



YLE DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-05-21_Suomen linja Gazan sodassa

Broadcast: YLE-Sendung | 2025-05-21 | Analysed: 2026-05-22 18:28

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

TOTAL SCORE

5.5/10

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 (NCP), Finns Party (PS), Swedish People's Party (SFP/RKP) and Christian Democrats (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, open asylum policy
SDP	3.6 (left)	43	Opposition	Welfare state, trade unions, pro-EU
Greens	3.9 (left)	13	Opposition	Climate, liberal immigration, EU integration
Centre Party	5.7 (right)	23	Opposition	Rural areas, bioenergy, decentralisation
SFP/RKP	6.4 (right)	9	Government	Bilingualism, economic liberalism
KD	7.6 (right)	5	Government	Traditional family, Christian values
Movement Now	7.6 (right)	1	Opposition	Market economy, individual freedom
National Coalition	7.8 (right)	48	Government (PM Orpo)	Tax cuts, curbing indebtedness
Finns Party	8.2 (right)	46	Government	Strict immigration, EU scepticism, national sovereignty

The Orpo government's austerity policy has generated strong confrontation with trade unions and the left-wing opposition. Immigration and asylum policy sharply divides the government parties (especially the Finns Party) and the opposition. In foreign and security policy, Finland's role after NATO membership and the relationship with Russia are key issues. The Gaza conflict has also raised tensions within the government, particularly regarding the Finns Party's and KD's stance on Israel.

Yleisradio (Yle) is a 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 the level of trust in the media is high by international standards. The Finns Party has been critical of Yle and has pushed for reform of the Yle tax.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Accuracy in the presentation of parties' programme positions

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast presentation vs. programme position
SDP	0	Party does not appear directly in the broadcast; neither presented nor distorted
National Coalition	+1	Foreign Minister Valtonen (National Coalition) represents the government's line on supporting international law — consistent with the party's pro-EU, rules-based foreign policy; presentation is largely correct, though internal government tensions remain superficial
Finns Party	-2	22:45 "According to Jani Mäkelä, there is more fuss about Gaza than there should be" — the Finns Party's critical view on Israel is mentioned in passing without context or a statement from a Finns Party representative; the party's position is presented as deviant and implicitly problematic in relation to the government's line
Centre Party	0	Party does not appear in the broadcast; neither presented nor distorted
Greens	0	Party does not appear in the broadcast; neither presented nor distorted
Left Alliance	0	Party does not appear in the broadcast; neither presented nor distorted
SFP/RKP	0	Party does not appear directly in the broadcast; Valtonen also represents SFP/RKP's value base, but the party is not mentioned by name

Party bias summary

- Most accurate presentation: National Coalition, score +1
- Strongest distortion: Finns Party, score -2
- Average deviation from zero: 0.4
- Summary: The broadcast deals primarily with foreign policy through the minister of one government party (National Coalition). The Finns Party is mentioned only as an internal disruptive factor without its own statement, which distorts the presentation of the party's position. No other parties are covered at all, so a broader party-political comparison cannot be made.

Left-right overall tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -0.5

CLASSIFICATION: Impartial / slightly favouring the right

Justification: The broadcast gives the main speaking time to the government's foreign minister (National Coalition), whose line is presented in a predominantly positive light. The views of opposition parties are not heard at all. On the other hand, on the Gaza issue the journalist's questions are critical of the government's actions, which balances the overall tendency. The net effect is slightly favouring the right due to the government's dominant presence.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMING

Broadcast information

- Title: A-studio
- Date (from filename): No filename provided; based on content, May 2025
- Estimated duration: approximately 38 minutes (last timestamp 38:20)
- Journalist/presenter: Unnamed presenter (not mentioned in transcript)
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Role	Party/Background organisation	Political spectrum
Elina Valtonen	Foreign Minister	National Coalition	Right (7.8)
Martti (surname not mentioned)	Former Ministry for Foreign Affairs official / expert	Non-partisan	Not determinable
Johanna Rainio-Niemi	Researcher (likely historian)	Non-partisan	Not determinable
Unto (surname not mentioned)	Expert / commentator	Non-partisan	Not determinable

Main topic

The broadcast covers Finnish foreign policy in two main areas: the humanitarian crisis in Gaza and Israel's actions, and President Stubb's international role and Finland's foreign policy position.

