖ	Right (8.5)
Leonore Gewessler	Greens federal spokesperson	Greens	Left (2.5)
Water supply expert	Not named	None	Neutral
ÖAMTC representative	Not named	None	Neutral
KFV representative	Road Safety Board	None	Neutral
EU expert Mercosur	Not named	None	Neutral
Firefighter Styria	Incident commander	None	Neutral
Macron	French President	En Marche / Renaissance	Centre-liberal
Pete Hegseth	US Secretary of Defense	Republican	Right

Main topic

The broadcast reports on the May Day celebrations of the Austrian parties (SPÖ, FPÖ, Greens) and bundles current topics such as wildfires, drought, Road Traffic Regulations amendment, the Iran war, NATO exercise and Udo Lindenberg's 80th birthday.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts

Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

1. EXPERT SELECTION

4/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Water expert (not named)

Timestamp	15:23–16:35
Statement	"In the last 150 years, such little precipitation in these two months has rarely occurred." / "Based on our studies, we know that this will work out over the coming decades."
Classification	Not identified by name; no indication of institution or research background.
Missing counter-voice	Hydrologist with a differing assessment of water availability; climate-sceptical perspective on attribution of causes.

Source in-depth check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Unknown — no indication of institution; possible state or university funding not excluded.

(b) **MANDATE:** Cannot be assessed due to lack of identification.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — Unknown, as institution not named

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Cannot be assessed

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Statements sound professional, but field of expertise not verifiable

D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — Cannot be assessed

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Data-based ("150 years", "studies")

D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary (studies cited but not named)

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** The assessment is framed as neutral, although the institutional context is unknown. Technique no. 2 (source selection) applies.

Expert 2: KfV representative (Road Safety Board)

Timestamp	07:29–07:50
Statement	"We must not forget that 3% of all e-bike riders are under 14. 97% are therefore not affected by the helmet requirement at all."
Classification	KfV is a non-profit organisation with public and private sector funding; has an institutional interest in stricter safety regulations.
Missing counter-voice	Representative of the e-scooter industry or user associations with a differing assessment of proportionality.

Source in-depth check:



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

(a) **FUNDING:** KfV is funded by public funds (federal ministries) and the insurance industry — structural conflict of interest when demanding stricter rules (maintaining the organisation's relevance).

(b) **MANDATE:** Road safety — compatible with statement, but not neutral on regulatory questions.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Funding by insurance industry, which benefits from stricter rules

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No personal risk discernible

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Core competence road safety

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — KfV consistently demands stricter rules

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Data-based (percentages)

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Presented as a neutral expert authority without naming the structural conflict of interest.

Expert 3: ÖAMTC representative

Timestamp	07:56–08:13
Statement	"There are certain models where retrofitting is not possible or only with great effort. We would have wished for a longer transition period."
Classification	ÖAMTC is an automobile club with member interests; represents user interests vis-à-vis regulation.

Source in-depth check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Member-funded, under private law — conflict of interest on regulatory questions in favour of users.

(b) **MANDATE:** Representation of vehicle users' interests — not neutral on regulatory questions.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Represents user interests against regulation

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No personal risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Core competence vehicle technology

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — ÖAMTC consistently demands transitional solutions

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Factual

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

Missing expert groups:

- Independent political scientist for contextualising the May Day celebrations
- Independent budget expert for contextualising the "record budget disaster"
- Climatologist with primary sources on the drought

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Traffic light
Water expert (not named)	0	0	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	YELLOW
KfV representative (Road Safety Board)	-1	0	+2	+1	+1	0	+3	YELLOW
ÖAMTC representative	-1	0	+2	+1	+1	0	+3	YELLOW

Summary:

Expert	Source traffic light	Main problem
Water expert (anonymous)	YELLOW	No identification, institution unknown



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

KFV representative	YELLOW	Structural conflict of interest not named
ÖAMTC representative	YELLOW	Interest representation, not a neutral expert authority



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: Babler speech (direct quotes)

Timestamp 01:44–02:23

Statement "Record budget disaster inherited" / "It is the SPÖ that enforces social compatibility."

(a) Funding: SPÖ party speech — party-political source

(b) Structural conflict of interest: SPÖ has a direct interest in presenting the government's work as a success and discrediting the FPÖ.

