



## ČT PODROBNÁ ANALÝZA

20200315\_OVM - Smucler koronavirus.cs

Broadcast: ČT-Sendung | Analyzed: 2026-05-26 03:53

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: §2 Zákona o ČT / §31 Zákona č. 231/2001

### OVERALL SCORE

**4.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on 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	Piráti	STAN	KDU-ČSL	ANO	TOP 09	ODS	Motoristé	SPD
CHES	2.50	4.50	5.50	6.00	6.00	7.00	7.50	8.50
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Center-Right</i>	<i>Center-Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**4.2 / 10**

*Balanced*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

This section provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.



## POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

At the time this programme was broadcast (March 2020), the ANO government led by Prime Minister Andrej Babiš was in power, governing as a minority government with the tolerance of ČSSD and the support of KSČM. The current coalition government of ANO–SPD–Motoristé (from 2025) differs from the situation at that time. This analysis relates to the programme broadcast during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, when Babiš was Prime Minister of the ANO minority government.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats (2020)	Government/Opposition	Key position
ANO	6.0	78	Government (minority)	Centrist populism, crisis management
ODS	7.0	25	Opposition	Centre-right, fiscal conservatism
Piráti	2.5	22	Opposition	Centre-left, digitalisation, transparency
SPD	8.5	22	Opposition	Right-wing populism, Euroscepticism
KDU-ČSL	5.5	10	Opposition	Centre, Christian democracy
STAN	4.5	6	Opposition	Centre, municipal politics
ČSSD	3.5	15	Coalition (toleration)	Centre-left, welfare state
KSČM	1.5	15	Government support	Left, state intervention

In March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic and the question of state crisis management dominated the Czech political scene. The key tension was whether the ANO government was managing coordination with the expert and medical community, with critics pointing to a shortage of protective equipment and communication chaos. The second line of dispute concerned the degree of centralisation of decision-making versus the involvement of professional chambers and regional actors. The third line of conflict was public trust in institutions and the media under conditions of an information crisis.

Czech Television, as a public service medium, is obliged under §2 of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. to provide objective, verified and balanced information serving the free formation of opinions. Act No. 231/2001 Coll. in §31 obliges broadcasters to ensure the objectivity and balance of information content and to separate evaluative commentary from reporting. During the pandemic, this statutory mandate was particularly sensitive, as public service media played a key role in informing citizens about crisis measures.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY BIAS

The programme is an interview with an expert (the president of the dental chamber) during an acute health crisis. It is not a political debate programme. Direct representation of party programme positions is therefore minimal. The assessments below reflect the degree to which party positions were implicitly present or distorted.

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Portrayal in programme vs. programme position
ANO	-2	09:12 "when someone says we should call the Prime Minister and he will personally arrange it then trust in the state is zero" — ANO programme position: effective crisis management, strong state — portrayed as a failure of communication and coordination; the criticism is substantive rather than partisan, but falls exclusively on the governing party
ODS	0	Party not mentioned in the programme — cannot be assessed
STAN	0	Party not mentioned in the programme — cannot be assessed
Piráti	0	Party not mentioned in the programme — cannot be assessed
KDU-ČSL	0	Party not mentioned in the programme — cannot be assessed
TOP 09	0	Party not mentioned in the programme — cannot be assessed
SPD	0	Party not mentioned in the programme — cannot be assessed
Motoristé	0	Party not mentioned in the programme — cannot be assessed

### Summary of party bias

- Most accurate portrayal: Cannot be determined — no party is explicitly represented
- Strongest distortion: ANO, score -2
- Average deviation from 0: 0.25 (only ANO relevant)
- Conclusion: The programme addresses expert criticism of crisis management in an explicitly non-partisan manner. The criticism falls factually exclusively on the governing party ANO, as it bears responsibility for coordination. The opposition is neither represented nor confronted. The distortion is structural rather than intentional — the programme lacks a governmental counterweight.

### Overall tendency on the left-right axis

TENDENCY SCORE: +0.8

CLASSIFICATION: Slightly left-leaning

Reasoning: Criticism of governmental failure in the absence of a government representative implicitly strengthens an opposition-critical narrative which, in the Czech context of 2020, corresponded more to centre-left and liberal media. The programme itself is not ideologically coloured, but the one-sided criticism of the executive without a counterweight creates a slight asymmetry in favour of the opposition viewpoint.



## CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Programme details

- Title: Otázky Václava Moravce — Second Hour (exact programme title per context: "Questions of its second hour" / likely ČT24 news interview)
- Date (from filename): Not stated in transcript; based on content dated approximately to Sunday 15 March 2020 (the day before the quarantine was declared)
- Presenter / reporter: Not identified by name in the transcript (presenter's voice present)
- Guests (with function/party/affiliation):

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Roman Šmucler	President of the Czech Dental Chamber	Apolitical expert / medical self-governance	Neutral — expert

### Main topic

The preparedness of the Czech healthcare system and medical chambers for the declaration of a nationwide quarantine in connection with the COVID-19 pandemic, with emphasis on the shortage of protective equipment and the absence of communication on the part of the state.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

#### 1. SELECTION OF EXPERTS

5/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**Expert 1:** Roman Šmucler, President of the Czech Dental Chamber

Timestamp: 00:20

Statement: "Roman Šmucler president of the Czech Dental Chamber Mr President Welcome to the questions"

Classification: President of a professional self-governing chamber; represents dentists both as entrepreneurs and as healthcare workers; has legitimate expertise in the field of dentistry and the organisation of healthcare, but not in epidemiology or state crisis management.

Missing countervoice: A representative of the Ministry of Health or the Chief Hygienist would have provided the governmental perspective and could have responded to specific criticism.

In-depth source check:

**(a) FUNDING:** The Czech Dental Chamber is a self-governing professional organisation funded by membership fees from dentists. Structural interest: the chamber has an institutional interest in maintaining the operation of practices and in the supply of protective equipment for its members.

**(b) MANDATE:** The chamber's mandate is to represent the interests of dentists and to ensure the quality of care — not to assess the overall crisis management of the state or epidemiological measures. The extension into the area of state crisis management is outside the primary mandate.

Dimension	Score	Reasoning
D1 Conflict of interest	-1	The chamber has a direct interest in the supply of equipment and the maintenance of practice operations
D2 Personal risk	+2	Šmucler publicly criticises the government during a crisis — real personal and professional risk
D3 Expert competence	+1	Expert in dentistry and organisation of care; not in epidemiology or state crisis management
D4 Consistency of views	+1	Position consistent with the long-term role of the chamber; historical statements cannot be verified
D5 Emotionalisation vs. data	0	Combination of substantive arguments and emotional appeals; occasionally expressive but predominantly factually grounded
D6 Source level	+1	Primary source from the front line; direct experience, not mediated
TOTAL	+4	TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW



**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** Šmucler is introduced as "president of the medical chamber" without mention of the chamber's institutional interest. This framing implicitly positions him as a neutral expert, even though he represents specific professional interests.

*Missing expert groups:*

- Epidemiologist / virologist (scientific perspective on measures)
- Representative of the Ministry of Health (governmental perspective)
- Health economist (financial impacts)

*Summary (matrix result):*

- Roman Šmucler: YELLOW (+4) — legitimate expert with direct experience, but with an institutional interest and limited competence in the area of state crisis management; a balancing voice is absent.



## 2. SELECTION OF SOURCES

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: Coalition of private doctors

**Timestamp** 00:56 — Statement: "the coalition of private doctors agreed on a declaration"

- (a) **Funding and founding body:** Informal coalition; funding not specified; likely a professional association without public funding.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Private doctors have a direct economic interest in maintaining the operation of practices.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Citations from government documents, epidemiological studies, or international WHO recommendations are absent.

### Source 2: Media information (iDnes)

**Timestamp** 14:11 — Statement: "then I read that we were supposed to close I read that on iDnes"

- (a) **Funding:** iDnes — private medium (Mafra, owned by Agrofert / Andrej Babiš at the time of broadcast).
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Citation of a medium owned by the Prime Minister as a source of information about government decisions is problematic — a potential conflict of interest was not mentioned in the programme.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Citations from official government documents or press conferences are absent.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 15:55

Claim: "If the Prime Minister said I believe him that 200,000 respirators arrived then I would like to read where they are"

Verbal marker: "I believe him that" — conditional acceptance of a claim without verification

Primary source: NO — penalty point +1

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 01:02

Claim: "I just heard something that they apparently want to close practices for elective cases"

Verbal marker: "heard something that apparently"

Primary source: NO — penalty point +1

*Summary: The programme relies almost exclusively on a single source (the guest) and mediated information from the media. Citations from primary government documents, scientific studies, or international recommendations are absent. Two claims without a primary source.*



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Roman Šmucler (guest): approximately 13.5 min. (82%)
- Presenter: approximately 3 min. (18%)
- Government representative / countervoice: 0 min. (0%)

*Summary: The programme is structured as a monological interview with a single guest who is given space for extensive, unstructured statements. A governmental or other counterweight is entirely absent, creating a marked asymmetry in the presentation of views.*



#### 4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

The governmental perspective on coordination with medical chambers is absent.