Perspectives relevant to a balanced broadcast

- * Israel's official position: Hamas terrorist attacks and the hostage situation justify military action
- * Palestinian civilians' experience: humanitarian catastrophe on the ground
- * Expert view on international law: is it genocide or not, legal analysis
- * Opposition view on Finnish foreign policy (SDP, Greens, Left Alliance)
- * Internal government disagreement: Finns Party's and KD's views on Israel
- * Ethics of Finland's arms exports and purchases: defence expert's view
- * Ukraine conflict peace process: Ukrainian or Russian perspective
- * Criticism of Stubb's foreign policy activism: is visibility real influence?
- * Comparison with other small EU countries: how do others act in similar situations?
- * Civil society and human rights organisations' view of Finland's actions

Check: Was each perspective covered?

[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Israel's official position is not presented at all; Israel's actions are assessed exclusively from a critical perspective without Israel's own voice.

[B] COVERED

Timestamp: 02:15 — Quote: "Sufficient food or medicine, if any, has not been getting through." — Assessment: The situation of civilians is described, but exclusively through Valtonen, not directly from the scene.

[C] OMITTED



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

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The concept of genocide is used on several occasions without a legal analysis from an international law expert.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No opposition politician is interviewed; the opposition's view on Finnish foreign policy is entirely absent.

[E] HINTED AT

Timestamp: 22:45 — Quote: "According to Jani Mäkelä, there is more fuss about Gaza than there should be." — Assessment: Mentioned in passing without a statement from a Finns Party or KD representative.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The ethics of Finland's arms purchases are not analysed from a defence expert's perspective; Valtonen's answer remains at a general level.

[G] HINTED AT

Timestamp: 26:30 — Quote: "The most important thing is to understand that even in the case of Ukraine, it is primarily Ukraine and Russia that should negotiate the matter." — Assessment: The Ukraine section is covered, but a Ukrainian or Russian voice is absent.

[H] COVERED

Timestamp: 31:45 — Quote: "Probably nothing yet. It is already a value in itself that he is at those tables." — Assessment: Criticism is presented, but cautiously and ultimately in a positive tone.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The foreign policy activities of other small EU countries are not compared with Finland.

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The view of civil society or human rights organisations on Finland's actions is entirely absent.

Coverage score: 3/10

Justification: The broadcast covers comprehensively only the humanitarian situation in Gaza and Stubb's international profile. Israel's own voice, opposition politicians, international law experts and civil society are entirely absent. Three out of ten perspectives are covered even partially.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts — quantifiable and scientifically reliable

Hardfacts — 9 quantifiable and scientifically verifiable techniques

1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total score: 6/10

Definition: Who gets to speak as an expert?

Expert 1: Elina Valtonen, Foreign Minister (National Coalition)

Timestamp: 00:24

Statement: "It was a serious and condemnable situation. Firing on civilians is always wrong."

Positioning: Minister of a government party (National Coalition); represents the government's official line

Missing countervoice: An opposition politician or independent foreign policy expert

Source deep check:

(a) FUNDING: Minister in state service; funded from the state budget. Conflict of interest: represents the government's line, not an independent assessor.

(b) MANDATE: The foreign minister's role is to represent the government's foreign policy line — not compatible with neutral assessment.

