



ČT PODROBNÁ ANALÝZA

20250301_Interview CT24 - Macinka Motoriste plan.cs

Broadcast: ČT-Sendung | Analyzed: 2026-05-26 03:48

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

4.8/10

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 | [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

The current Czech government is a coalition of three parties: ANO 2011 (80 seats, 35.0%), SPD (15 seats, 6.2%) and Motoristé sobě/AUTO (13 seats, 5.5%). The Prime Minister is Andrej Babiš (ANO). At the time of broadcast the government had not yet received a vote of confidence from the Chamber of Deputies. The opposition consists of ODS (27 seats), STAN (22 seats), Piráti (18 seats), KDU-ČSL (16 seats) and TOP 09 (9 seats).

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Key position
Piráti	2.5	18	Opposition	Digitalisation, civil liberties, left-wing liberalism
STAN	4.5	22	Opposition	Municipal politics, pro-European centre
KDU-ČSL	5.5	16	Opposition	Christian democracy, family, centre
TOP 09	6.0	9	Opposition	Fiscal responsibility, pro-European centre-right
ANO	6.0	80	Government	Centrist populism, social transfers, Babiš
ODS	7.0	27	Opposition	Liberal economy, right wing, pro-Atlantic orientation
Motoristé	7.5	13	Government	Drivers' rights, right-wing populism, Euroscepticism
SPD	8.5	15	Government	Anti-immigration, Eurosceptic, right-wing populism

The key tension is the relationship between President Petr Pavel and the ANO–SPD–Motoristé coalition government, particularly on the question of ministerial appointments and foreign policy. Another fundamental issue is Czech participation in the ammunition initiative in support of Ukraine, where the coalition takes a markedly more reserved stance than the previous government. The third line of conflict is statements by Tomio Okamura that are at odds with the Czech Republic's pro-Atlantic and pro-European foreign policy orientation.

Czech Television is a public service broadcaster established under Act No. 483/1991 Coll. and is obliged to provide objective, verified and balanced information within the meaning of §2(2)(a) of that Act. CNN Prima News is a private television station operated by Prima, subject to §31 of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. on radio and television broadcasting operations, which imposes obligations of objectivity, balance and separation of commentary from news reporting. The analysed programme originates from CNN Prima News.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Portrayal in programme vs. programmatic position
ANO	-1	00:43 "even though I spent an hour trying to convince the President" — Programmatic position: sovereign governing party advancing its nominees — portrayed as a party on the defensive, without context of its programmatic priorities in the field of the environment; mildly distorted
ODS	+2	05:08–05:44 Fiala cited with criticism of "alibistic policy" — Programmatic position: pro-Atlantic, pro-Ukrainian — portrayed accurately and without challenge; correct
STAN	0	Party not mentioned in programme — cannot be assessed
Piráti	0	Party not mentioned in programme — cannot be assessed
KDU-ČSL	0	Petr Macinka appears as Foreign Minister and chairman of Motoristé, not as a KDU-ČSL representative; party affiliation is not relevant in this context
TOP 09	0	Party not mentioned in programme — cannot be assessed
SPD	-1	04:55 Okamura describes keeping the initiative as a "coalition compromise" and emphasises "Czech money will not go to weapons" — Programmatic position: abolition of the ammunition initiative — portrayed as a party that achieved a compromise, without critical context regarding its original position; mildly distorted in favour of SPD
Motoristé	-1	06:53–07:57 Macinka presented as a matter-of-fact and composed politician — Programmatic position: forceful insistence on Turek — portrayed without context of the nominee Turek's controversial background; mildly distorted by omission

Summary of party bias

- Most accurate portrayal: ODS, score +2
- Strongest distortion: ANO, SPD and Motoristé, score -1 (equal)
- Average deviation from 0: 0.7
- Conclusion: The programme portrays the opposition ODS (Fiala) with full space for criticism and without a counterweight, while the coalition parties ANO, SPD and Motoristé are portrayed without deeper context of their programmatic positions. Missing, for example, is the context of Filip Turek's controversial background, which is key to understanding the President's refusal. The party bias is mild, not systemic.

Overall tendency on the left-right axis

TENDENCY SCORE: +0.8

CLASSIFICATION: Mildly left-leaning

Reasoning: The programme provides prominent space for criticism of the coalition government (ANO–SPD–Motoristé) through Fiala's statement without a counterweight. The President's position — which is in line with the pro-Atlantic and pro-European mainstream — is presented as legitimate without challenge. The coalition parties are portrayed in a defensive role. The overall tendency mildly favours the pro-European, pro-Ukrainian narrative typical of centre-left and centre-right opposition parties.