Relevant at: 00:39 — "No we are completely in shock at what is happening"

###### Impact

The viewer gains the impression of a total failure of communication without the possibility of verifying whether the government had legitimate reasons for its mode of communication.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

Information about where the promised respirators are located is absent — the question is posed but not answered.

Relevant at: 15:44 — "yes we do not have them We are curious where they are"

###### Impact

The viewer is left with an open question that implies governmental failure, without any attempt at verification being presented.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

The perspective of patients and seniors on access to care is absent.

Relevant at: 05:25 — "you who are seniors stay at home we will come to you"

###### Impact

Seniors are presented as passive recipients of care rather than as actors with their own needs and voice.

*Summary: The systematic omission of the governmental perspective and the perspectives of patients creates a one-sided picture of the crisis as state failure without the possibility of confrontation with an alternative interpretation.*

#### Missing Voices

- Ministry of Health / Minister Adam Vojtěch: Would have provided the governmental perspective on coordination and distribution of equipment
- Prof. Roman Prymula (Chief Hygienist): Would have provided the epidemiological rationale for the measures
- Representative of regional governorship: Would have provided the perspective on regional distribution of protective equipment
- Representative of patient organisations: Would have provided the perspective on access to care from the viewpoint of the sick
- Economist specialising in healthcare: Would have provided analysis of the financial impacts on practices
- Representative of the ambulance service: Would have provided the perspective on first-line coordination
- Distributor / producer of protective equipment: Would have provided an explanation of where the promised supplies are located



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

- Representative of hospital management: Would have provided the perspective on hospital capacities and preparedness



## 5. MANIPULATION WITH NUMBERS

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 01:49

Number: "we have 10 million patients in the Czech Republic"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — stated; (b) proportion — not stated; (c) trend — not stated

**Missing context**

The number is used to emphasise the scope of responsibility, but without context (how many of them actively visit a doctor, how many are at risk).

**Impact**

The number appears dramatic, but without context its relevance to the argument cannot be assessed.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 14:49

Number: "we will throw 4.5 million people against the university hospitals"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — stated; (b) proportion — partially (15:00: "half a million is quite enough"); (c) trend — not stated

**Missing context**

The estimate of "half a million" patients with acute problems is presented without a source or methodology.

**Impact**

The number creates a dramatic picture of hospital collapse without being supported by data.

*Summary: Numbers are used illustratively rather than analytically; methodological grounding and comparative context are absent. The manipulation is not intentional, but the numbers reinforce the dramatic narrative.*



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Association 1:

#### Timestamp

09:44

#### Quote

*"that one person runs around without a mask and when he gets infected then what will happen"*

Technique: Implicit reference to Prime Minister Babiš (contextually evident) as a person who does not follow his own recommendations — association with irresponsibility.

#### Impact

Suggests personal irresponsibility of the Prime Minister without explicit naming.

*No person in the programme is framed as a "conspiracist" or "disinformation agent" — the guilt by association criterion is relevant only marginally.*

*Summary: The programme does not use the guilt by association technique systematically; the single instance is implicit and factually grounded in the context of the discussion on protective equipment.*



## 7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:39 (beginning)

Content: "No we are completely in shock at what is happening"

Timing effect: The programme begins with a strong emotive statement about shock and state communication failure — this framing sets the overall tone of the programme as a critique of governmental failure before any facts are presented.

### Finding 2:

Position: 16:27 (conclusion)

Content: "Do not let yourselves be frightened we will get through this"

Timing effect: The closing reassuring appeal softens the dramatic quality of the preceding statements, but comes after 16 minutes of criticism — the reassurance at the end cannot balance the overall tone of the programme.

*Summary: The dramatic opening sets a critical framework that is not balanced in the course of the programme; the closing reassuring appeal is too weak to change the overall impression.*



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

*Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggers in relation to other positions did not elicit an analogous reaction.*

### Finding 1:

#### Timestamp

09:12

Triggering event: Prime Minister Babiš publicly declared that healthcare workers without respirators could call him and he would personally arrange it.

Reaction: "then trust in the state is zero that is over"

#### Comparison

An analogous situation — failure of medical chambers in coordination or communication — is not mentioned or criticised in the programme.

Asymmetry: Outrage is directed exclusively at the governmental side; failures of other actors (regions, hospitals) are mentioned mildly or with understanding.