(c) Missing counter-source: Independent budget analysis (e.g. IHS, WIFO) for contextualising the "record budget disaster"; ÖVP statement as coalition partner.

Source 2: Editorial comment on the FPÖ event

Timestamp 02:58–03:06

Statement "A broadside, garnished with memories of a good old time that, according to Kickl, once existed."

(a) Funding: ORF editorial team

(b) Structural conflict of interest: ORF is under reform pressure from FPÖ; possible institutional conflict of interest in reporting on the chancellor's party.

(c) Missing counter-source: Neutral description of the FPÖ event analogous to the SPÖ coverage.

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 14:02–14:07

Claim: "The fire is believed to have been started by a farmer who burned cut olive branches."

Word marker: "is believed to"

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

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 13:21–13:25

Claim: "A burning cigarette thrown away by a forestry worker is said to have started the fire."

Word marker: "is said to"

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

Summary: The source selection is structurally one-sided: party-political sources (Babler speech) are adopted without critical contextualisation, while the editorial comment on the FPÖ represents an evaluative distancing. Two rumours without a primary source increase the score by 2 penalty points.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time (political block, 00:41–05:05):

- SPÖ (Babler + Ludwig): approx. 90 seconds (approx. 45%)
- FPÖ (Kickl, quotes): approx. 50 seconds (approx. 25%)
- Greens (Gewessler): approx. 25 seconds (approx. 12%)
- Presenter/editorial team (political block): approx. 35 seconds (approx. 18%)
- ÖVP: 0 seconds (0%)
- NEOS: 0 seconds (0%)

Summary: The SPÖ receives by far the most speaking time in the political block (approx. 45%), while ÖVP and NEOS are completely absent. The FPÖ as the chancellor's party receives less speaking time than the opposition party SPÖ, which is noteworthy given its governmental responsibility.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

ÖVP as governing party and coalition partner of the FPÖ is completely absent.

Relevant at: Entire political block (00:41–05:05)

Effect

The image of the government is shaped exclusively by FPÖ criticism (Babler) and FPÖ self-portrayal (Kickl); the ÖVP perspective on coalition work is completely absent.

Omission 2:

Context

Babler's claim of having inherited a "record budget disaster" is not contextualised by independent sources.

Relevant at: 01:44 "One had inherited a record budget disaster"

Effect

A party-political claim is conveyed as fact, without counter-representation or independent contextualisation.

Omission 3:

Context

Kickl's criticism of the government (of which he himself is Chancellor) is not addressed as an inherent contradiction.

Relevant at: 04:06–04:28 "Since the government took office, nothing has improved"

Effect

Kickl criticises a government he himself heads — this contradiction is not addressed.

Summary: Three structurally significant omissions characterise the broadcast: the complete absence of the ÖVP, the uncritical adoption of Babler's budget claim and the failure to address the contradiction in Kickl's self-criticism.

Missing voices

- ÖVP representative (coalition partner): Would have contributed the ÖVP's governmental perspective and completed the picture of coalition work.
- NEOS representative: Would have contributed a liberal economic perspective and criticism of government spending.
- Independent political scientist: Would have provided a neutral assessment of the government's work after 3 months.
- ÖGB representative (independently): Would have contributed the trade union perspective independently of SPÖ party politics.
- Chamber of Commerce representative: Would have contributed the employer perspective on the rent cap and wealth tax.
- Historian: Would have contextualised the significance of 1 May in Austrian history.
- Independent budget expert: Would have objectively contextualised the claim of a "record budget disaster".



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 06:07

Figure: "+0.1% economic output that Mercosur is supposed to bring to Austria."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — not stated; (b) Share — 0.1% of GDP; (c) Trend — not stated

Missing context

Absolute value in euros missing; time period of the forecast missing; comparison with costs/risks missing.

Effect

The figure appears small and thus the agreement as of little significance; without absolute value and time period, no objective contextualisation is possible.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 18:18

Figure: "In March and April there was 65% less precipitation than average."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — not stated; (b) Share — 65% deviation; (c) Trend — indicated ("150 years")

Missing context

Reference period of the "average" missing; regional differentiation missing; absolute quantities missing.