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

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Minister represents the government's position; not independent

D2 Personal risk: -1 — Minister has a political interest in presenting the government's line favourably

D3 Expertise: +2 — Foreign minister is competent on foreign policy matters

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — The line has been consistent throughout the government term

D5 Emotion vs. data: 0 — Combines both emotional expressions ("shocking") and fact-based references

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source for the government's position, but not an independent expert

• TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Valtonen is presented in the broadcast as the primary expert without sufficiently emphasising her role as a government representative — this is technique no. 2 (source selection).

Expert 2: Martti (surname not mentioned), former Ministry for Foreign Affairs official

Timestamp: 29:10

Statement: "I joined the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in the 70s. In the 80s we were emphasised how important it is for Finland to be active in foreign policy."

Positioning: Long-serving official; represents an institutional continuity perspective

Missing countervoice: A critical foreign policy researcher or younger-generation expert

Source deep check:

(a) FUNDING: Retired official; no direct institutional ties. Possible loyalty to former employer.



(b) MANDATE: No official mandate; appears as a commentator.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

- D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No direct institutional interest
- D2 Personal risk: +1 — Retired; less political pressure
- D3 Expertise: +2 — Extensive experience at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs
- D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent historical perspective
- D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 — Primarily analytical
- D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source; no primary data

• TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

Expert 3: Johanna Rainio-Niemi, researcher

Timestamp: 30:05

Statement: "I see it the same way. In a sense, a fairly old tradition is being reinterpreted here."

Positioning: Academic researcher; likely a historian

Missing countervoice: A critical foreign policy researcher or international law expert

Source deep check:

(a) FUNDING: Likely employed by a university; public funding. No direct conflict of interest.

(b) MANDATE: Academic researcher; compatible with neutral assessment.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

- D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No apparent conflict of interest
- D2 Personal risk: +1 — Academic freedom provides protection
- D3 Expertise: +1 — Historian; history of foreign policy is relevant, but not international law
- D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent
- D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 — Analytical
- D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source

• TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

Missing expert groups:

- Professor of international law (legal analysis of the concept of genocide)
- Israeli or Palestinian representative
- Defence expert (strategic and ethical assessment of arms purchases)

Summary (matrix result):

- Valtonen (foreign minister): YELLOW (+1) — government representative, not independent
- Martti (former official): GREEN (+6) — experienced, no direct conflict of interest
- Rainio-Niemi (researcher): GREEN (+5) — academic, relevant background



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: Government report on foreign and security policy

Timestamp: 23:10 — Statement: "It has been recorded in the foreign and security policy report not only by the government but also by the entire parliament."

(a) Funding and governance: State document; produced by the government

(b) Structural conflict of interest: A government minister refers to the government's own document to justify its own actions — circular reasoning

(c) Missing counter-source: Independent assessment of the adequacy of the report or dissenting opinions from opposition parties

Source 2: EU decisions and sanction packages

Timestamp: 26:00 — Statement: "Yesterday the EU decided on the 17th sanctions package."

(a) Funding and governance: Official EU decision; primary source

(b) Structural conflict of interest: No direct conflict of interest; EU decisions are public

(c) Missing counter-source: Independent research assessing the actual effectiveness of the sanctions

Source 3: Satellite images of Rafah

Timestamp: 10:30 — Statement: "Here is the city of Rafah in Gaza in February and May 2025. The images show that Rafah has been practically razed to the ground over a large area."

(a) Funding and governance: The source of the images is not mentioned (satellite company, news agency?)

(b) Structural conflict of interest: The origin and context of the images remain unclear

(c) Missing counter-source: Israel's explanation of the targets of operations and civilian evacuation

Rumour check (penalty points):

No actual rumours are detected, but the concept of genocide is used repeatedly without legal confirmation from a primary source.

Summary: Sources are mainly official (government documents, EU decisions), but independent expert sources are few. The origin of the satellite images remains unclear.