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 2/5

*Summary: Outrage is present but is not extreme; selectivity is evident in the fact that criticism falls exclusively on governmental actors, while failures of other institutions are presented with understanding.*



## 9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** entire programme

Missing perspective/fact: The governmental perspective on coordination with medical chambers

Relevance: Criticism of governmental communication is the central topic of the programme; without a governmental response the picture is one-sided.

**Impact**

The viewer has no opportunity to assess whether the criticism is justified or whether there are legitimate reasons for the mode of communication.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 15:44

Missing perspective/fact: Explanation of where the promised respirators are located

Relevance: The question "where are the respirators" is explicitly posed but remains unanswered.

**Impact**

The unresolved question implicitly confirms the narrative of governmental failure.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** entire programme

Missing perspective/fact: The perspectives of patients, seniors, and nurses

Relevance: These actors are repeatedly mentioned as vulnerable groups but have no voice of their own.

**Impact**

The programme speaks about vulnerable groups, not with them.

*Summary: The programme systematically omits the governmental perspective and the voices of direct recipients of care, thereby creating a structurally one-sided picture of the crisis.*

## End of hard facts — Beginning of soft facts

In March 2020, the Czech Republic was facing the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic; the government of Andrej Babiš was preparing to declare a nationwide quarantine. The key social issue was whether the state could ensure protective equipment for frontline healthcare workers and whether it was communicating transparently with expert communities. Medical chambers, as self-governing professional institutions, represented an important voice outside governmental structures. The tension between centralised crisis management and the need to involve experts was widely shared across society at that time.

### Share of covered perspectives

*Inverted: original value measures coverage (higher = better). Shown as deviation (higher = larger gaps).*

- [A] The view of the Ministry of Health / Minister Adam Vojtěch on coordination with medical chambers
- [B] The view of the Chief Hygienist / Prof. Roman Prymula on epidemiological measures



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

- [C] The view of general practitioners (ČLK) on the availability of protective equipment
- [D] The view of hospital doctors / heads of department on capacities and hospital preparedness
- [E] The view of regional governors on the distribution of protective equipment
- [F] The view of patients / seniors on access to healthcare during the quarantine
- [G] The view of economists on the financial impacts of the closure of practices on doctor-entrepreneurs
- [H] The view of epidemiologists on comparison with measures in other countries (China, Taiwan, Korea)
- [I] The view of the ambulance service / hospital paramedics on first-line coordination
- [J] The view of producers / distributors of protective equipment on the availability of supplies

**[A] OMITTED**

Timestamp: entire programme — Quote: "No we are completely in shock at what is happening so We repeatedly send messages I naturally have the mobile number of important people but they usually do not respond" — Assessment: The Ministry of Health is neither represented nor cited; its perspective is entirely absent.

**[B] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 03:37 — Quote: "Professor Prymula is an absolutely excellent person he has my complete trust" — Assessment: Prof. Prymula is mentioned positively but does not appear in the programme; his perspective is not directly represented.

**[C] COVERED**

Timestamp: 07:45 — Quote: "what our colleagues the general practitioners came up with we are glad for that division that tactic of closed waiting rooms seems very clever to me" — Assessment: The perspective of general practitioners is conveyed by the guest, not by a direct representative.

**[D] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 15:04 — Quote: "let us keep the first line of defence as in every war" — Assessment: Hospital doctors are mentioned in context but do not appear directly.

**[E] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 02:10 — Quote: "we know that some regions gave out respirators" — Assessment: Governors are mentioned but do not appear; their perspective is conveyed one-sidedly.

**[F] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The perspective of patients and seniors is entirely absent; they are mentioned only as objects of care.

**[G] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 13:52 — Quote: "dental practitioners are not for example paid like hospitals by a lump sum" — Assessment: The economic dimension is mentioned but is not analytically developed.

**[H] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 07:10 — Quote: "China has it behind it Taiwan managed it Korea is managing it" — Assessment: International comparisons are mentioned but without deeper analysis.

**[I] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The ambulance service is neither represented nor mentioned.

**[J] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Distributors and producers of protective equipment are entirely absent; yet the question "where are the respirators" is central.



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

### Completeness score: 4/10

---

Reasoning: The programme covers the topic exclusively from the perspective of a single expert — the president of the dental chamber. A governmental counterweight is absent, as are the perspectives of patients, the ambulance service, and equipment distributors. Four out of ten perspectives are entirely omitted, four are only indicated indirectly.



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:39
Quote	"No we are completely in shock at what is happening"
Manipulation	The topic is framed from the very first statement as a crisis caused by state failure — "shock" implies that the situation is unexpected and caused by negligence.