CHAPTER 2 — PROGRAMME INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Programme details

- Title: CNN Prima News news programme (no explicit programme title in the transcript)
- Date (from filename): Undetermined — from context January 2025 (reference to a meeting of constitutional officials on 26 January)
- Presenter/reporter: Presenter (unnamed in transcript); reporters Jan Socha (CNN Prima News), Matěj Říha (CNN Prima News), Jakub Říhas (CNN Prima News)
- Guests (with position/party/affiliation):

Actors	Position	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Andrej Babiš	Prime Minister, chairman of ANO	ANO 2011	Centre-populism
Petr Macinka	Foreign Minister, chairman of Motoristé sobě	Motoristé sobě	Right wing
Tomio Okamura	Chairman of SPD, coalition partner	SPD	Right-wing populism
Petr Fiala	Chairman of ODS, former Prime Minister	ODS	Centre-right
Ivan Bednář	Minister of Transport	ANO (coalition nominee)	Centre-populism
Presidential spokesperson	Spokesperson for President Pavel	Presidential Office	Non-partisan/institutional

Main topic

President Petr Pavel repeatedly refuses to appoint Filip Turek as Minister of the Environment, thereby creating a constitutional and coalition crisis, while at the same time the ANO–SPD–Motoristé government is deciding on the conditions for continuing the ammunition initiative in support of Ukraine.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

1. SELECTION OF EXPERTS

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Unidentified commentator (voice in shot, 01:10–01:21)

Timestamp	01:10
Statement	"I assume eh, that this is not a surprise for eh Andrej Babiš and the coalition leaders and that they had to have counted on this option and that they are prepared for it."
Classification	The person is not identified by name or position; expertise and any conflict of interest cannot be verified.

Missing countervoice: A constitutional lawyer with an opposing assessment of the situation.

Source Depth Check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Unknown — the person is not identified; cannot be assessed.

(b) **MANDATE:** Unknown — without identification the compatibility with neutral assessment cannot be assessed.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — cannot be assessed without identification

D2 Personal risk: 0 — cannot be assessed

D3 Professional competence: -1 — the statement is a political estimate, not expert analysis

D4 Consistency of views: 0 — cannot be verified

D5 Emotiveness vs. data: -1 — the statement is speculative ("I assume"), without data support

D6 Source level: -1 — tertiary (commentary without primary source)

TOTAL: -3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) **PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** The statement is framed as a factual estimate, although it is speculation without a verifiable basis. Technique No. 2 (selection of sources).

Expert 2: Petr Fiala, chairman of ODS, former Prime Minister (05:08–05:44)

Timestamp	05:08
Statement	"Such a policy, an alibistic policy, an insincere policy, a non-solidary policy, that cannot pay off for us in the long term."
Classification	An opposition politician with a direct political interest in criticising the government; not a neutral expert.

Missing countervoice: A government expert on security policy or ANO representative on the ammunition initiative.

Source Depth Check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Party funding from ODS; direct political interest in criticising the coalition government.

(b) **MANDATE:** Incompatible with neutral assessment — Fiala is a direct political opponent of the government.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — direct political interest in negative assessment of the government



D2 Personal risk: +1 — as opposition leader bears political risk for his statements

D3 Professional competence: +1 — as former Prime Minister has experience with security policy

D4 Consistency of views: +2 — ODS has long held a pro-Ukrainian position

D5 Emotiveness vs. data: -1 — the statement is evaluative and emotive, without specific data

D6 Source level: 0 — secondary (political commentary)

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: Fiala is presented as a credible critic without explicit notice of his role as a direct political opponent. Technique No. 2 (selection of sources).

Missing expert groups:

- Constitutional lawyer on the question of presidential powers
- Security analyst on the ammunition initiative
- Environmental expert on Turek's qualifications

Source Credibility Overview:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Unidentified commentator (voice in shot, 01:10–01:21)	0	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-3	YELLOW
Petr Fiala, chairman of ODS, former Prime Minister (05:08–05:44)	-2	+1	+1	+2	-1	0	+1	YELLOW

Summary (result of matrix as a structured overview):

- Unidentified commentator: YELLOW traffic light — speculative statement without identification
- Petr Fiala: YELLOW traffic light — politically interested, presented without notice of conflict of interest



2. SELECTION OF SOURCES

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Spokesperson of Prague Castle (01:00–02:07)

Timestamp

01:00 — Statement: "The President's position on the appointment of Filip Turek as a member of the government remains unchanged and he will send the Prime Minister a written response."

