



YLE DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-05-13_Suomen linja Gazan kriisissä

Broadcast: YLE broadcast | 2025-05-13 | Analysed: 2026-05-22 18:14

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Mittapuu: Laki Yleisradio Oy:stä 7 §

TOTAL SCORE

5.1/10

Significant imbalance

0 = impartial, 10 = strongly biased

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic study by 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale of 0 (far left) – 10 (far right).

Party	Left Alliance	Greens	SDP	Centre Party	KD	National Coalition	Finns Party
CHES	1.50	2.60	3.50	5.60	6.80	7.20	8.40
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

The overall tendency is presented on a scale of 0–10 (0 = strongly favouring the left, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly favouring the right). The calculation is based on the difference between the average favouring of left-wing and right-wing parties (grouping according to CHES 2024).

TENDENCY (L – R)

5.0 / 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](#) | Threshold values: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not affect the total score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Finland has had the Orpo government since June 2023, consisting of four parties: National Coalition (KOK), Finns Party (PS), SFP/RKP and KD. The coalition holds 108 seats in the 200-seat parliament. The opposition consists of SDP, Centre Party, Greens, Left Alliance and Movement Now.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core position
Left Alliance	1.6 (left)	11	Opposition	Redistribution, trade unions, open asylum policy
SDP	3.6 (left)	43	Opposition	Welfare state, progressive taxation, pro-NATO
Greens	3.9 (left)	13	Opposition	Climate policy, liberal immigration, EU integration
Centre Party	5.7 (right)	23	Opposition	Rural policy, bioenergy, decentralisation
SFP/RKP	6.4 (right)	9	Government	Bilingualism, economic liberalism, pro-EU
KD	7.6 (right)	5	Government	Traditional family, Christian values, nuclear energy
LN	7.6 (right)	1	Opposition	Economic liberalism, small state
National Coalition	7.8 (right)	48	Government (PM Orpo)	Tax cuts, curbing indebtedness, strict immigration
Finns Party	8.2 (right)	46	Government	Very strict immigration, EU scepticism, national sovereignty

The Finnish political landscape is clearly bipolar: three left-wing parties versus six right-wing parties, four of which are in government. Key lines of conflict are the government's austerity policy on welfare services, tightening of immigration policy, and the Finns Party's EU-critical stance in relation to coalition partners. In foreign policy, the war in Ukraine and Finland's NATO membership are broadly supported, but Middle East policy divides the parties. YLE's relationship with the government is tense, particularly due to the Finns Party's media criticism.

YLE is Finland's public broadcasting company, regulated by the Act on Yleisradio Oy, in particular Section 7, which obliges it to provide diverse, comprehensive and impartial information and to promote pluralism. Finland regularly ranks at the top of RSF's Press Freedom Index, and trust in the media is exceptionally high by international standards. However, YLE faces criticism especially from the Finns Party, which considers it to be left-green biased.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast presentation vs. party programme
SDP	0	The party does not appear directly in the broadcast; Johannes Koskinen appears as chair of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee, not as an SDP representative — party position not highlighted
National Coalition	-1	04:42 "You also represent the government party National Coalition" — Pia Kauma presents a cautious, process-oriented line consistent with National Coalition's programme; however, her position on the conditionality of recognising Palestine is partly left unexplained in a broader context
Finns Party	0	The Finns Party does not appear in the broadcast at all — the party's views on the Middle East or oil policy are entirely absent
Centre Party	0	Does not appear in the broadcast
Greens	0	Does not appear in the broadcast
Left Alliance	0	Does not appear in the broadcast
SFP/RKP	0	Does not appear directly in the broadcast; SFP/RKP's role in government is not mentioned

Summary of party bias

- Most accurate representation: National Coalition (-1), reasonably accurately through Pia Kauma
- Strongest distortion: Finns Party (0 points, but systematic absence — a government party whose views on the Middle East and oil policy are entirely absent)
- Average deviation from zero: 0.1
- Conclusion: The broadcast does not directly distort party programmes, but of the four government coalition parties, only National Coalition is represented. The Finns Party, KD and SFP/RKP are entirely absent, creating a structural imbalance. From the opposition, SDP is represented through Koskinen, but his party affiliation remains in the background.

Left-right overall tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +1.2

CLASSIFICATION: Slightly favouring the left

Justification: The broadcast frames Israel's actions unambiguously as violations of international law without presenting opposing views. Researcher Stewart's perspective is clearly critical of Israel, and no counterbalance is provided. In the oil section, economic historian Eloranta presents a more balanced analysis, but the framing of the Middle East section leans clearly in the direction of a left-liberal foreign policy line.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST DETAILS AND TOPIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast details

- Title: A-Studio
- Date: May 2025 (exact day not apparent from transcript; Trump began his Middle East visit on 13.5.2025)
- Estimated duration: approximately 28 minutes
- Journalist/presenter: Unidentified (not named in transcript)
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Role	Party/Background organisation	Political spectrum
Timo R. Stewart	Senior researcher	Not specified (likely FIIA or equivalent)	Non-partisan
Johannes Koskinen	Chair of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee	SDP (opposition)	Left (3.6)
Pia Kauma	President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly	National Coalition (government)	Right (7.8)
Jari Eloranta	Professor of economic history	Non-partisan	Academic

Main topic

The broadcast covers Israel's planned large-scale military operation in Gaza, the reactions of the international community and Finland, and the geopolitical consequences of the fall in crude oil prices, particularly from the perspective of Russia's war economy and Trump's Middle East visit.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts — quantifiable and scientifically reliable

Hard facts — 9 quantifiable and scientifically verifiable techniques

1. EXPERT SELECTION

5/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total score: 5/10

Definition: Who gets to speak as an expert?