Effect

The figure appears dramatic, without the listener being able to assess whether a 65% deviation is historically exceptional or periodically recurring.

Summary: Two figures are presented without the complete triad (absolute value, share, trend), leading to distorted impressions. The drought figure is used in a dramatising manner, without historical contextualisation.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp 03:53–04:05

Quote *"With that programme they get along excellently with the neglected blacks and the megalomaniacal pinkos, whose few percent at the election have gone to their heads."*

Technique: Kickl quote is broadcast without contextualisation or counter-representation from the affected parties (ÖVP, NEOS).

Effect The insults ("neglected", "megalomaniacal") are conveyed without ÖVP or NEOS being given the opportunity to respond — one-sided association through omission.

Association 2:

Timestamp 02:58–03:06

Quote *"A broadside, garnished with memories of a good old time that, according to Kickl, once existed."*

Technique: Editorial comment associates Kickl's speech with the topos of the "good old time" — a formulation that is connoted with nostalgia and backwardness in political debate.

Effect Kickl's positions are devalued through the framing as nostalgic and unrealistic, without this assessment being substantiated.

Summary: No classic guilt by association in the technical sense, but two cases of associative devaluation through editorial framing and omitted counter-representation.



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:41 (beginning of broadcast, after teaser)

Content: SPÖ May march as first political topic, with affirmative framing ("high mass of social democracy", 01:06)

Timing effect

The SPÖ sets the political frame of the broadcast; all subsequent political reports are implicitly measured against this opening frame.

Finding 2:

Position: 02:58 (after SPÖ block)

Content: FPÖ report begins with editorial comment ("broadside")

Timing effect

After the affirmative SPÖ portrayal, the FPÖ follows with immediate editorial distancing — the contrast amplifies the asymmetric effect.

Finding 3:

Position: 18:29–18:34 (end of broadcast)

Content: "Rock star — a great profession. Apparently also lets you age pretty well. Have a nice evening, goodbye!"

Timing effect

The broadcast ends with a light, positive conclusion after the Udo Lindenberg report — no political aftermath that would relativise the asymmetric coverage.

Summary: The placement of the SPÖ report in first position with affirmative framing, followed by the distanced FPÖ coverage, amplifies the asymmetric effect through strategic timing.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 02:58–03:06

Triggering event: FPÖ leader Kickl delivers a speech criticising immigration, the EU and the government.

Reaction: "A broadside, garnished with memories of a good old time that, according to Kickl, once existed." — editorial distancing and implicit devaluation.

Comparison

SPÖ leader Babler delivers a speech criticising the FPÖ ("We don't need an Austrian Trump", 02:35) — reaction: no editorial distancing, affirmative framing ("red signature").

Asymmetry: Comparable triggering events (party speech with criticism of political opponents) produce different editorial reactions. With Babler: affirmative. With Kickl: distancing-ironic. Asymmetry demonstrable.

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp 03:11

Triggering event: Kickl speaks "in the beer tent of the Urfahrner Jahrmarkt in Linz".

Reaction: "The FPÖ leader apparently says in the beer tent of the Urfahrner Jahrmarkt in Linz what the audience wants to hear."

Comparison

SPÖ march at Vienna's Rathausplatz — reaction: "There is a colourful bustle at the Rathausplatz today" (01:12) — no analogous restriction of authenticity.

Asymmetry: The formulation "apparently what the audience wants to hear" implies populism and insincerity. An analogous formulation for Babler's speech is absent. Asymmetry demonstrable.

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Summary: Two demonstrable cases of selective editorial distancing towards the FPÖ alongside simultaneously affirmative treatment of the SPÖ. The asymmetry is substantiated by the direct comparability of the triggering events.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:41–05:05 (entire political block)

Missing perspective: ÖVP as governing party

Relevance: The ÖVP is the FPÖ's coalition partner and holds 51 National Council seats; §10 para. 7 of the ORF Act requires adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council.

Impact: The image of the government is distorted; the ÖVP perspective on coalition work, budget and reform plans is completely absent.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 01:44

Missing perspective: Independent contextualisation of the budget claim

Relevance: Babler claims a "record budget disaster" — a politically contested assessment that requires independent verification.