- (a) **Funding and establishing authority:** State institution — Office of the President of the Republic; funded from the state budget.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** The President's spokesperson defends the President's position; is not a neutral source.
- (c) **Missing source documenting the opposing view:** Statement of the government's legal adviser or an independent constitutional lawyer.

Source 2: Petr Fiala — direct quote (05:08–05:44)

Timestamp

05:08 — Statement: "an alibistic policy, an insincere policy, non-solidary"

- (a) **Funding:** ODS — an opposition party with a direct political interest.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Fiala as former Prime Minister and opposition leader has an interest in negative assessment of Babiš's government.
- (c) **Missing balancing source:** A government expert or independent security policy analyst.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 03:19–03:22

Claim: "could push for a competence action against President Petr Pavel"

Verbal marker: "could" — speculative formulation without a primary source

Primary source available: no — penalty point

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 08:09–08:23

Claim: "if the President had the feeling that by this step he would break up our government coalition... perhaps today he is being led by the effort to push through some political subjects closer to him"

Verbal marker: "perhaps", "maybe" — speculative attribution of motives to the President without any source

Primary source available: no — penalty point

Summary: The programme relies predominantly on political actors with a direct interest in the outcome of the dispute; independent expert sources are missing. Two speculative claims without a primary source increase the score by 2 penalty points.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Coalition parties (Babiš, Macinka, Okamura, Bednář): approx. 3 min. 20 s (37%)
- Opposition parties (Fiala): approx. 45 s (8%)
- Presenter/reporters: approx. 3 min. 30 s (39%)
- Presidential spokesperson / institutional voices: approx. 45 s (8%)
- Unidentified commentator: approx. 25 s (5%)
- Other (Matěj Říha — field reporter): approx. 1 min. 30 s (17%)

Summary: Coalition parties have the most space, but their statements are predominantly factual (description of the situation), while Fiala's criticism is evaluative and emotive — and is not balanced by a comparably strong countervoice from the coalition. The time distribution is formally approximately balanced, but qualitatively asymmetric.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

Filip Turek's background and the specific reasons for the President's refusal

Relevant at: 00:05–01:09 (the entire introductory block on the refusal of Turek)

Impact

The viewer does not know why the President is refusing Turek; the dispute appears to be an act of presidential wilfulness, rather than a response to specific problematic statements or conduct by the nominee.

Omission 2:

Context

Specific content of Okamura's statements in his New Year's address

Relevant at: 01:19–02:07

Impact

The viewer does not know what Okamura said; cannot assess the seriousness of the President's approach nor the justifiability of Babiš's trivialisation.

Omission 3:

Context

The impact of the change in the Czech position on the ammunition initiative on relations with allies (NATO, EU)

Relevant at: 04:00–05:44

Impact

Fiala's criticism sounds like partisan rhetoric without factual support; specific reactions from allies that would either confirm or refute it are missing.

Summary: The systematic omission of substantive content (Turek's background, Okamura's statements, allies' reactions) means that the programme informs about the course of the political dispute, but does not enable the viewer to understand its substance and assess the justifiability of the individual positions.

Missing Voices

- Constitutional lawyer: Would provide analysis of the President's powers in appointing ministers and the limits of his discretion.
- Representative of the Presidential Office (in more detail): Would provide the specific legal and substantive reasons for refusing Turek.
- Filip Turek personally: Would provide his own statement on the reasons for the refusal and his defence.
- NATO representative or foreign ministry of an allied country: Would provide a perspective on the impact of the change in the Czech position on the ammunition initiative.
- Environmental expert: Would provide an assessment of Turek's professional qualifications for the post of minister.
- Opposition representative on the constitutional question (STAN, Piráti): Would provide a broader opposition perspective beyond Fiala's criticism of the ammunition initiative.



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

- Political scientist: Would provide analysis of precedents for refusing ministerial appointments and the impacts on governmental stability.
- ANO representative on the constitutional question: Would provide the position of the largest coalition party on a possible competence action.



5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES									2/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	03:40–03:48
Figure: "the government of the ANO SPD and Motoristé movement has not yet received a vote of confidence from the Chamber of Deputies"	
Dimension: (a) absolute value — mentioned implicitly; (b) share — missing (how many votes does the government need, how many does it have secured); (c) trend — missing	
Missing context	How many deputies does the government need to obtain a confidence vote and how many votes does it have secured at this point?
Impact	The viewer does not know how real the risk of the government's fall is; the information appears more dramatic than it might be with full context.

Summary: Manipulation of figures is not a dominant technique in this programme; the only relevant finding concerns the missing context for the confidence vote.