Expert 1: Timo R. Stewart, senior researcher

Timestamp: 01:16–03:17

Statement: "This would now be reminiscent of Trump's Riviera plan, i.e. the ethnic cleansing of the Gaza Strip."

Positioning: A researcher whose background organisation is not mentioned in the broadcast; uses strong political terminology ("ethnic cleansing") without the journalist requesting clarification or a contrary view.

Missing opposing voice: A researcher on Israeli security policy or an expert in international law who could have assessed the legal nature of the operation more impartially.

Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Background organisation not mentioned in the broadcast. This is in itself a problem — the viewer cannot assess possible conflicts of interest.

(b) MANDATE: Unclear; the title "senior researcher" does not indicate the field of research or institution.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source traffic light, 6 dimensions, -2 – +2):

- U1 Conflict of interest: 0 — No identifiable institutional affiliation, but background organisation unknown
- U2 Personal risk: +1 — As a researcher, takes a public position that may have professional consequences
- U3 Expertise: +1 — Middle East researcher, but specialisation not specified
- U4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No information on previous positions
- U5 Emotion vs. data: -1 — "Ethnic cleansing" is a strong political term without legal specification
- U6 Source level: 0 — Secondary analysis
- TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Stewart's view is presented as expert analysis, even though "ethnic cleansing" is a legally and politically contested term that is not contextualised.

Expert 2: Jari Eloranta, professor of economic history

Timestamp: 19:15–27:41

Statement: "I would believe that it is certainly longer-term. In the sense that perhaps there is now some fluctuation back and forth"

Positioning: Academic economic historian; presents a balanced analysis of oil markets.

Missing opposing voice: An analyst specialising in energy economics or geopolitics could have deepened the analysis.



Source depth check:

(a) FUNDING: University professor — public funding; no apparent conflict of interest in the analysis of oil markets.

(b) MANDATE: Economic history is a relevant background for historical analysis of oil markets; however, forecasting current markets is a different specialisation.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

- U1 Conflict of interest: +2 — No identifiable conflict of interest
- U2 Personal risk: +1 — Academic position provides protection
- U3 Expertise: +1 — Economic history relevant, but not a specialist in energy economics
- U4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Presents cautious assessments, not absolute claims
- U5 Emotion vs. data: +2 — Clearly data-oriented, uses concrete figures
- U6 Source level: +1 — Secondary analysis, but based on well-known statistics
- TOTAL: +8 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Eloranta is presented as an expert, and his mandate is reasonably well justified.

Missing expert groups:

- A researcher on Israeli security policy
- An expert in international humanitarian law
- An analyst specialising in energy economics

Summary:

Expert	Source traffic light	Key issue
Timo R. Stewart	YELLOW	Background organisation unknown, strong political terminology without contextualisation
Jari Eloranta	GREEN	Expertise relevant, analysis balanced



2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without a primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Total score: 5/10

Definition: What sources are cited? Are they diverse and independent?

Source 1: Israeli government statement (indirect)

Timestamp: 01:00 — Statement: "Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu announced that the army would strike Gaza with full force in the coming days."

(a) Funding and governance: Official Israeli government statement — political source

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The Israeli government has an interest in presenting operations as justified; this is not contextualised

(c) Missing counter-source: Assessment by the Israeli opposition or human rights organisations of the justification for the operations

Source 2: Information received by Pia Kauma from Israel

Timestamp: 10:15 — Statement: "just yesterday I spoke with Israel. And I was told from there that since the start of this war they have delivered 25,000 truckloads of humanitarian aid."

(a) Funding: Informal diplomatic contact — not verifiable

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Information provided by the Israeli government on humanitarian aid is a clearly biased source

(c) Missing counter-source: Official UN or OCHA statistics on humanitarian aid

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 10:15

Claim: "they have delivered 25,000 truckloads of humanitarian aid"

Word marker: "I was told from there" — indirect source without a verifiable primary source

Primary source: NO — penalty point +1

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 11:13

Claim: "This information came directly from them."

Word marker: "information came directly from them" — not verifiable

Primary source: NO — penalty point +1

Summary: The broadcast relies mainly on statements by political actors and one researcher without independent primary sources. Humanitarian aid statistics remain unverified.



3. DISTRIBUTION OF SPEAKING TIME

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 3/10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Timo R. Stewart (researcher): approximately 4 min. (14%)
- Johannes Koskinen (SDP, opposition): approximately 5 min. (18%)
- Pia Kauma (National Coalition, government): approximately 6 min. (21%)
- Jari Eloranta (professor): approximately 8 min. (29%)
- Journalist: approximately 5 min. (18%)

Summary: The distribution of speaking time is reasonably balanced between the two political guests. However, no one represents the Israeli perspective, meaning that all speaking time is used by voices that either criticise or cautiously defend Israel's actions.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total score: 6/10

Definition: What is not shown, even though it would be relevant?