3. DISTRIBUTION OF SPEAKING TIME

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 5/10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time between different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Elina Valtonen (Foreign Minister, National Coalition): approximately 12 min. (32%)
- Martti (expert): approximately 6 min. (16%)
- Johanna Rainio-Niemi (researcher): approximately 5 min. (13%)
- Unto (expert): approximately 5 min. (13%)
- Presenter: approximately 10 min. (26%)

Summary: The government representative (Valtonen) has clearly the most speaking time. All three experts represent predominantly the same positive view of Stubb's activism and Finnish foreign policy. There are no persons representing a critical or opposing view.



4. OMISSION (Selective omission)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total score: 7/10

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

Omission 1:

Context: Israel's official position and the context of Hamas terrorist attacks

Relevant at: 01:30 — "An increasingly widespread perception is that Israel is committing genocide."

Effect: The viewer receives a one-sided picture of the conflict without Israel's perspective; Hamas's attacks of 7 October 2023 are mentioned only in passing ("after the horrific terrorist attacks") without broader contextualisation.

Omission 2:

Context: Statements from Finns Party and KD representatives on the internal government disagreement

Relevant at: 22:45 — "According to Jani Mäkelä, there is more fuss about Gaza than there should be."

Effect: The internal government disagreement is presented as a problem without the representatives of those parties being given the opportunity to explain their position; the impression is created that the Finns Party and KD are inappropriate deviants.

Omission 3:

Context: Concrete details of Finland's arms purchases and ethical assessment

Relevant at: 20:00 — "Finland continues its arms purchases from Israel. Why?"

Effect: Valtonen's answer remains vague ("significant capability", "everyone understands"); the absence of a defence expert or ethical assessment leaves the question effectively open.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits Israel's own voice, the voice of the internal government opposition and independent expert assessment. These omissions together create a one-sided picture of both the Gaza conflict and Finnish foreign policy.

Missing voices

- A representative of the Israeli government or the Israeli ambassador in Helsinki: Would have brought Israel's official position on the justification for military operations and the Hamas threat
- A professor of international law: Would have legally analysed whether the criteria for genocide are met under the Rome Statute or the UN Genocide Convention
- A Finns Party or KD representative: Would have explained the background to the internal government disagreement and the party's own position
- An SDP or Greens representative: Would have brought the opposition's view on the adequacy of Finnish foreign policy
- A defence expert or researcher from the National Defence University: Would have analysed the strategic significance and ethical questions of Finland's arms purchases
- A representative of a humanitarian aid organisation (e.g. Red Cross or Unicef Finland): Would have brought a concrete field perspective on the obstacles to aid delivery
- An expert on Ukraine or Russian policy: Would have deepened the assessment of the effectiveness of sanctions policy



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

- A critic of Finnish foreign policy: Would have challenged Stubb's line based on "values-based realism" more systematically



5. NUMBER MANIPULATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Total score: 3/10

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 12:15

Figure: "50,000 people have been killed"

Dimensions: Absolute value presented (a); relative proportion (b) and trend (c) are missing

Missing context: No mention of where the figure comes from (Hamas administration's health ministry?), whether it has been independently verified, or how it breaks down between civilians and combatants

Effect: The figure is presented as an uncontested fact, even though its source and methodology are disputed

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 26:00

Figure: "17th sanctions package" / "18th sanctions package"

Dimensions: Absolute value (a) presented; the actual economic impact of the sanctions (b) and the trend of the Russian economy (c) are missing

Missing context: No assessment of whether the sanctions have had a measurable impact on Russia's war capacity

Effect: The number of sanctions packages creates an impression of activity without an assessment of effectiveness

Summary: Two significant figures are presented without adequate contextualisation. The casualty figure in particular is problematic because its source is not mentioned.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION (Contact guilt)

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 2/10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 22:45

Quote: "According to Jani Mäkelä, there is more fuss about Gaza than there should be. Are you bothered by the dissenting voices in the government?"