6. CONTACT GUILT									5/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Association 1:	
Timestamp	08:09–08:23
Quote	<i>"if the President had the feeling that by this step he would break up our government coalition and break up the government, perhaps today he is being led by the effort to push through some political subjects closer to him"</i>
Technique: Macinka attributes a hidden political motive to President Pavel (advancing "subjects closer to him") without any evidence; thereby associating the President with political scheming.	
Impact	The statement is broadcast without the presenter's challenge or request for substantiation; the viewer may gain the impression that the President is acting out of political calculation rather than constitutional reasons.

Check for persons framed as "conspiracy theorists": No such person appears in this programme — the criterion is not applicable.

Summary (assignment of categories with matrix reasoning):

- Petr Macinka: Category B statement (partially substantiable — the President has political preferences — but speculative in attributing a specific motive); the programme neither refutes nor challenges the statement.



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:05–00:18 (beginning)

Content: "President Petr Pavel continues to refuse to appoint Filip Turek as Minister of the Environment."

Timing effect: The programme begins by presenting the President's refusal as a permanent and unchanging fact, thereby framing the entire subsequent discussion as a response to the President's intransigence — rather than as a legitimate exercise of his constitutional powers.

Finding 2:

Position: 05:08–05:44 (middle)

Content: Fiala's criticism of the ammunition initiative as "alibistic policy"

Timing effect: The emotive opposition criticism is placed in the middle of the programme without an immediate counterweight; what follows is only a factual statement by Minister Bednář on logistics, not a direct response to Fiala's criticism.

Summary: The timing of the introductory framing and the placement of Fiala's criticism without a counterweight mildly reinforces the overall asymmetry of the programme.



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 it is necessary to document the triggering event. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggering events from other positions did not produce an analogous reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 05:08–05:44

Triggering event: Government decision not to contribute financially to the ammunition initiative

Reaction: Fiala's statement "an alibistic policy, an insincere policy, non-solidary" is broadcast without the presenter's challenge or request for specific substantiation.

Comparison

Macinka's statement at 08:09 attributing hidden political motives to the President — presenter's reaction: none, the interview is concluded with thanks.

Asymmetry: Emotive opposition criticism of the government passes without challenge; the speculative attack on the President likewise passes without challenge. Asymmetry is not clearly proven — both sides receive space without critical challenge.

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 1/5

Summary: The programme does not display marked selective outrage; emotive statements pass without challenge on both sides of the dispute, which is itself problematic from the perspective of journalistic rigour, but is not clearly selective.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 00:05–09:00 (entire programme)

Missing perspective/fact: Specific reasons for the President's refusal of Turek (Turek's statements, his background)

Relevance: Without this context it is not possible to assess whether the President is acting in accordance with the constitution and the public interest, or whether he is exceeding his powers.

Impact

The dispute is presented as a political conflict of personalities, rather than as a substantive constitutional question.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 01:19–02:07

Missing perspective/fact: Specific content of Okamura's statements in his New Year's address

Relevance: Without knowledge of the content of the statements it is not possible to assess the seriousness of the President's reproach or the justifiability of Babiš's trivialisation.

Impact

The viewer cannot form their own opinion on the seriousness of the situation.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 04:00–05:44

Missing perspective/fact: Reactions of allies (NATO, EU) to the change in the Czech position on the ammunition initiative

Relevance: Fiala's criticism of "loss of prestige" would be either confirmed or refuted by specific reactions from allies.

Impact

The criticism sounds like partisan rhetoric without factual support; the viewer cannot assess its justifiability.

Summary: The programme systematically omits substantive content that would allow the viewer to understand the substance of both main topics. It informs about the course of the political dispute, but not about its causes and consequences.

End of hard facts — beginning of soft facts

The dispute over the appointment of Filip Turek reflects deeper tensions between President Pavel — a proponent of the pro-Atlantic and pro-European course — and the coalition government, which includes parties with Eurosceptic and anti-Ukrainian tendencies (SPD, parts of ANO). Turek was nominated by Motoristé, with his background (statements questioning democratic values) being the reason for the President's refusal, although this context is not explicitly mentioned in the programme. The ammunition initiative represents the second key point: the new government maintains the format of the initiative but refuses direct financial contributions, which the opposition



describes as alibism. Both topics are part of the broader dispute about the direction of Czech foreign and security policy after the 2025 elections.

Share of covered perspectives

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

[A] President Pavel's reasons for refusing Turek: specific legal and substantive arguments

[B] Filip Turek's background and statements, which form the basis for the President's refusal

[C] Constitutional law analysis: does the President have the right to refuse to appoint a minister and under what conditions?