Omission 1:

Context: Hamas's role in using Gaza's civilian population as a shield and in seizing aid remains marginal.

Relevant at: 10:27 — "some of it has unfortunately also gone directly to Hamas"

Effect: The viewer gets the impression that Israel is the only actor preventing humanitarian aid; Hamas's role in diverting aid away from civilians does not receive balanced treatment.

Omission 2:

Context: The context of the terrorist attack of 7 October 2023 and its impact on Israel's security assessment is entirely absent.

Relevant at: 01:09 — "For the audience this may fall into place as part of a kind of continuous stream of bad news from the region since October 2023"

Effect: The origin of the conflict and Israel's security rationale are left unaddressed, giving a one-sided picture of the situation.

Omission 3:

Context: The legal criteria for recognising Palestine (Montevideo Convention: permanent population, defined territory, functioning government, capacity to enter into relations) are not explained.

Relevant at: 14:51 — "usually when a state is recognised, the criteria must be met"

Effect: The viewer does not receive information on what the concrete legal prerequisites for recognition are, making the political discussion superficial.

Summary: The broadcast systematically fails to address Israel's security perspective and Hamas's role, creating an unbalanced picture of the conflict's dynamics.

Missing voices

- Representative of the Israeli government or embassy: Would have brought Israel's official perspective on the objectives of the operations and obstacles to humanitarian aid
- Palestinian civilian or humanitarian field worker: Would have brought concrete experience of the lack of aid
- Expert in international law: Could have assessed the actions of both Israel and Hamas legally and impartially
- Economic analyst from OPEC+ countries: Would have deepened the analysis of production decisions
- Russia expert: Would have complemented Eloranta's economic analysis with a geopolitical perspective
- Representative of the Finns Party or KD: The government coalition's views on the Middle East are left one-sidedly to National Coalition
- Expert on US Middle East policy: The objectives of Trump's visit remain speculative without expert analysis
- Finnish Foreign Ministry official: Could have clarified Finland's official foreign policy line instead of party-political statements



5. NUMBER MANIPULATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Total score: 4/10

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 10:18

Figure: "25,000 truckloads of humanitarian aid"

Dimensions: Absolute value presented (a), but relative share (b) and trend (c) are missing

Missing context: What do 25,000 trucks mean in relation to the needs of Gaza's 2.3 million inhabitants? What is the UN's estimate of the aid needed? How does the figure compare to the pre-war normal level?

Effect: The figure sounds large without context; the researcher refutes it immediately but does not offer a corresponding concrete figure.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 06:15–06:24

Figure: "For Israel, the EU is by far the largest trading partner. For the EU, Israel is the 25th largest trading partner."

Dimensions: Relative significance presented (b), but absolute trade volumes (a) and trend (c) are missing

Missing context: What is the absolute value of EU–Israel trade? How has it developed? This would have helped assess the real leverage of the association agreement.

Effect: The asymmetry is presented clearly, but its practical significance as a pressure tool remains unclear.

Summary: Figures are used argumentatively without sufficient contextualisation; in particular, humanitarian aid figures remain unverified and uncontextualised.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION (Guilt by association)

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 4/10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 03:12

Quote: "This would now be reminiscent of Trump's Riviera plan, i.e. the ethnic cleansing of the Gaza Strip."

Technique: Israel's planned operation is directly equated with "ethnic cleansing" and Trump's Riviera plan — two negatively charged references combined without legal analysis.

Effect: The viewer gets the impression that Israel's actions are comparable to historical ethnic cleansings; this serious claim is neither challenged nor contextualised.

Association 2:

Timestamp: 12:10

Quote: "This is truly irresponsible, that this threat by Netanyahu, that in a couple of days a full-scale operation will be launched."

Technique: Koskinen uses the term "irresponsible" about Netanyahu's actions — a strong moral judgement that the journalist does not challenge.

Effect: The Israeli Prime Minister is labelled irresponsible without a contrary view.

Summary: The broadcast allows strong political and moral judgements against Israel without challenging or contextualising them; this is a structural problem from the perspective of impartiality.



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

Total score: 4/10

Definition: Strategic placement of information (beginning/middle/end).

Finding 1:

Location: 00:10–00:14 (beginning)

Content: "Israel is planning to take control of even the entire Gaza Strip."

Timing effect: The broadcast opens with a claim about Israel's actions that frames the entire Gaza section as Israeli aggression before any context has been provided. This anchors the viewer's interpretive framework right from the start.

Finding 2:

Location: 03:12–03:17 (climax of the Gaza section)

Content: "the ethnic cleansing of the Gaza Strip." (repeated twice)

Timing effect: The strongest and most contentious claim is placed at the climax of the Gaza section just before the interviews with political guests, framing their responses within this interpretive framework.

Finding 3:

Location: 18:36 (transition)

Content: "And we continue with Trump's visit and the Middle East, but focus on the fall in oil prices"

Timing effect: The transition to the oil section takes place without a summary or balancing perspective on the Gaza section, leaving the one-sided framework in place.

Summary: The structure of the broadcast reinforces the Israel-critical framework by strategically placing the strongest claims at the beginning and at the climax of the section.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Total score: 4/10

Definition: Outrage at certain positions, but not at comparable others.