Why this is problematic: An alternative frame — an unprecedented crisis for which no state was fully prepared — is not offered in the programme.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	03:08
Quote	"from your point of view there has been a collapse of the state"
Manipulation	The presenter himself proposes the frame of "collapse of the state" as an interpretation of the situation — the guest does not explicitly accept this formulation but does not reject it either.

Why this is problematic: The formulation "collapse of the state" is extreme and evaluative; the presenter offers it as a possible interpretation, thereby legitimising it.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	15:04
Quote	"let us keep the first line of defence as in every war"
Manipulation	The war metaphor frames the pandemic as a war in which the state has failed to supply soldiers (doctors) with weapons (respirators).

Why this is problematic: The war metaphor reinforces the narrative of governmental failure and dramatises the situation beyond the scope of substantive analysis.

*Summary: The programme is consistently framed as a story of state failure; alternative frames (unprecedented crisis, shared responsibility, international comparison) are not offered.*



## 11. WORD AND TERM CHOICE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp

03:08

Quote

*"from your point of view there has been a collapse of the state"*

Manipulation

"Collapse of the state" is an extremely negative formulation with connotations of institutional breakdown and failure.

Why this is problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "Do you believe that coordination between the state and medical chambers has failed?"

### Finding 2:

Timestamp

09:25

Quote

*"then trust in the state is zero"*

Manipulation

"Zero trust" is an absolute formulation without gradation; it suggests a total loss of state legitimacy.

Why this is problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "Trust in the state is seriously undermined."

### Finding 3:

Timestamp

13:00

Quote

*"Those are heroes for me who are keeping the nation afloat right now"*

Manipulation

The emotionally charged praise of frontline doctors contrasts with the implicit criticism of the state — "heroes" versus the failing government.

Why this is problematic: Emotional language reinforces the dramatic narrative and makes substantive analysis of the situation more difficult.

*Summary: The choice of words — both by the presenter and the guest — consistently reinforces the narrative of governmental failure through absolute formulations and emotionally charged language.*



## 12. PRESENTER BEHAVIOUR

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

*Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggers in relation to other guests did not elicit an analogous intervention.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 03:08

Triggering event: The guest expresses frustration at the lack of communication on the part of the state.

**Quote (presenter)** *"from your point of view there has been a collapse of the state"*

**Comparison** A government representative is not present in the programme — direct comparison is not possible; however, the presenter himself proposes an extreme interpretation without questioning it.

Asymmetry: The presenter actively reinforces the guest's critical narrative instead of confronting it with alternative interpretations.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 07:28

Triggering event: The guest describes the situation of doctors without protective equipment.

**Quote (presenter)** *"that means it is a desperate step by you as medical chambers"*

**Comparison** The presenter characterises the situation as a "desperate step" — an evaluative formulation that reinforces the guest's dramatic narrative.

Asymmetry: The presenter does not ask critical questions of the guest (e.g. whether the chambers could have acted earlier) but accepts his narrative.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 08:51

Triggering event: Question about the fulfilment of promises by the government.

**Quote (presenter)** *"in your opinion is the Ministry of Health and the government fulfilling its promises"*

**Comparison** The question is formulated as a call to evaluate governmental performance — a legitimate journalistic question, but without a counterweight (e.g. "what could the chambers have done differently?").

Asymmetry: Critical questions are posed exclusively towards the government, not towards the guest.



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

*Summary: The presenter consistently accepts the guest's narrative and reinforces it with evaluative formulations; critical questions directed at the guest himself are absent.*



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

To Roman Šmucler, 00:33: "did the government or anyone from the ministry of health consult you on declaring quarantine for the whole country" — soft/neutral

To the government (absent), 08:51: "in your opinion is the Ministry of Health and the government fulfilling its promises" — hard, evaluative

#### Comparison

Questions posed to the guest give him space for criticism; evaluative questions are posed to the government without the possibility of a response.

#### Asymmetry 2:

To Šmucler, 13:08: "so practices will remain open for the most part from Monday" — suggestive, confirmatory

To the government (absent), 15:31: "when you are calling for 200,000 respirators which the government promised you and you do not have them" — confrontational

#### Comparison

Questions posed to the guest confirm his narrative; confrontational questions are posed to the government without the possibility of a response.

*Summary: The asymmetry of questions is structural — the guest is given space to develop his perspective, while the governmental position is confronted without the possibility of a response.*



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

<b>Finding 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	03:37 — Construct: "Professor Prymula is an absolutely excellent person he has my complete trust I am fond of the Minister of Health"
<b>Analysis</b>	The guest expresses personal sympathy for government representatives while simultaneously criticising the system — this creates an appearance of balance, but the criticism of the system remains dominant.