[D] The position of Motoristé sobě and their programmatic priorities in the field of the environment

[E] The impact of maintaining the ammunition initiative without a financial contribution on Czech reputation among allies

[F] The reaction of NATO/EU partners to the change in the Czech position on the ammunition initiative

[G] Tomio Okamura's statements in his New Year's address: specific content and their problematic nature

[H] Alternative candidates for Minister of the Environment and their professional qualifications

[I] Time pressure: the government needs a confidence vote in parliament next week — how does this crisis affect the confidence vote?

[J] The reaction of civil society and expert opinion to the refusal of Turek

[A] INDICATED

Timestamp: 01:00–01:09 — Quote: "The President's position on the appointment of Filip Turek as a member of the government remains unchanged and he will send the Prime Minister a written response." — Assessment: The President's position is mentioned, but without any substantive reasoning.

[B] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Filip Turek's background and the specific reasons for the President's refusal are not mentioned at all in the programme; the viewer does not have the information needed to form their own judgement.

[C] INDICATED

Timestamp: 01:22–01:31 — Quote: "he is adhering to the constitution, at least according to the statements so far, where simply the President does not 100% have to appoint." — Assessment: The constitutional dimension is mentioned in one sentence without deeper analysis.

[D] INDICATED

Timestamp: 06:53–07:57 — Quote: "Filip Turek remains our nominee for the post of Minister of the Environment." — Assessment: The Motoristé position is presented, but without programmatic context in the field of the environment.

[E] COVERED

Timestamp: 05:08–05:44 — Quote: "It is not possible to ask allies for everything while we ourselves give nothing." — Assessment: Fiala's criticism covers this perspective, albeit one-sidedly.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The reaction of allies to the change in the Czech position on the ammunition initiative is entirely absent.

[G] INDICATED

Timestamp: 01:53–02:07 — Quote: "He emphasised the need to align public statements so that they correspond to the country's foreign policy priorities." — Assessment: The content of Okamura's statements is neither quoted nor described; the viewer does not know what specifically was problematic.



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

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Alternative candidates for Minister of the Environment are not mentioned.

[I] INDICATED

Timestamp: 03:40–03:48 — Quote: "the government of the ANO SPD and Motoristé movement has not yet received a vote of confidence from the Chamber of Deputies and would like to request one next week." — Assessment: The context of the confidence vote is mentioned, but its connection to the crisis surrounding Turek is not developed.

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The reaction of expert opinion, lawyers or civil society is entirely absent.

Completeness score: 4/10

Reasoning: The programme covers the basic facts about the course of the dispute, but systematically omits substantive content — the reasons for the President's refusal, Turek's background, constitutional law analysis and the reactions of allies. The viewer receives information about what happened, but not why and with what consequences. Four of ten perspectives are entirely omitted.



Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAME-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:05–00:18
Quote	"President Petr Pavel continues to refuse to appoint Filip Turek as Minister of the Environment."
Manipulation	The verb "refuses" frames the President's action as a negative, obstructive act, rather than as the exercise of a constitutional power.

Why this is problematic: A neutral alternative would read: "President Petr Pavel is not appointing Filip Turek" or "The President is maintaining his position on the Turek nomination." The use of "refuses" pre-evaluates the President's action as unjustified.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	00:39–00:42
Quote	"But the traditional New Year's lunch could be considered bittersweet by Andrej Babiš."
Manipulation	The metaphor "bittersweet" frames the outcome of the meeting as Babiš's defeat before the viewer has been told the facts.

Why this is problematic: An evaluative metaphor in the introduction of a news report violates the principle of separation of commentary from news reporting pursuant to §31(2) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	08:09–08:23
Quote	"perhaps today he is being led by the effort to push through some political subjects closer to him"
Manipulation	Macinka's statement attributing hidden political motives to the President is broadcast without the presenter's challenge, thereby being implicitly legitimised as a credible interpretation.

Why this is problematic: Speculation about the President's motives without evidence is framed as equivalent political analysis.

Summary: The programme uses evaluative language and metaphors that pre-frame the outcome of the political dispute as Babiš's/the coalition's defeat, while at the same time allowing speculative statements about the President's motives to pass without challenge.



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

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:39–00:42
Quote	"bittersweet"
Manipulation	Emotive metaphor in a news context.

Why this is problematic: Neutral alternative: "The outcome of the meeting was mixed for Babiš." The metaphor "bittersweet" is evaluative and belongs in commentary, not in news reporting.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	05:15–05:18
Quote	"an alibistic policy, an insincere policy, non-solidary"
Manipulation	Strongly evaluative statements by an opposition politician are quoted without the presenter's challenge or contextualisation as partisan rhetoric.