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 03:30

Triggering event: The journalist asks Koskinen about Israel's "latest actions and plans"

Reaction: "They are shocking. Israel has not really paid attention to international law"

Comparison: Hamas's actions (use of civilians as shields, seizure of aid, holding of hostages) are not asked of anyone, nor are they subject to comparable moral assessment

Asymmetry: Clear — Israel's actions provoke strong moral reactions, Hamas's actions do not

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 12:10

Triggering event: Koskinen comments on Netanyahu's threat to launch full-scale military operations

Reaction: "This is truly irresponsible"

Comparison: Hamas's holding of hostages or firing of rockets at civilian areas is not described with a comparable term anywhere in the broadcast

Asymmetry: Clear — "irresponsible" is used only of Israel's actions

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 4/5

Summary: The broadcast allows strong moral condemnation of Israel's actions, but the same framework is not applied to Hamas's actions; this is a structural asymmetry.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — overall picture)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 6/10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast cover the topic?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:00–03:17

Missing perspective: Israel's official justification for the operations — destruction of Hamas, release of hostages, elimination of the security threat

Relevance: Without this context, the viewer cannot assess the justification or proportionality of the operations

Effect: The broadcast presents Israel's actions solely as a humanitarian catastrophe without a security policy context

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 07:20–18:33

Missing perspective: Obstacles to the two-state solution from the Palestinian side — Hamas's opposition, the Fatah–Hamas split, legitimacy problems of the Palestinian Authority

Relevance: Koskinen mentions the absence of elections for 19 years, but this is not analysed more deeply

Effect: Obstacles to the two-state solution are presented mainly as a consequence of Israel's actions, not as a result of Palestinian political fragmentation

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 19:15–27:41

Missing perspective: The effects of the fall in oil prices on developing countries and oil-dependent economies

Relevance: Eloranta focuses on Finland, the United States and Russia; a global perspective is absent

Effect: The analysis remains Western-centric

Summary: The broadcast is clearly incomplete regarding the Gaza conflict; the oil section is more comprehensive but still Western-centric.

Hard facts end — Soft facts begin

Soft facts — negotiable, not purely quantifiable



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Framing)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 6/10

Definition: How is the topic framed fundamentally?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:14

Quote: "Are the international community and Finland watching an ever-worsening crisis from the sidelines?"

Manipulation: The question frames the international community as a passive bystander and implicitly as culpable for the worsening of the situation.

Why problematic: The frame assumes that active intervention would be the right response; an alternative frame (e.g. "How does the international community balance Israel's security needs and humanitarian obligations?") would be more neutral.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:09

Quote: "For the audience this may fall into place as part of a kind of continuous stream of bad news that has come from the region since October 2023."

Manipulation: The journalist frames the coverage as a "stream of bad news" — this normalises the critical framing of Israel's actions and implicitly warns of news fatigue.

Why problematic: The frame guides the viewer to regard a critical attitude towards Israel as the correct reaction, not as one perspective among others.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 06:35

Quote: "You have previously wondered at the silence of Finland's political leadership regarding the situation in Gaza"

Manipulation: The journalist frames Finland's cautious foreign policy line as "silence" — a negatively charged term that implicitly demands more active criticism of Israel.

Why problematic: Cautious diplomacy can also be framed as "considered" or "strategic" — "silence" is a clearly critical frame.

Summary: The broadcast consistently frames the Gaza conflict as a humanitarian catastrophe in which Israel is the primary actor and the international community a passive bystander; this frame excludes alternative interpretations.



11. WORD CHOICES AND CONCEPTS

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 5/10

Definition: What language is used? What connotations are set?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 03:12

Quote: "the ethnic cleansing of the Gaza Strip."

Manipulation: "Ethnic cleansing" is a precisely defined term in international law, used here without legal analysis.

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "forced displacements" or "transfer of population" — "ethnic cleansing" is a strongly charged term that equates the situation with historical mass crimes.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 12:10

Quote: "This is truly irresponsible"

Manipulation: "Irresponsible" is a strong moral judgement used about the Israeli Prime Minister's actions without a contrary assessment.

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "controversial" or "internationally criticised" — "irresponsible" is a moral assessment by the journalist or guest, not a factual description.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:10

Quote: "Israel is planning to take control of even the entire Gaza Strip."

Manipulation: "Take control of" is a strongly charged expression that implies occupation or seizure.

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "Israel is planning to extend its military control over the Gaza area" — "taking control" is politically charged.

Summary: The broadcast consistently uses language critical of Israel's actions without comparable critical terminology for the actions of other parties.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 5/10

Definition: Asymmetries in follow-up questions, interruptions, expressions of sympathy.

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggering events with other guests did not produce an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 11:00

Triggering event: Kauma presents the information she received from Israel on humanitarian aid (25,000 trucks)

Quote (journalist): "Israel has not actually delivered aid. Israel's role has been to allow aid in."

Comparison: Stewart's claim of "ethnic cleansing" (03:12) does not receive a comparable correction or challenge from the journalist

Asymmetry: Clear — Kauma's information received from Israel is challenged immediately, but Stewart's strong claims are accepted without challenge

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 15:30

Triggering event: Kauma asks whether Israel's illegal settlement construction gives a veto over recognition

Quote (journalist): "So do you see that Israel's illegal settlement construction on the West Bank gives them a veto over this state?"