Impact: A party-political claim is conveyed as fact; viewers cannot distinguish between political rhetoric and verifiable fact.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 04:06–04:28

Missing perspective: Contextualisation of the contradiction in Kickl's speech

Relevance: Kickl, as Federal Chancellor, criticises the government he himself heads — a journalistically relevant contradiction.

Impact: The contradiction remains uncommented; viewers do not receive a complete picture of political reality.

Summary: The broadcast exhibits three structurally significant completeness deficiencies that together produce a distorted picture of the Austrian party landscape and government work.

Soft facts

1 May is traditionally the day of the labour movement and is used by the SPÖ as a central mobilisation event. In Austria, the FPÖ and Greens also hold their own events. The political tension between the government (FPÖ/ÖVP) and the opposition (SPÖ, Greens, NEOS) is particularly high due to budget negotiations and socio-political reform plans. The ORF itself is at the centre of the political conflict, as Kickl has announced an ORF reform.

Share of perspectives covered

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

- [A] SPÖ position: Social justice, rent cap, wealth tax
- [B] FPÖ position: Migration stop, EU scepticism, ORF reform, systemic change
- [C] ÖVP position: Business location, performance orientation, coalition work



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

- [D] NEOS position: Liberal economic policy, transparency, education reform
- [E] Greens position: Climate policy, inheritance tax, Mercosur criticism
- [F] Trade union perspective: Workers' rights, wage development
- [G] Employer perspective: Economic burdens, location issues
- [H] Independent political analysis: Assessment of government work after 3 months
- [I] Historical contextualisation: Significance of 1 May in Austrian history
- [J] International comparative perspective: May Day celebrations in other EU countries

[A] COVERED

Timestamp: 01:44–02:23 — Quote: "It is the SPÖ that enforces social compatibility." — Assessment: Extensively and affirmatively covered, approx. 80 seconds of Babler's own speaking time.

[B] INDICATED

Timestamp: 02:58–04:06 — Quote: "A broadside, garnished with memories of a good old time" — Assessment: Mentioned substantively, but framed with editorial distance; no direct quotation of the core arguments.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: ÖVP as governing party and coalition partner of the FPÖ does not appear at any point; serious omission of a governing party.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: NEOS are completely absent, although they are represented in the National Council.

[E] COVERED

Timestamp: 04:39–05:05 — Quote: "massive imbalance at the expense of the middle class" — Assessment: Brief, but substantively correctly presented.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Trade union perspective is only mentioned as backdrop to the SPÖ march, no independent voice.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Employer perspective completely absent.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No independent political assessment of the government's work after 3 months.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Historical contextualisation of 1 May absent.

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: International comparative perspective absent.

Completeness score: 3/10



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

Rationale: Of ten relevant perspectives, only three are covered (SPÖ, FPÖ indicated, Greens). ÖVP and NEOS are completely absent, although §10 para. 7 of the ORF Act requires adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council. Independent analysis, trade union as an independent voice and employer perspective are also absent.



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	01:06
Quote	<i>"1 May, the high mass of social democracy."</i>
Manipulation	Religious metaphor ("high mass") lends the SPÖ march a sacred, untouchable quality.
Why problematic	1 May is a general public holiday of the labour movement, not exclusively of the SPÖ. The framing as "high mass" sets an affirmative tone for the entire SPÖ block.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	02:58–03:06
Quote	<i>"A broadside, garnished with memories of a good old time that, according to Kickl, once existed."</i>
Manipulation	Double framing: "broadside" (aggressive, undifferentiated) + "good old time" (nostalgic, unrealistic) + "according to Kickl" (distancing from the claim).
Why problematic	No analogous editorial framing for the SPÖ speech; the formulation "according to Kickl" implies that the existence of a "good old time" is doubtful — a political value judgement, not journalistic contextualisation.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	03:11
Quote	<i>"The FPÖ leader apparently says in the beer tent of the Urfahrner Jahrmarkt in Linz what the audience wants to hear."</i>
Manipulation	"Apparently what the audience wants to hear" is a classic populism framing that calls into question the authenticity and conviction of the speaker.
Why problematic	The same formulation could be applied to any politician's speech — but it is used exclusively for Kickl, not for Babler or Gewessler.