Why this is problematic: Neutral alternative: after the quote the presenter should request a response from the governing party or draw attention to the partisan context of the statement.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	00:43–00:51
Quote	"to perform some good deed and give Mr Turek a chance"
Manipulation	Babiš uses moralising language ("good deed") that frames the President's refusal as a moral failure; the programme broadcasts this statement without comment.

Why this is problematic: Neutral alternative: the presenter could point out that the appointment of a minister is not a "good deed" but a constitutional act with specific conditions.

Summary: The programme adopts the evaluative language of political actors without critical distance; this applies both to the coalition party (Babiš) and to the opposition (Fiala).



12. PRESENTER BEHAVIOUR

5/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment it is necessary to document the triggering event. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggering events involving other guests did not produce an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 08:00–08:08

Triggering event: Macinka refuses to disclose the Motorist's planned steps, citing the need to first inform the parliamentary group.

Quote (presenter) "So I probably won't be able to persuade you, Mr Chairman, thank you for your time and good evening."

Comparison When Fiala's criticism was cited (05:08–05:44) the presenter/reporter did not ask any follow-up question nor demand specific substantiation of the claim "alibistic policy".

Asymmetry: The presenter accepts Macinka's refusal to answer without further pressure; equally accepts Fiala's criticism without a follow-up question. Asymmetry is not clearly proven — in both cases critical pressure is absent.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 07:57–08:08

Triggering event: Macinka speculates about the President's hidden motives.

Quote (presenter) [no reaction — the interview is concluded with thanks]

Comparison An analogous speculation from the opposition (Fiala) likewise passes without challenge.

Asymmetry: The presenter does not challenge speculative statements on either side — the problem is symmetric, not asymmetric.

Summary: The presenter does not display marked asymmetry in treatment of different guests, but overall critical pressure on all sides is absent — speculative and evaluative statements pass without challenge regardless of their origin.



13. ASYMMETRY OF QUESTIONS

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Asymmetry 1:

Presenter to Macinka, 06:44–06:49: "So tell us, with what proposals are you going to the parliamentary group meeting? Will you be looking for a replacement for Filip Turek?" — hard/direct

Presenter to Macinka, 08:00–08:08: "So I probably won't be able to persuade you, Mr Chairman, thank you for your time and good evening." — soft/accepting

Comparison

The presenter begins with a hard question, but after Macinka's evasive answer concludes the interview without further pressure. Fiala (cited in the report) is not asked any question — his statements are taken over without challenge.

Asymmetry 2:

Reporter Matěj Říha (03:02–03:48) speculates about possible steps by Motoristé (competence action, new candidate) without these speculations being supported by statements from specific deputies.

Comparison

The same speculative method is not applied to the opposition — there is no speculation about what the opposition would do if the government obtained a confidence vote.

Asymmetry: Mild — the speculation concerns exclusively the coalition party.

Summary: The asymmetry of questions is mild; a more significant problem is the overall lack of critical pressure on all sides.



14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

04:50–05:07

Construct: Okamura's statement "I am glad that we managed to achieve the compromise" is placed alongside Fiala's criticism "an alibistic policy" — as if these were two equivalent political interpretations of the same fact.

Analysis

Okamura assesses the outcome as a success for SPD (maintaining the initiative without a financial contribution), Fiala as a failure. The programme places these two interpretations side by side without a factual analysis that would help the viewer assess which is closer to reality. An independent security analyst is missing.

Summary: False balance is present to a limited extent; the programme places political interpretations side by side without a factual anchor.



15. AGENDA SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The President's refusal of Turek is framed as a problem that the coalition must solve — rather than as a legitimate exercise of constitutional powers.

Timestamp

00:05–00:18 — Evidence: "President Petr Pavel continues to refuse to appoint Filip Turek as Minister of the Environment."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether Turek meets the prerequisites for the exercise of the function of minister, and the specific reasons for the President's refusal.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Maintaining the ammunition initiative without a financial contribution is presented as a political decision to be assessed — rather than as a potential breach of allied commitments.

Timestamp

04:00–05:44 — Evidence: The entire block on the ammunition initiative is framed as a domestic political dispute (Babiš vs. Fiala), rather than as a foreign policy question with international consequences.

Alternative agenda: The Czech Republic's specific commitments to NATO and the EU in the field of support for Ukraine and their potential breach.