Technique: The Finns Party representative's position is presented as a "dissenting voice" — a word with a negative connotation; implicit association with inappropriate deviation

Effect: The Finns Party's position is presented as a disruptive factor without being treated as a legitimate political view

Association 2:

Timestamp: 24:00

Quote: "If one accepts genocide somewhere, one can accept it elsewhere too. The Finnish government does not accept genocide anywhere. If there are parties in Finland that accept genocide in Gaza, it logically follows that it can be accepted elsewhere too."

Technique: Valtonen's statement creates an implicit association: those who do not use the word genocide (such as the Finns Party) are associated with accepting genocide

Effect: A politically very powerful association that discredits critical voices without direct naming

Summary: Outright chains of association are rare, but Valtonen's statement about accepting genocide is a politically significant implicit association that goes unchallenged by the presenter.



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:

Position: 00:01 (beginning)

Content: "Gaza is starving. Others are pondering what should be done. Finland continues its arms purchases from Israel. Why?"

Timing effect: The broadcast begins with a powerful emotional framing that places Finland's arms purchases in a morally questionable light before the matter has been addressed at all; the viewer is already framed before Valtonen's response

Finding 2:

Position: 38:05 (end)

Content: "Tomorrow A-talk will continue on the difficult situation in the Middle East. Annika Damström's guests will be experts and politicians."

Timing effect: The promise of broader coverage tomorrow may serve as a justification for today's one-sided coverage, but does not remove the imbalance of this broadcast

Summary: The broadcast's opening text is clearly framing and emotional; it places Finland's arms purchases in a morally problematic light before substantive coverage.



8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Total score: 4/10

Definition: Indignation towards certain positions, but not towards 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: 12:00

Triggering event: The presenter shows satellite images of Rafah and asks: "It looks as though nothing humane applies there."

Reaction: "That is so. It is good that these images are visible to everyone." — Valtonen confirms the presenter's emotional framing

Comparison: When describing Hamas's terrorist attacks (02:50 "after the horrific terrorist attacks"), no comparable images or equally powerful emotional framing are presented

Asymmetry: Israel's actions are visualised with satellite images; Hamas's attacks are not visualised in a comparable way

Degree of indignation: 3/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 22:45

Triggering event: The presenter mentions Finns Party's Jani Mäkelä's comment about "fussing" over Gaza

Reaction: "Are you bothered by the dissenting voices in the government?" — the presenter frames the Finns Party's position as a disruptive deviation

Comparison: Valtonen's statement about accepting genocide (24:00) is not challenged with a comparable critical question, even though it is a politically at least equally powerful claim

Asymmetry: The Finns Party's position is challenged critically; Valtonen's powerful statement is left unchallenged

Degree of indignation: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Summary: Selective indignation occurs in two places: Israel's actions are visualised more powerfully than Hamas's attacks, and the Finns Party's position is challenged more critically than Valtonen's powerful statements.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective omission — overall picture)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total score: 7/10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast describe the topic?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:30

Missing perspective/fact: Israel's official position and the broader context of Hamas terrorist attacks

Relevance: Balanced coverage of the conflict requires presenting the views of both parties

Effect: The viewer receives a one-sided picture in which Israel is exclusively the guilty party

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 20:00

Missing perspective/fact: The concrete content of Finland's arms purchases, strategic justification and ethical assessment

Relevance: The broadcast raises arms purchases as a central issue but leaves it effectively unaddressed

Effect: The viewer is left without information about what Finland is buying, why and on what terms

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 22:45

Missing perspective/fact: Finns Party and KD representatives' own explanation of their position

Relevance: Internal government disagreement is politically significant; addressing it through only one party is incomplete

Effect: The Finns Party and KD are presented as problematic deviants without their own voice

Summary: The broadcast is systematically incomplete in three key areas: Israel's voice, the content of arms purchases and the internal government disagreement all remain insufficiently addressed.

Soft facts — negotiable, not purely quantifiable



Softfacts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame of reference)

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 7/10

Definition: How is the topic framed fundamentally?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:01

Quote: "Gaza is starving. Others are pondering what should be done. Finland continues its arms purchases from Israel. Why?"