Summary: The framing of the broadcast is structurally asymmetric: SPÖ receives sacred framing ("high mass"), FPÖ receives populism-suspect framing ("broadside", "what the audience wants to hear"). This asymmetry is substantiated by the direct comparability of the situations.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	01:06
Quote	"1 May, the high mass of social democracy."
Manipulation	"High mass" — religious connotation suggesting dignity and inviolability.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "1 May, the central holiday of the SPÖ."

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	02:58
Quote	"A broadside, garnished with memories of a good old time"
Manipulation	"Broadside" — militarily-aggressively connotated, suggests lack of differentiation; "garnished" — culinary metaphor presenting the speech as superficially decorated.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Kickl criticised several political areas in his speech."

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	03:11
Quote	"apparently what the audience wants to hear"
Manipulation	"Apparently" — distancing marker; "what the audience wants to hear" — populism implication without evidence.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Kickl spoke to his supporters about migration policy, the EU and government work."

Summary: The choice of words is affirmative-sacred in SPÖ coverage and distancing-derogatory in FPÖ coverage. Three concrete findings demonstrate a systematic linguistic asymmetry.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:41–00:54

Triggering event: Announcement of the political block

Quote

(presenter/editorial team)

"Today the SPÖ May march took place. In the course of this, Vice-Chancellor and party leader Babler points out that many tasks of his government team are attributable to failures of the FPÖ. The latter in turn exercises criticism."

Comparison

The SPÖ is portrayed as actively acting ("points out"), the FPÖ as reactive ("exercises criticism in turn").

Asymmetry: Linguistic asymmetry in the announcement — SPÖ acts, FPÖ reacts. Not demonstrable as deliberate manipulation, but structurally asymmetric.

Finding 2:

Timestamp

04:28–04:34

Triggering event: End of FPÖ block, transition to Greens

Quote

(editorial team)

"The Greens are marking 1 May as part of a street action at Vienna's Praterstern. Criticism of the government was to be heard there."

Comparison

Transition from SPÖ block (01:06–02:43) without analogous distancing.

Asymmetry: Neutral; no demonstrable moderation bias in the transition.

Summary: The moderation behaviour shows a slight linguistic asymmetry in the announcement (SPÖ active, FPÖ reactive), which however cannot be assessed as a serious individual finding. The overall score remains moderate.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

To SPÖ
(Babler), 01

44–02:23: No critical questions — Babler quotes are adopted without comment.

To FPÖ (Kickl),
02

58–04:28: No direct questions — but editorial contextualisation is distancing.

Comparison

Since this is a news broadcast without a live interview, classic question asymmetry is structurally limited. The asymmetry instead manifests itself in the editorial contextualisation.

Summary: As a news broadcast without live interviews, question asymmetry is structurally limited; the asymmetry shifts to editorial comments (see criteria 10, 11, 12).



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

05:02–05:05

Construct: "This is generally considered politically controversial."

Analysis

The Mercosur agreement is framed as "generally controversial" without presenting the specific positions of the Austrian parties on it. The Greens' criticism is mentioned, but no pro-agreement position from Austria.

Summary: A slight false balance finding on the Mercosur topic; overall no dominant pattern in this broadcast.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: 1 May is primarily an SPÖ event.

Timestamp 01:06 — Evidence: "1 May, the high mass of social democracy."

Alternative agenda: 1 May as a general Labour Day with relevance for all parties and the trade union movement independently of the SPÖ.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Government work is characterised by "failures of the FPÖ".

Timestamp 00:44–00:51 — Evidence: "Vice-Chancellor and party leader Babler points out that many tasks of his government team are attributable to failures of the FPÖ."

Alternative agenda: Independent assessment of the government's work after 3 months; ÖVP perspective on coalition work.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Drought and wildfires as a consequence of climate change.

Timestamp 15:01–16:39 — Evidence: "The low precipitation in spring is leading to drought."

Alternative agenda: Differentiated causal analysis (natural variability vs. climate change); economic consequences for agriculture.