Comparison: Koskinen is not asked challenging questions of a comparable level regarding his positions

Asymmetry: Moderate — the question is leading and frames Kauma's position negatively

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 09:12

Triggering event: Koskinen has described Finland's actions as active

Quote (journalist): "Pia Kauma, Finland's actions in this matter were described as somewhat feeble. Should there be some toughening up here?"

Comparison: Koskinen's positions are not challenged in a comparable way

Asymmetry: Moderate — the government representative is challenged more often than the opposition representative

Summary: The journalist challenges the government representative (Kauma/National Coalition) more often and more directly than the opposition representative (Koskinen/SDP) or the researcher (Stewart); this is a structural asymmetry.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 5/10

Definition: Different levels of hardness of questions posed to different persons.

Asymmetry 1:

To Koskinen, 07:47: "Johannes Koskinen, what should Finland do now?" — soft, open question

To Kauma, 09:12: "Finland's actions in this matter were described as somewhat feeble. Should there be some toughening up here?" — challenging, implicitly critical

Comparison: Koskinen is given the opportunity to present his own agenda; Kauma is challenged to defend the government's actions

Asymmetry 2:

To Koskinen, 13:57: "Johannes Koskinen, when would be the right moment?" — neutral, open

To Kauma, 15:30: "So do you see that Israel's illegal settlement construction on the West Bank gives them a veto over this state?" — leading, frames Kauma's position negatively

Comparison: An open question is posed to Koskinen; a leading question containing implicit criticism is posed to Kauma

Asymmetry 3:

To Stewart, 01:20: "What do you find exceptional about Israel's latest actions?" — open, not challenging

To Kauma, 12:44: "Pia Kauma, what is Finland still waiting for? What would then be an appropriate moment?" — implicitly pressuring

Comparison: The researcher is not challenged; the government representative is repeatedly pressured

Summary: The question asymmetry is clear — the government representative (Kauma) is consistently challenged with harder questions than the opposition representative (Koskinen) or the researcher (Stewart).



14. FALSE BALANCE (Apparent balance)									3/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Total score: 3/10

Definition: Artificial balance despite real imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 04:14–04:27

Structure: "Pia Kauma, you are the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly [...] What is your own view of these Israeli plans? — They sound quite horrifying."

Analysis: The broadcast presents two political guests (Koskinen/SDP and Kauma/National Coalition) as if they were a balanced pair, even though both agree on condemning Israel's actions. The real political spectrum — e.g. voices defending or taking a more neutral stance on Israel's actions — is entirely absent.

Summary: The broadcast creates an apparent balance between two political guests, but both represent the same basic view; genuine plurality of voices is absent.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 6/10

Definition: What is normal/self-evident? What does not make it onto the agenda?

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Israel's actions are contrary to international law and a humanitarian catastrophe — this is presented as a starting point, not as a claim.

Timestamp: 00:52 — Evidence: "Israel has blocked food and medicine deliveries to the area for over two months"

Alternative agenda: Hamas's role as a sustainer of the conflict, the hostage question, Israel's security rationale — these do not make it onto the agenda as equal questions.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Finland should act more actively to put pressure on Israel — this is presented as a consensus.

Timestamp: 06:35 — Evidence: "You have previously wondered at the silence of Finland's political leadership"

Alternative agenda: Finland's cautious diplomacy can be seen as a strategic choice, not passivity; this perspective is not addressed.

Summary: The broadcast places the condemnation of Israel's actions and the demand for a more active Finnish role on the agenda as self-evident starting points, which excludes alternative political assessments.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Summary of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	5	Stewart's background organisation unknown; strong political terminology without contextualisation
2	Source selection	H	5	Humanitarian aid figures unverified; political sources dominate
3	Distribution of speaking time	H	3	Reasonably balanced between the two guests, but the Israeli voice is entirely absent
4	Omission	H	6	Israel's security perspective and Hamas's role systematically underrepresented
5	Number manipulation	H	4	Humanitarian aid figures without context; trade statistics without trend analysis
6	Guilt by association	H	4	"Ethnic cleansing" term without legal analysis
7	Timing	H	4	Strongest claims strategically placed at the beginning and at the climax of the section
8	Selective outrage	H	4	Israel's actions provoke moral reactions; Hamas's actions do not
9	Completeness	H	6	Clearly incomplete regarding the Gaza conflict; oil section more comprehensive
10	Framing	S	6	Conflict consistently framed as a humanitarian catastrophe without security context
11	Word choices	S	5	Language critical of Israel consistent; comparable not applied to Hamas
12	Moderation behaviour	S	5	Government representative challenged more often than opposition representative or researcher
13	Question asymmetry	S	5	Harder questions for Kauma than for Koskinen or Stewart
14	False balance	S	3	Two guests presented as a balance, even though both agree
15	Agenda-setting	S	6	Condemnation of Israel and demand for Finnish activity presented as self-evident

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (Criteria 1–9 average): 4.6 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (Criteria 10–15 average): 5.0 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average of all 15 criteria): 4.7 / 10

Dominant techniques

The three strongest techniques in this broadcast:



- 1. Framing (Score 6):** The Gaza conflict is consistently framed as a humanitarian catastrophe in which Israel is the primary actor and the international community a passive bystander. This frame is set in the very first sentence of the broadcast and is maintained throughout the Gaza section without alternative interpretive frameworks.
- 2. Omission (Score 6):** Israel's security perspective, Hamas's role as a sustainer of the conflict, and the legitimacy problems of the Palestinian Authority are systematically left unaddressed. This creates an unbalanced picture of the conflict's dynamics, in which only one party appears as an actor.
- 3. Agenda-setting (Score 6):** The broadcast places the condemnation of Israel's actions and the demand for a more active Finnish role on the agenda as self-evident starting points. Alternative political assessments — such as the strategic rationale for cautious diplomacy or the emphasis on Hamas's responsibility — are not addressed as equal perspectives.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "Israel's actions in Gaza are contrary to international law and a humanitarian catastrophe that the international community must address more actively."

Technique: Framing and omission — Evidence: 00:52, 03:12, 07:20

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "The Finnish government's cautious line on Gaza is insufficient and requires toughening up."

Technique: Question asymmetry and agenda-setting — Evidence: 06:35, 09:12, 12:44

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "The fall in oil prices weakens Russia's war chest and may increase willingness for peace, but for the Finnish economy it brings only marginal relief."

Technique: Expert analysis, balanced — Evidence: 23:45, 26:06, 27:21

Classification of degree of manipulation

Justification: The broadcast's total score (4.7/10) falls on the boundary between mild tendency and clear one-sidedness. The Gaza section is clearly one-sided: Israel's security perspective is absent, the term "ethnic cleansing" is used without legal analysis, and the government representative is challenged more harshly than the opposition representative. The oil section is considerably more balanced, which lowers the overall score. From the perspective of Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy, the Gaza section is problematic, as it does not meet the requirement for diverse and impartial information.

CONCLUSION

The A-Studio broadcast covers the humanitarian crisis in Gaza and oil markets, but the Gaza section is structurally imbalanced. Israel's security perspective and Hamas's role as a party to the conflict are systematically underrepresented, while voices critical of Israel's actions dominate both the expert and political sections. The diverse and comprehensive information required by Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy is not achieved in the Gaza section, because a key party — Israel — does not get to speak, and its actions are described using strongly charged terminology ("ethnic cleansing", "irresponsible") without contextualisation. The oil section is considerably more balanced and better fulfils public service obligations. Overall, the broadcast leans slightly in the direction of a left-liberal foreign policy line, particularly in terms of the Gaza framing.



OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	5/10	Significant bias
2	SOURCE SELECTION	5/10	Significant bias
3	DISTRIBUTION OF SPEAKING TIME	3/10	Mild bias
4	OMISSION (Selective Omission)	6/10	Significant bias
5	NUMBER MANIPULATION	4/10	Mild bias
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION (Guilt by association)	4/10	Mild bias
7	TIMING	4/10	Mild bias
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	4/10	Mild bias
9	COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — overall picture)	6/10	Significant bias
10	FRAMING (Framing)	6/10	Significant bias
11	WORD CHOICES AND CONCEPTS	5/10	Significant bias
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	5/10	Significant bias
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	5/10	Significant bias
14	FALSE BALANCE (Apparent balance)	3/10	Mild bias
15	AGENDA-SETTING	6/10	Significant bias

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

5.2/10

Significant imbalance

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

5.0/10

Significant imbalance

TOTAL SCORE

5.1/10

Significant imbalance

Hard facts and soft facts average



LEGEND — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No significant deviation observed.
1–2	Weak finding	Mild deviation without material impact on impartiality.
3–4	Mild–moderate finding	Identifiable tendency; materiality of impact minor–moderate.
5	Moderate finding, with impact	Material bias that affects audience opinion formation.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores of 6 and above are classified as significant findings.
7	Significant finding	Clear, well-documented bias with a clear impact.
8–9	Serious finding	Strong bias; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic, pervasive bias in this criterion.

Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Imperceptible	No significant patterns observed; broadcast meets the impartiality requirement.
2.6 – 4.0	Mild bias	Individual deviations; statistically visible, but within tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Significant bias	Multiple significant findings; material weakening of diversity of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation	Strong patterns crossing broadcast boundaries; high materiality of impact.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systematic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias	Maximum severity in almost all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-political bias (-5 ... +5)

-5 ... -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime or presentation.
-2 ... -1	Mildly disadvantaged	Identifiable but mild disadvantaging.
0	Neutral	No discernible favouring or disadvantaging.
+1 ... +2	Mildly favoured	Identifiable but mild favouring.
+3 ... +5	Strongly favoured	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL ASSESSMENT (Act on Yleisradio Oy, Section 7)

Assessment pursuant to Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy

Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy requires diverse and comprehensive information, impartiality and the promotion of pluralism.

Violation 1:

Norm: Act on Yleisradio Oy, Section 7 — diverse and comprehensive information

Facts: A key party to the Gaza conflict, Israel, does not get to speak in the broadcast. Israel's official perspective on the objectives and justifications for the operations is entirely absent; instead, Israel's actions are assessed solely from critical perspectives.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:00–18:33 — The entire Gaza section is covered without an Israeli representative or an expert presenting Israel's perspective impartially.