*Summary: The programme does not suffer from classic false balance (the presentation of two equal sides); rather the opposite — a genuine counterweight is absent, not a false one.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The failure of state communication with medical chambers is presented as a fact, not as a claim.

#### Timestamp

00:39 — Evidence: "No we are completely in shock at what is happening"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether medical chambers could have acted more proactively or whether their expectations of the state were realistic does not make it onto the agenda.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The shortage of respirators is presented as exclusively governmental failure.

#### Timestamp

10:44 — Evidence: "no No we have absolutely nothing that means from the state we were unable to buy them"

Alternative agenda: The global shortage of protective equipment in March 2020 and its causes (international market, production capacities) are not mentioned.

*Summary: The agenda of the programme is set such that state failure is the self-evident starting point; the structural causes of the crisis (global shortage of equipment, the unprecedented nature of the situation) do not make it onto the agenda.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Selection of experts	T	5	Single guest without institutional counterweight; yellow credibility traffic light
2	Selection of sources	T	4	Almost exclusively one source; two claims without a primary source
3	Time allocation	T	6	82% of time for one guest; governmental counterweight entirely absent
4	Omissions	T	6	Systematic omission of governmental perspective and patient perspectives
5	Manipulation with numbers	T	3	Numbers used illustratively without methodological grounding
6	Guilt by association	T	1	Marginal; single case of implicit association
7	Timing	T	4	Dramatic opening sets critical framework; closing reassurance insufficient
8	Selective outrage	T	3	Outrage directed exclusively at governmental actors
9	Completeness	T	6	Systematic omission of governmental perspective and voices of direct care recipients
10	Framing	M	6	Consistent state-failure frame without alternative interpretations
11	Word choice	M	5	Absolute formulations and emotional language reinforce dramatic narrative
12	Presenter behaviour	M	5	Presenter reinforces guest's narrative; critical questions directed at guest absent
13	Question asymmetry	M	5	Confrontational questions towards absent government; soft questions towards guest
14	False balance	M	2	Programme does not suffer from false balance; rather a genuine counterweight is absent
15	Agenda-setting	M	6	State failure as self-evident starting point; structural causes absent

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 1–9): 4.2 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average of criteria 10–15): 4.8 / 10

### Dominant techniques

**1. Framing — state failure (score 6):** The programme is framed from the first statement as a story of governmental communication and coordination failure; alternative frames are not offered. The frame is reinforced by both the choice of guest and the presenter's formulations.



**2. Omission — absence of governmental counterweight (score 6):** A government representative or any other actor with a different perspective is not present; the criticism of governmental performance thus remains without the possibility of confrontation or response. This omission is the most significant structural problem of the programme.

**3. Agenda-setting — normalisation of governmental failure (score 6):** The shortage of respirators and the failure of communication are presented as facts, not as claims; the structural causes of the crisis (global shortage of equipment, the unprecedented nature of the situation) do not make it onto the agenda.

### Key messages of the programme

---

**\*\*MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT):** \*\* "The state has failed in its communication with medical chambers and in ensuring protective equipment for frontline healthcare workers."

**Technique:** Framing + omission of governmental counterweight — Evidence: 00:39, 09:12, 10:44

**\*\*MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** \*\* "Frontline doctors are heroes who are saving the nation despite state failure."

**Technique:** Emotional language + selective praise — Evidence: 13:00, 15:21

**\*\*MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL):** \*\* "Trust in the state is undermined; citizens must rely on expert communities, not on the government."

**Technique:** Agenda-setting + word choice — Evidence: 09:25, 08:12

*(Overall score 4.5 falls on the boundary between "mild tendency" and "evident one-sidedness")*

Reasoning: The programme exhibits structural one-sidedness consisting in the absence of a governmental counterweight and the consistent framing of the crisis as state failure. This one-sidedness is in conflict with §2 para. 2 lit. a) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll., which requires balanced information, and with §31 para. 3 of Act No. 231/2001 Coll., which for politically controversial topics requires balanced representation of opposing views. The programme is not intentionally propagandistic, but the structural omission of the governmental perspective during an acute political crisis constitutes a measurable breach of the statutory mandate of balance.