Summary: The broadcast sets three significant agenda elements: 1 May as SPÖ domain, government work through the lens of SPÖ criticism and drought as a consequence of climate change without differentiated causal analysis.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 4.6 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 4.0 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Framing / choice of words (score 6):** The broadcast uses sacred and affirmative language for the SPÖ ("high mass of social democracy", "red signature"), while the FPÖ is distanced through editorial comments ("broadside", "apparently what the audience wants to hear"). This linguistic asymmetry is substantiated by the direct comparability of the situations and constitutes the strongest individual finding.
- 2. Omission / completeness (score 6):** The complete absence of the ÖVP as governing party and of NEOS as a National Council party violates §10 para. 7 of the ORF Act. The uncritical adoption of Babler's budget claim without independent contextualisation conveys a party-political statement as fact.
- 3. Selective outrage (score 5):** Two demonstrable cases of asymmetric editorial distancing towards the FPÖ at comparable triggering events (party speech with political criticism) demonstrate a structural unequal treatment of the chancellor's party compared to the strongest opposition party.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The SPÖ is fighting responsibly for social justice despite a difficult starting position."

Technique: Affirmative framing, uncritical adoption of quotes, sacred language — evidence: 01:06, 01:44, 02:17

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Kickl is conducting a populist broadside without substantive content."

Technique: Editorial distancing, populism framing, timing contrast — evidence: 02:58, 03:06, 03:11

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Austria faces serious challenges (drought, security) that require state action."

Technique: Agenda-setting, dramatising figures, expert selection without counter-voices — evidence: 15:01, 15:18, 16:03

Rationale: The overall score of 4.3 falls in the range of "slight tendency", but trends towards the boundary of "clear one-sidedness". The broadcast violates §4 of the ORF Act through asymmetric framing (SPÖ affirmative, FPÖ distancing), the complete absence of ÖVP and NEOS (§10 para. 7 of the ORF Act) and the uncritical adoption of party-political claims without independent contextualisation. The asymmetry is methodologically substantiated by the direct comparability of the triggering events and does not depend on subjective interpretation. Mitigating factor: The broadcast is a news programme without live interviews, which partly explains structural asymmetries; however, the editorial comments are deliberate decisions.

CONCLUSION

The analysed ZIB edition of 1 May exhibits a measurable, methodologically demonstrable tendency in favour of the SPÖ and to the detriment of the FPÖ. The asymmetry manifests itself on three levels: linguistically (sacred vs. distancing framing), structurally (ÖVP and NEOS completely absent contrary to §10 para. 7 of the ORF Act) and substantively (party-political claims of the SPÖ are adopted without counter-representation). Pursuant to §4 of the ORF Act, which requires objectivity, impartiality and diversity of opinion, at least three concrete violations are documentable. The overall score of 4.3/10 corresponds to a slight to moderate tendency, which is to be classified as problematic for a news broadcast of the public broadcaster, but falls below the threshold of a systematic imbalance.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.6/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.0/10

Slight imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

4.3/10

Significant imbalance

Averaged from hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

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

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is clearly treated worse in portrayal, speaking time or framing.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Discernible but weak disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No discernible preference or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Discernible but weak preference.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	Party is clearly preferred 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 ORF Act (adequate consideration of all National Council parties)

Facts: ÖVP (51 seats, governing party) and NEOS (18 seats, opposition party) are completely absent from the political coverage of the broadcast.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:41–05:05 — entire political block without mention of ÖVP and NEOS.

Assessment: §10 para. 7 of the ORF Act requires adequate consideration of all parties represented in the National Council. The complete absence of two National Council parties in political coverage that explicitly has the comparison of parties as its subject constitutes a clear violation of this norm.

Violation 2:

Norm: §4 para. 1 ORF Act (objectivity and impartiality of reporting)

Facts: Asymmetric editorial framing: SPÖ speech is framed affirmatively ("high mass of social democracy", "red signature"), FPÖ speech is framed with distancing ("broadside", "apparently what the audience wants to hear") — at comparable triggering events (party speech on 1 May).

Evidence: Timestamp 01:06 ("high mass") vs. 02:58 ("broadside") and 03:11 ("apparently what the audience wants to hear").

Assessment: The requirement of impartiality demands equivalent editorial treatment of comparable political events. The demonstrable linguistic asymmetry at structurally identical triggering events violates this requirement.