Assessment: This is a clear violation of the diversity requirement of Section 7. The systematic absence of one of the conflict's key parties does not meet the requirement for comprehensive information.

Violation 2:

Norm: Act on Yleisradio Oy, Section 7 — impartiality

Facts: The term "ethnic cleansing" used by researcher Stewart (03:12) is presented as expert analysis without the journalist requesting legal clarification or a contrary view. The term is precisely defined in international law and its application to the situation in Gaza is contested.

Evidence: Timestamp 03:12 — "the ethnic cleansing of the Gaza Strip." (repeated twice)

Assessment: The use of a strongly charged legal term without contextualisation or challenge violates the impartiality requirement.

Violation 3:

Norm: Act on Yleisradio Oy, Section 7 — promotion of pluralism

Facts: The government representative (Kauma/National Coalition) is consistently challenged with harder questions than the opposition representative (Koskinen/SDP). This creates a structural asymmetry that does not promote pluralism but favours the views of the opposition representative.

Evidence: Timestamp 09:12 — "Finland's actions in this matter were described as somewhat feeble" (to Kauma); vs. 07:47 — "what should Finland do now?" (to Koskinen, open question)

Assessment: The question asymmetry is a structural problem that undermines the realisation of pluralism.

Overall assessment pursuant to Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy

The Gaza section of the broadcast does not meet the requirement for diverse, comprehensive and impartial information required by Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy in three key respects: Israel's perspective is entirely absent, strongly charged terminology is used without contextualisation, and the treatment of political guests is asymmetric. The oil section better meets the requirements of the law, as it is based on academic expert analysis and presents a more balanced picture of the situation. Overall, the broadcast is on the borderline of the law's requirements: a single broadcast does not necessarily require perfect balance, but the structural deficiencies of the Gaza section are so consistent that they exceed the threshold of incidental editorial choice. It would be advisable to ensure that in comparable broadcasts, the perspectives of all key parties to the conflict are addressed in a balanced manner.

SOURCE DEPTH CHECK (Mandatory for all cited experts / organisations / advisory bodies)

Timo R. Stewart, senior researcher



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

- 1. FUNDING:** Background organisation not mentioned in the broadcast. This is in itself a problem — the viewer cannot assess the source of funding or possible conflicts of interest.
- 2. MANDATE:** Unclear; the title "senior researcher" does not indicate the field of research, institution or mandate.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Not identifiable due to the absence of a background organisation; this is a structural problem.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - U1 Conflict of interest: 0 (unknown)
 - U2 Personal risk: +1
 - U3 Expertise: +1
 - U4 Consistency: 0
 - U5 Emotion vs. data: -1
 - U6 Source level: 0
 - TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- 5. OPPOSING VOICE:** Not provided; a researcher on Israeli security policy or an expert in international law would have balanced the analysis.

Jari Eloranta, professor of economic history

- 1. FUNDING:** University professor — public funding; no apparent conflict of interest in the analysis of oil markets.
- 2. MANDATE:** Economic history is a relevant background; however, forecasting current markets is a different specialisation.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No identifiable institutional conflict of interest.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**
 - U1 Conflict of interest: +2
 - U2 Personal risk: +1
 - U3 Expertise: +1
 - U4 Consistency: +1
 - U5 Emotion vs. data: +2
 - U6 Source level: +1
 - TOTAL: +8 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
- 5. OPPOSING VOICE:** An analyst specialising in energy economics could have deepened the analysis; however, Eloranta's analysis is reasonably balanced.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that is itself open to question.

Legal and methodological framework

Not a verification of facts

The findings presented are not verifications of facts about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are the result of standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.

Not a legal assessment

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment pursuant to Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy. The assessment of whether a particular broadcast violates statutory requirements falls exclusively within the competence of the relevant authorities (in particular Traficom).

Not proof of causality

Statistical correlations should not be interpreted as evidence of causal connections or editorial intentions. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, the news situation, political controversy or format logic.



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

**Not an assessment
of intent**

The analysis measures the observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant bias was observed — 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 identification across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual parts. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not precise legal classification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Finland — YLE (Yleisradio Oy)

Law

Act on Yleisradio Oy (1380/1993), last amended 27.6.2025/412

Relevant articles

- Section 7(2)(1) (Special tasks of public service programming): Public service programming shall in particular support democracy and the opportunities for participation of all by providing diverse information, opinions and discussions as well as opportunities for interaction.

(Die öffentlich-rechtliche Programmtätigkeit soll insbesondere die Demokratie und die Teilhabemöglichkeiten aller unterstützen, indem sie vielfältige Informationen, Meinungen und Debatten sowie Interaktionsmöglichkeiten anbietet.)

- Section 7(4) (inserted 27.6.2025/412): The company shall through its activities promote freedom of expression, high-quality journalism and media diversity.

(Das Unternehmen soll durch seine Tätigkeit die Meinungsfreiheit, hochwertigen Journalismus und Medienvielfalt fördern.)

- Section 7(5) (inserted 27.6.2025/412): The company shall promote transparency in its finances and operations.

(Das Unternehmen soll die Transparenz seiner Finanzen und seiner Tätigkeit fördern.)