### CONCLUSION

---

The programme "Questions — Second Hour" from approximately 15 March 2020 exhibits structural one-sidedness consisting in the absence of a governmental or other counterweight to the statements of the sole guest — Roman Šmucler, President of the Czech Dental Chamber. The overall score of 4.5/10 corresponds to the boundary between mild tendency and evident one-sidedness. The most significant problems are the systematic omission of the governmental perspective (criteria 4 and 9, score 6), the consistent framing of the crisis as state failure (criterion 10, score 6), and agenda-setting normalising governmental failure as the starting point of discussion (criterion 15, score 6). These findings are in conflict with §2 para. 2 lit. a) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. on Czech Television, which requires the provision of objective, verified and, in their entirety, balanced information, and with §31 para. 2 and 3 of Act No. 231/2001 Coll., which obliges broadcasters to ensure the objectivity and balance of information content and, for politically controversial topics, balanced representation of opposing views. The programme would stand as a legitimate news interview if supplemented by a government representative or at least citations from government documents.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	SELECTION OF EXPERTS	5/10	Significant imbalance
2	SELECTION OF SOURCES	4/10	Slight imbalance
3	TIME ALLOCATION	6/10	Significant imbalance
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	6/10	Significant imbalance
5	MANIPULATION WITH NUMBERS	3/10	Slight imbalance
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	1/10	Unremarkable
7	TIMING	4/10	Slight imbalance
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	3/10	Slight imbalance
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE	6/10	Significant imbalance
10	FRAMING	6/10	Significant imbalance
11	WORD AND TERM CHOICE	5/10	Significant imbalance
12	PRESENTER BEHAVIOUR	5/10	Significant imbalance
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	5/10	Significant imbalance
14	FALSE BALANCE	2/10	Unremarkable
15	AGENDA-SETTING	6/10	Significant imbalance

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

**4.2/10**

Significant imbalance

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

**4.8/10**

Significant imbalance

#### OVERALL SCORE

**4.5/10**

Significant imbalance

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

### Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

<b>0</b>	<b>No finding</b>	No relevant anomaly detected.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with impact</b>	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
<b>6</b>	<b>Significant finding (threshold)</b>	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
<b>7</b>	<b>Significant finding</b>	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Severe finding</b>	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum severity</b>	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

### Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Slight imbalance</b>	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Significant imbalance</b>	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
<b>6.1 – 8.0</b>	<b>Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation</b>	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree</b>	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

### Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favored</b>	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favored</b>	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (§2 of the Act on Czech Television / §31 of Act No. 231/2001)

### Assessment under §2 of the Act on Czech Television / §31 of Act No. 231/2001

#### Violation 1:

Standard: §2 para. 2 lit. a) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. on Czech Television; §31 para. 3 of Act No. 231/2001 Coll.

Facts: The programme addresses a politically controversial topic (governmental crisis management during the pandemic) without representation of the governmental perspective; criticism of governmental performance is presented without the possibility of a response or confrontation.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:39 — Quote: "No we are completely in shock at what is happening so We repeatedly send messages I naturally have the mobile number of important people but they usually do not respond"

Assessment: Act No. 231/2001 Coll. §31 para. 3 requires balanced representation of opposing views for politically and economically controversial topics; this condition is not met, as the governmental perspective is entirely absent.

#### Violation 2:

Standard: §31 para. 2 of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. — separation of evaluative commentary from reporting

Facts: The presenter himself proposes an evaluative interpretation of the situation ("collapse of the state") without designating it as commentary or confronting it with an alternative interpretation.

Evidence: Timestamp 03:08 — Quote: "from your point of view there has been a collapse of the state"

Assessment: The formulation "collapse of the state" is an evaluative judgement, not a journalistic question; its use by the presenter without distancing violates the obligation to separate evaluative commentary from reporting.

#### Violation 3:

Standard: §2 para. 2 lit. a) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. — objective and verified information

Facts: The programme contains two claims without a primary source (rumours) that are presented as factual information.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:02 — Quote: "I just heard something that they apparently want to close practices for elective cases"; timestamp 15:55 — Quote: "If the Prime Minister said I believe him that 200,000 respirators arrived"

Assessment: The law requires verified information; claims without a primary source do not meet this condition.

### Overall assessment under §2 of the Act on Czech Television / §31 of Act No. 231/2001

The programme exhibits three measurable breaches of the statutory mandate of balance and objectivity. The most serious is the absence of a governmental counterweight in a programme devoted to the politically controversial topic of crisis management, which is in direct conflict with §31 para. 3 of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. The second violation is the use of an evaluative judgement by the presenter without distancing, in conflict with §31 para. 2 of the same act. The third violation is the presentation of unverified claims as factual information, in conflict with §2 para. 2 lit. a) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. These violations are structural and measurable; the programme would stand as a legitimate news interview if supplemented by a government representative and if the presenter were to refrain from evaluative formulations.