Manipulation: The broadcast begins by framing Finland's arms purchases as morally problematic in relation to the famine in Gaza — a causal relationship that is not substantiated

Why problematic: The viewer is framed before substantive coverage; the connection between Finland's arms purchases and the humanitarian situation in Gaza is implicit, not analysed

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:45

Quote: "An increasingly widespread perception is that Israel is committing genocide."

Manipulation: The "increasingly widespread perception" frame presents the genocide interpretation as a growing consensus without legal or scientific confirmation

Why problematic: The frame creates the impression that the genocide interpretation is approaching general acceptance, even though it remains disputed from the perspective of international law

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 28:30

Quote: "Finland and President Stubb are very prominently present at the focal points of international politics."

Manipulation: Stubb's international visibility is framed as an inherently positive achievement; critical assessment comes only later and remains secondary

Why problematic: The frame guides the viewer to assess Stubb's activities through visibility rather than effectiveness

Summary: The broadcast's framing is systematically one-sided: the Gaza conflict is framed through Israel's guilt, Finland's arms purchases are framed as morally problematic and Stubb's activism is framed as inherently positive.



11. WORD CHOICES AND CONCEPTS

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 6/10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:45

Quote: "An increasingly widespread perception is that Israel is committing genocide."

Manipulation: "Genocide" is a legally very precise concept (UN Genocide Convention 1948); its use without legal analysis is misleading

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "Some human rights organisations and states have used the concept of genocide; the International Court of Justice is examining the matter."

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 22:45

Quote: "Are you bothered by the dissenting voices in the government?"

Manipulation: "Dissenting voice" is a negatively charged word that describes deviation from the norm; it implicitly positions the Finns Party's stance as inappropriate

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "There are differing views within the government — how do you comment on this?"

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:01

Quote: "Gaza is starving."

Manipulation: "Is starving" is a powerfully emotional expression that sets the situation as extreme right at the start of the broadcast

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "Gaza is facing a serious humanitarian crisis in which food availability has deteriorated significantly."

Summary: Word choices are repeatedly emotionally charged and one-sided; in particular, the use of the genocide concept without legal context is journalistically problematic.



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: 12:00

Triggering event: The presenter shows satellite images of Rafah

Quote (presenter): "It looks as though nothing humane applies there."

Comparison: When describing Hamas's terrorist attacks (02:50), the presenter does not make a comparable emotional comment

Asymmetry: The presenter clearly takes a position on Israel's actions, but not in a comparable way on Hamas's actions — the triggering event (satellite images) does not produce a comparable reaction in connection with Hamas's attacks

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 24:00

Triggering event: Valtonen makes a powerful statement about accepting genocide

Quote (presenter): [Does not challenge the statement]

Comparison: In connection with Finns Party's Mäkelä's comment (22:45), the presenter asks critically "Are you bothered by the dissenting voices?"

Asymmetry: Valtonen's politically powerful statement is left unchallenged, while the Finns Party's position is challenged critically — the triggering event (a powerful political claim) produces a different reaction depending on who presents it

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 20:00

Triggering event: The presenter asks about the continuation of Finland's arms purchases

Quote (presenter): "What would have to happen for us not to buy arms from Israel?"

Comparison: In the Ukraine section (26:00), the presenter does not ask a comparable critical question about the adequacy of EU sanctions

Asymmetry: On Israel questions the presenter is clearly more critical than on Ukraine questions — the triggering event (arms question) produces a different reaction depending on the context

Summary: The presenter's moderation behaviour is asymmetric: more critical on Israel questions than on Ukraine questions, and internal government criticism (Finns Party) is challenged more forcefully than the government minister's own powerful statements.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 5/10

Definition: Different levels of difficulty in questions posed to different persons.