Summary: The programme sets the agenda such that both main topics are presented as domestic political disputes between personalities, rather than as substantive constitutional or foreign policy questions with specific consequences.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Selection of experts	H	6	An unidentified commentator and the party-interested Fiala are presented without notice of conflict of interest.
2	Selection of sources	H	5	The programme relies on political actors with a direct interest; two speculative claims without a primary source.
3	Time distribution	H	4	Formally approximately balanced, but qualitatively asymmetric — opposition criticism is more emotive and without a counterweight.
4	Omissions	H	7	Turek's background, the content of Okamura's statements and allies' reactions are systematically absent.
5	Manipulation of figures	H	2	The only relevant finding: missing context for the confidence vote.
6	Guilt by association	H	5	Macinka's speculative statement about the President's motives passes without challenge.
7	Timing	H	4	The introductory framing and placement of Fiala's criticism without a counterweight mildly reinforce the asymmetry.
8	Selective outrage	H	3	Emotive statements pass without challenge on both sides — the problem is symmetric.
9	Completeness	H	7	The programme informs about the course of the dispute, but not about its causes and consequences.
10	Framing	S	6	Evaluative metaphors and verbs frame the President's action as obstruction.
11	Choice of words	S	5	The programme adopts the evaluative language of political actors without critical distance.
12	Presenter behaviour	S	5	Critical pressure on all sides is absent; asymmetry is not marked.
13	Asymmetry of questions	S	4	Mild asymmetry; a more significant problem is the overall lack of critical pressure.
14	False balance	S	3	Political interpretations are placed side by side without a factual anchor.
15	Agenda setting	S	6	Both topics are framed as domestic political disputes, rather than as substantive questions.

Results

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



Dominant techniques

- 1. Omissions (score 7):** The programme systematically omits substantive content key to understanding both main topics — Turek's background, the content of Okamura's statements and the reactions of allies to the change in the Czech position on the ammunition initiative. The viewer is informed about the course of the political dispute, but does not have sufficient information to form their own opinion.
- 2. Completeness (score 7):** Closely linked to omissions — the programme covers only 4 of 10 relevant perspectives, with 4 entirely omitted. The voices of constitutional lawyers, security analysts, allies and environmental experts are missing.
- 3. Framing (score 6):** Evaluative metaphors ("bittersweet"), the verb "refuses" and the uncritical adoption of evaluative statements by political actors frame the President's action as obstruction and the coalition crisis as Babiš's defeat before the facts are conveyed.

Key messages of the programme

****MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT):** ** "President Pavel is arbitrarily blocking the appointment of Turek and destabilising the government coalition."

Technique: Framing (verb "refuses"), omissions (reasons for refusal are absent) — Evidence: 00:05, 00:39

****MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** ** "Andrej Babiš is a weak Prime Minister who cannot assert his will either with the President or with allies."

Technique: Timing (metaphor "bittersweet" at the beginning), selection of sources (Fiala's criticism without a counterweight) — Evidence: 00:39, 05:08

****MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** ** "The new government is unstable and its foreign policy is insincere."

Technique: Agenda setting, selection of sources (Fiala as the sole evaluative voice on the ammunition initiative) — Evidence: 03:40, 05:08

Reasoning: The programme achieves an overall score of 4.8/10, which falls on the boundary between mild tendency and discernible one-sidedness. The dominant problems are the systematic omission of substantive content (Turek's background, the content of Okamura's statements, allies' reactions) and the framing of the President's action as obstruction. These shortcomings are at odds with the requirement of §2(2)(a) of Act No. 483/1991 Coll. to provide "in their entirety balanced and comprehensive information for the free formation of opinions" and with §31(2) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. to ensure the objectivity and balance of informational content. The programme originates from the private station CNN Prima News, which is subject to Act No. 231/2001 Coll.