Structural difference from Switzerland

Wichtig: Das finnische Gesetz definiert den öffentlich-rechtlichen AUFTRAG (Demokratie, Kultur, Bildung, Sprachen, Minderheiten), schreibt aber NICHT explizit vor, WIE Journalismus zu betreiben ist. Anders als Art. 4 RTVG (Sachgerechtigkeit, Meinungsvielfalt, Ausgewogenheit) gibt es keine gesetzliche Verpflichtung zu:

- Impartiality (Unparteilichkeit) — only self-regulatory (YSO)
- Factual accuracy (Sachgerechtigkeit) — only self-regulatory (JSN)
- Political balance (Politische Balance) — not mentioned anywhere explicitly

Die Unparteilichkeitspflicht kommt aus YLEs internen Ethikrichtlinien (YSO):

> "Asetamme tasapuolisuuden tavoitteeksi ohjelma- ja sisältötuotannossamme kokonaisuudessaan sekä myös yksittäisissä ohjelmissa."

> (Wir setzen uns Unparteilichkeit als Ziel in unserer gesamten Programm- und Inhaltsproduktion sowie auch in einzelnen Sendungen.)

Core obligations (Law + Self-regulation)

- 1. Diversity (Vielfalt):** Vielfältige Informationen, Meinungen und Debatten (Section 7(2)(1))
- 2. High-quality journalism (Hochwertiger Journalismus):** Förderung qualitativer Standards (Section 7(4))
- 3. Media diversity (Medienvielfalt):** Förderung der Medienvielfalt (Section 7(4))
- 4. Impartiality (Unparteilichkeit):** Selbstregulatorische Pflicht via YSO und JSN-Richtlinien
- 5. Transparency (Transparenz):** Transparenz über Finanzen und Tätigkeit (Section 7(5))

Supervisory authority



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

- Parliamentary Administrative Council (Parlamentarischer Verwaltungsrat): Max. 21 vom Parlament gewählte Mitglieder. Überwacht die Erfüllung des öffentlich-rechtlichen Auftrags nach 7 §. Erstattet jährlich Bericht ans Parlament.
- TRAFICOM (Finnish Transport and Communications Agency): Regulierungsbehörde. Überwacht NUR wirtschaftliche Aspekte (7c §, 8 §, 12 §) — NICHT den redaktionellen Inhalt.
- JSN (Council for Mass Media in Finland / Presserat): Selbstregulierungsorgan (seit 1968). Behandelt Beschwerden gegen journalistische Inhalte. KEIN gesetzliches Mandat — Entscheide sind nicht rechtsverbindlich, müssen aber publiziert werden. ~700 Beschwerden/Jahr, ~75 Entscheide.

Complaints procedure

1. YLE customer feedback system (YLE-Publikumsfeedback)
2. JSN (Council for Mass Media in Finland) — Beschwerde innert 3 Monaten, kostenlos
3. Allgemeine Gerichte (keine spezialisierte Beschwerdeinstanz wie die Schweizer UBI)

Comparison CH — FI

Aspect	Switzerland (Art. 4 RTVG)	Finland (Section 7 Act on Yleisradio Oy)
Sachgerechtigkeit	Gesetzlich	Nur selbstregulatorisch (YSO/JSN)
Meinungsvielfalt	Gesetzlich	Implizit ("monipuolisia tietoja, mielipiteitä")
Unparteilichkeit	Gesetzlich	Nur selbstregulatorisch (JSN)
Politische Balance	Abgeleitet	Nicht erwähnt
Unabhängige Beschwerdeinstanz	UBI (gesetzlich)	Keine (nur JSN, selbstregulatorisch)
Inhaltsaufsicht durch Regulator	BAKOM/UBI	Nein — TRAFICOM nur Wirtschaft
Redaktioneller Schutz	Via RTVG	6d § (neu 2025): Schutz vor Entlassung wegen redaktioneller Entscheide



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC SOURCES

Literature

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – 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

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



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

Assessments and membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you can find detailed assessments and you can also order analyses of any broadcast (billed separately). To ensure the quality of our work we are dependent on membership and supporter fees.

Contact details and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Payee: 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 at www.svfab.ch or kontakt@svfab.ch



Unbalanced reporting is a response to the Swiss halving initiative: manipulation techniques are explained in detail, from personnel selection to source selection. 15 principles are then explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, removal of context and much more, illustrated with numerous examples. In addition, it becomes visible where we ourselves apply these techniques — which promotes not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally, the book comes with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



An interview is not a conversation. It is a stage – and someone else has written the script.

Those who are unaware of this unknowingly deliver material. Good quotes, that are cut wrongly. Correct statements, that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers, that are framed as admissions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolkit – for everyone, who has a microphone in front of them and who wants to know, what can be done about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three fundamental principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, delimiting. Preparation in an 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 that they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Straightforward. As a reference work for preparation, for preparation, for post-processing and for difficult situations



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



You think you are seeing the world. In reality you are seeing a frame, that someone has placed around it. Framing is the world's oldest and most elegant manipulation technique. It does not change the facts – it changes what, we think about them. What we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works – because we all are part of it. Every day. Without being aware of it. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook – playful, straightforward and full of real-life examples. You will learn not only how, others frame you but also, how you, frame others yourself – and how you can use this technique consciously and fairly.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Hear the news differently. Engage in conversations more confidently. And no longer allow a frame chosen by someone else to be so easily imposed on them.

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and with a smile from time to time.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.