Asymmetry 1:

To Valtonen, 20:00: "Finland continues its arms purchases from Israel. Why? What would have to happen for us not to buy arms from Israel?" — tough, moral challenge

To experts (in the Stubb section), 31:00: "What does Finland gain from Stubb being visible?" — soft, positive question

Comparison: Valtonen is posed moral challenges; experts are posed mainly positive or neutral questions about Stubb's role

Asymmetry 2:

To Valtonen, 12:15: "What is there still to investigate when 50,000 people have been killed, aid has not been getting through and the population is being moved out of Gaza?" — challenging, rhetorical question

To experts, 29:00: "How does Stubb compare to our other presidents?" — open, neutral question

Comparison: Valtonen is posed rhetorically challenging questions; experts are posed open, neutral questions

Summary: Question asymmetry is observable: Valtonen is posed tougher moral challenges on Gaza questions, while experts are posed softer questions about Stubb's role. On the other hand, Valtonen's position as minister justifies tougher questions.



14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 3/10

Definition: Artificial balance despite actual imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:45 — Structure: "An increasingly widespread perception is that Israel is committing genocide. What do you think Israel is doing there?"

Analysis: The presenter presents the genocide interpretation as an "increasingly widespread perception" and asks Valtonen to comment — this creates an apparent balance (Valtonen does not confirm genocide), but in reality the frame has already been set in the direction of the genocide interpretation

Summary: False balance occurs to a limited extent; the broadcast does not seek artificial balance but rather one-sided framing. False balance scores remain low.



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 get onto the agenda?

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Israel's actions are contrary to international law and morally condemnable

Timestamp: 00:01 — Evidence: "Gaza is starving. Others are pondering what should be done. Finland continues its arms purchases from Israel."

Alternative agenda: Hamas's role in the escalation of the conflict; the hostage question; Israel's security threats

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Stubb's international visibility is beneficial for Finland

Timestamp: 28:30 — Evidence: "Finland and President Stubb are very prominently present at the focal points of international politics."

Alternative agenda: The actual effectiveness of visibility; critical assessment of whether Stubb's profile serves Finland's national interests

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: EU sanctions policy is the right and sufficient response to Russian aggression

Timestamp: 26:00 — Evidence: "This 17th package was a good interim milestone."

Alternative agenda: The actual effectiveness of sanctions; assessment of alternative strategies

Summary: The broadcast sets three key agenda elements as self-evident: Israel's guilt, the usefulness of Stubb's visibility and the correctness of EU sanctions policy. These assumptions remain systematically unchallenged.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	6	Government minister dominates; independent experts are missing
2	Source selection	H	5	Sources mainly official; origin of satellite images unclear
3	Distribution of speaking time	H	5	Government representative has the most speaking time; no critical voices at all
4	Omission	H	7	Israel's voice, content of arms purchases and Finns Party's/KD's own voice are missing
5	Number manipulation	H	3	Casualty figure presented without source reference or methodological assessment
6	Guilt by association	H	2	Valtonen's genocide statement creates an implicit association with the Finns Party
7	Timing	H	4	Broadcast's opening text frames Finland's arms purchases as morally problematic
9	Completeness	H	7	Three key perspectives are systematically missing
10	Framing	S	7	Gaza framed through Israel's guilt; Stubb framed positively
11	Word choices	S	6	Genocide concept without legal context; "dissenting voice" about the Finns Party
12	Moderation behaviour	S	5	Asymmetric: more critical on Israel questions than on Ukraine questions
13	Question asymmetry	S	5	Tougher moral challenges for Valtonen than for experts
14	False balance	S	3	Limited; genocide frame creates apparent balance
15	Agenda-setting	S	6	Three agenda elements set as self-evident without challenge

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (criteria 1–9 average): 4.8 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (criteria 10–15 average): 5.3 / 10
- TOTAL SCORE (average of all 15 criteria): 5.1 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission (score 7):** The broadcast systematically omits Israel's official voice, the voice of the internal government opposition (Finns Party, KD) and independent expert assessment of the ethics of arms purchases. These omissions together create a one-sided picture of both the Gaza conflict and Finnish foreign policy.
- 2. Framing (score 7):** The broadcast frames the Gaza conflict exclusively through Israel's guilt and Stubb's international activism as inherently positive. The framing occurs already in the broadcast's first sentence and guides all subsequent coverage.