CONCLUSION

The analysed CNN Prima News broadcast informs about two key political topics — the refusal to appoint Filip Turek and the ammunition initiative — in a manner that meets basic requirements for factual accuracy, but systematically fails in completeness and substantive depth. The programme omits information essential to understanding the substance of both topics: the viewer does not learn why the President is refusing Turek, what specifically Okamura said, nor how allies are reacting to the change in the Czech position. The framing of the President's action as "refusing" and the metaphor "bittersweet" violate the principle of separation of commentary from news reporting pursuant to §31(2) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. The selection of sources is one-sided — as the sole evaluative voice on the ammunition initiative, the opposition politician Fiala appears without the counterweight of an independent expert or government representative, which is at odds with §31(3) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. requiring balanced representation of opposing views on politically controversial topics. The overall score of 4.8/10 corresponds to discernible one-sidedness, which, while not reaching the level of systematic manipulation, represents a measurable departure from the statutory requirements for objectivity and balance.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	SELECTION OF EXPERTS	6/10	Significant imbalance
2	SELECTION OF SOURCES	5/10	Significant imbalance
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	4/10	Slight imbalance
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	7/10	Pronounced imbalance
5	MANIPULATION OF FIGURES	2/10	Unremarkable
6	CONTACT GUILT	5/10	Significant imbalance
7	TIMING	4/10	Slight imbalance
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	3/10	Slight imbalance
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE	7/10	Pronounced imbalance
10	FRAME-SETTING	6/10	Significant imbalance
11	CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS	5/10	Significant imbalance
12	PRESENTER BEHAVIOUR	5/10	Significant imbalance
13	ASYMMETRY OF QUESTIONS	4/10	Slight imbalance
14	FALSE BALANCE	3/10	Slight imbalance
15	AGENDA SETTING	6/10	Significant imbalance

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

4.8/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

4.8/10

Significant imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

4.8/10

Significant imbalance

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



KEY — Score Definitions

Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

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

Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

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



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

Assessment pursuant to §2 of the Czech Television Act / §31 of Act No. 231/2001

The Czech Television Act (No. 483/1991 Coll.) §2(2)(a) requires the provision of objective, verified, in their entirety balanced and comprehensive information for the free formation of opinions. The Act on Radio and Television Broadcasting Operations (No. 231/2001 Coll.) §31(2) requires ensuring the objectivity and balance of informational content and the separation of evaluative commentary from news reporting. §31(3) requires balanced representation of opposing views on politically and economically controversial topics.

Note: The analysed programme originates from the private station CNN Prima News, which is subject to Act No. 231/2001 Coll. The Czech Television Act (No. 483/1991 Coll.) does not apply directly to this programme, but serves as a reference standard for assessing public service obligations.

Violation 1:

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

Facts: The evaluative metaphor "bittersweet" is used in a news context without being marked as commentary.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:39–00:42 — Quote: "But the traditional New Year's lunch could be considered bittersweet by Andrej Babiš."

Assessment: The expression "bittersweet" is an evaluative commentary, not a news fact; its use in the introduction of a news report without being marked as commentary violates the obligation to separate evaluative commentary from news reporting.

Violation 2:

Standard: §31(3) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. — balanced representation of opposing views on politically controversial topics

Facts: On the topic of the ammunition initiative, the sole evaluative voice is the opposition politician Petr Fiala; the governing party is given space only for factual statements (Babiš, Okamura), not for a direct response to Fiala's criticism.

Evidence: Timestamp 05:08–05:44 — Quote: "an alibistic policy, an insincere policy, non-solidary" — without the counterweight of a governing party evaluative statement or an independent expert.

Assessment: The one-sided representation of evaluative voices on a politically controversial topic (Czech participation in the ammunition initiative) violates the requirement of balanced representation of opposing views.

Violation 3:

Standard: §31(2) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll. — objectivity and balance of informational content

Facts: The programme systematically omits information essential for understanding the substance of both main topics — the specific reasons for the President's refusal of Turek and the content of Okamura's statements.

Evidence: Entire programme (00:05–09:00) — absence of any mention of Turek's background or the specific content of Okamura's statements.

Assessment: The omission of substantive content key to understanding the political dispute violates the requirement of objectivity and balance of informational content; the viewer does not have sufficient information for the free formation of opinions.

Overall assessment pursuant to §31 of Act No. 231/2001 Coll.

The analysed CNN Prima News broadcast displays three measurable violations of §31 of Act No. 231/2001 Coll.: use of evaluative language in a news context without marking it as commentary, one-sided representation of evaluative



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

voices on a politically controversial topic, and systematic omission of substantive content essential for understanding both main topics. These violations do not reach the level of systematic manipulation, but represent measurable departures from the statutory requirements for objectivity, balance and separation of commentary from news reporting. The Council for Radio and Television Broadcasting (RRTV) in assessing this programme could find a violation of §31(2) and (3) of Act No. 231/2001 Coll., particularly in the part concerning the ammunition initiative and the framing of the President's refusal of Turek.

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

No expert institutions, NGOs or advisory bodies within the meaning of this criterion are cited in this programme. Only political actors (Babiš, Macinka, Okamura, Fiala, Bednář) and institutional spokespersons (Presidential spokesperson) appear. The in-depth source check for expert institutions is therefore not applicable.

Political actors were assessed within the framework of criteria 1 (Selection of experts) and 2 (Selection of sources) above, including the credibility matrix and source traffic light.

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.

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 | 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 or 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.