### IN-DEPTH SOURCE CHECK (mandatory for all cited expert institutions / NGOs / advisory bodies)

#### 1. Czech Dental Chamber

**1. FUNDING:** Self-governing professional organisation funded by membership fees from dentists; without direct state or private funding. Structural interest: maintaining the operation of practices and the supply of protective equipment for members.



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

**2. MANDATE:** To represent the interests of dentists, ensure the quality of care and professional ethics. The mandate is not compatible with the role of a neutral assessor of the overall crisis management of the state.

**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** The chamber has a direct institutional interest in the supply of protective equipment and the maintenance of practice operations — that is, in the outcome which it criticises as inadequate. This conflict of interest is not mentioned in the programme.

**4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source traffic light, 6D -2/+2):**

Dimension	Score	Reasoning
D1 Conflict of interest	-1	Direct institutional interest in the outcome of the discussion
D2 Personal risk	+2	Public criticism of the government during a crisis — real professional risk
D3 Expert competence	+1	Expert in dentistry; limited competence in state crisis management
D4 Consistency	+1	Position consistent with the role of the chamber
D5 Emotionalisation vs. data	0	Combination of substantive arguments and emotional appeals
D6 Source level	+1	Primary source from the front line
TOTAL	+4	TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

**5. COUNTERVOICE:** The Ministry of Health, the Chief Hygienist, or another government representative would have provided an alternative perspective on coordination. This countervoice is absent from the programme.

**IMPORTANT:** "President of the medical chamber" is a social attribution of authority, not a substantive qualification for assessing the overall crisis management of the state. This attribution must itself be examined — and the result of that examination (yellow traffic light) shows that the source is legitimate but not neutral.

*Analysis processed in accordance with the methodology of version 3.0-detail, criteria K11+K8 (documentation of triggering event for selective outrage and moderation asymmetry). All quotations are direct citations from the transcript in the original language. Timestamps correspond to the transcript.*

## Legal and Methodological Notes

### No factual determination

The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.

### No legal judgment

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Zákon o ČT / Zákon č. 231/2001. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular RRTV).

### No proof of causation

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.



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

**No judgment of intent**

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.

**Heuristic comparison tool**

The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



## APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

### Legal Framework

---

Czech public television is governed by the Czech Television Act (Zákon o České televizi, č. 483/1991 Sb.) and the Broadcasting Act (Zákon o provozování rozhlasového a televizního vysílání, č. 231/2001 Sb.). These laws mandate that Česká televize provides objective, verified, balanced and comprehensive information for the free formation of opinions. The Broadcasting Act further requires all broadcasters to ensure objectivity and balance in news programming and to clearly separate factual reporting from evaluative commentary.

### Key Provisions

---

- §2 odst. 2 písm. a) Zákona o ČT: "poskytování objektivních, ověřených, ve svém celku vyvážených a všestranných informací pro svobodné vytváření názorů" — Provision of objective, verified, balanced and comprehensive information for free opinion formation.
- §31 odst. 2 Zákona č. 231/2001 Sb.: Broadcasters must ensure objectivity and balance of information content; evaluative commentary must be clearly separated from factual reporting.
- §31 odst. 3: In programmes dealing with political or economic controversies, the broadcaster must ensure balanced representation of competing views.
- §31 odst. 4: The right of reply must be granted to persons or groups whose reputation or rights may have been affected.
- §2 odst. 2 písm. b) Zákona o ČT: ČT must create and broadcast programmes for all population groups, including minorities and disadvantaged groups.

### Regulatory Body

---

Rada pro rozhlasové a televizní vysílání (RRTV) — Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting. 13 members appointed by the Prime Minister on nomination from the Chamber of Deputies. Complaints can be filed via data box, e-mail (info@rrtv.cz), or in person. Response window: 30 days. Limitation period: 3 years.



## APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

### References

---

- 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 – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 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). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- 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*



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

## Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately). To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

### Contact and further information:

[www.SVFAB.ch](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:Kontakt@SVFAB.ch)

**Bank details:** PostFinance – POFICHBE

**IBAN:** CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

**Beneficiary:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 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](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch)



**Unbalanced Reporting** is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness 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 don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox – for everyone who faces a microphone and wants to know what to do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what matters after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



**You think you see the world.** In reality you see the frame someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It doesn't 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 play along. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook – playful, direct, full of real-life examples. You don't just learn how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame – and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.



**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.**