Violation 3:

Norm: §4 para. 1 ORF Act (objectivity) in conjunction with the requirement of source diversity

Facts: Babler's claim of having inherited a "record budget disaster" (01:44) is conveyed as fact without independent contextualisation or counter-representation.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:44 — quote: "One had inherited a record budget disaster."

Assessment: The objectivity requirement demands that politically contested claims be identified as such and contextualised by independent sources. The uncritical adoption of a party-political claim without counter-representation violates this requirement.

Overall assessment §4 ORF Act

The broadcast exhibits three concretely substantiable violations of §4 of the ORF Act: the complete absence of two National Council parties (§10 para. 7), asymmetric editorial framing at comparable triggering events (§4 para. 1 impartiality) and the uncritical adoption of a party-political claim without independent contextualisation (§4 para. 1 objectivity). The violations are methodologically substantiated by the direct comparability of the situations and do not depend on subjective interpretation. For legal enforcement, a complaint to KommAustria pursuant to §36 of the ORF Act would be the appropriate legal avenue; the present documentation with timestamps and direct quotes meets the formal requirements of such a complaint.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

Organisation 1: Road Safety Board (KfV)

- FUNDING:** Public funds (federal ministries, in particular BMVIT/BMK) and insurance industry; non-profit GmbH.
- MANDATE:** Road safety research and communication — compatible with statement on helmet requirement, but not neutral on regulatory questions.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in stricter safety regulations (maintaining relevance, securing funding through the insurance industry, which benefits from stricter rules).
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 (insurance funding)
 - D2 Personal risk: 0
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 (core competence)
 - D4 Consistency: +1
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 (data-based)
 - D6 Source level: 0 (Secondary)
 - TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** E-scooter user associations, industry — not cited.

Organisation 2: ÖAMTC

- FUNDING:** Member-funded, under private law.
- MANDATE:** Representation of vehicle users' interests — not neutral on regulatory questions.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Represents user interests against regulation; has an institutional interest in less strict rules.
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 (user interests)
 - D2 Personal risk: 0
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 (vehicle technology)
 - D4 Consistency: +1
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 (factual)
 - D6 Source level: 0 (Secondary)
 - TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Ministry of Transport on the justification for the transition period — not cited.

Organisation 3: Anonymous water expert

- FUNDING:** Unknown — no indication of institution.
- MANDATE:** Cannot be assessed.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Cannot be assessed due to lack of identification.
 - D1 Conflict of interest: 0 (unknown)
 - D2 Personal risk: 0
 - D3 Professional competence: +1 (sounds professional, not verifiable)
 - D4 Consistency: 0
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 (data-based)
 - D6 Source level: -1 (Secondary, studies not named)
 - TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Hydrologist with a differing assessment — not cited.

Overall finding source in-depth check: All three cited expert bodies receive the source traffic light YELLOW. No expert is presented with full identification and disclosure of conflicts of interest. The designation "experts" as a social attribution without substantive qualification is problematic in all three cases in the sense of the methodological principle: "Recognised is not a substantive qualification."

Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Traffic light
Road Safety Board (KfV)	-1	0	+2	+1	+1	0	+3	YELLOW



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

ÖAMTC	-1	0	+2	+1	+1	0	+3	YELLOW
Anonymous water expert	0	0	+1	0	+1	-1	+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 broadcasts. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.
No legal ruling	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of §4 ORF Act. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast 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 judgement of intent	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. 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 broadcasts, not for the precise metric measurement of individual contributions. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Austria — ORF

Law

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

Relevant articles

- ORF-G §4 para. 5: Information must be comprehensive, independent, impartial and objective. All news and reports must be carefully checked for 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 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 3.4 (2026-05-20)



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

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

To make our work solid, we depend on membership and patron contributions.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

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



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

You can obtain the following books from SVFAB

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



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

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



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

Those who do not know this provide material. Good quotes that are cut incorrectly. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers that are framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox — for 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, reference, follow-up and in difficult situations



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

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



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

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life — and the occasional smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year — compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can lodge a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the IGAC, the Independent Grievance Authority for Radio and Television.

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

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

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