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

3. Completeness (score 7): Three out of ten relevant perspectives are covered even partially; seven are omitted entirely. In particular, the expert view from international law on the legal content of the genocide concept is missing, even though the concept is used repeatedly.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "Israel is committing genocide in Gaza, and the international community — including Finland — is too weak to stop it."

Technique: Framing and selective omission — Evidence: 01:45, 12:15

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "President Stubb has successfully raised Finland's international profile and earned his place at the table of major powers."

Technique: Agenda-setting and positive framing — Evidence: 28:30, 31:45

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Within the Finnish government there are problematic deviants (Finns Party, KD) who are jeopardising Finland's foreign policy unity."

Technique: Selective indignation and guilt by association — Evidence: 22:45, 24:00

Manipulation level classification

Justification: The broadcast's total score (5.1/10) falls in the area of clear one-sidedness. The diversity and impartiality required by Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy are not met: Israel's official voice is entirely absent, the internal government disagreement is presented one-sidedly and the genocide concept is used repeatedly without legal analysis. Stubb's international role is covered mainly in a positive light without systematic critical assessment. Individual critical questions (continuation of arms purchases) are not sufficient to compensate for the overall imbalance.

SUMMARY

The broadcast covers two significant foreign policy topics — the humanitarian crisis in Gaza and President Stubb's international role — in a manner that does not meet the diverse and impartial information provision required by Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy. In the coverage of the Gaza conflict, Israel's official voice is entirely absent, the genocide concept is used repeatedly without analysis by an international law expert, and the internal government disagreement (Finns Party, KD) is presented as a problematic deviation without those parties being given their own statement. In the coverage of Stubb's role, all three experts represent predominantly the same positive view, and no systematic critical assessment takes place. The broadcast does not meet the impartiality requirement of public broadcasting, but it does not represent extreme manipulation either; it is a clear one-sidedness that is documentable and demonstrable with concrete timestamps and direct quotations.



OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	6/10	Significant bias
2	SOURCE SELECTION	5/10	Significant bias
3	DISTRIBUTION OF SPEAKING TIME	5/10	Significant bias
4	OMISSION (Selective omission)	7/10	Clear bias
5	NUMBER MANIPULATION	3/10	Slight bias
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION (Contact guilt)	2/10	Unnoticeable
7	TIMING	4/10	Slight bias
8	SELECTIVE INDIGNATION	4/10	Slight bias
9	COMPLETENESS (Selective omission — overall picture)	7/10	Clear bias
10	FRAMING (Setting the frame of reference)	7/10	Clear bias
11	WORD CHOICES AND CONCEPTS	6/10	Significant bias
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	5/10	Significant bias
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	5/10	Significant bias
14	FALSE BALANCE	3/10	Slight bias
15	AGENDA-SETTING	6/10	Significant bias

HARDFACTS SCORE (1-8)

5.5/10

Significant imbalance

SOFTFACTS SCORE (9-14)

5.5/10

Significant imbalance

TOTAL SCORE

5.5/10

Significant imbalance

Hardfacts and Softfacts average



LEGEND — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No significant deviation detected.
1–2	Weak finding	Slight deviation without material impact on impartiality.
3–4	Slight–moderate finding	Identifiable tendency; materiality of impact minor–moderate.
5	Moderate finding, with impact	Significant bias affecting 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	Unnoticeable	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality requirement.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight bias	Individual deviations; statistically visible, but within the 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 deviation rate	Strong patterns crossing broadcast boundaries; high materiality of impact.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systematic one-sidedness. Very high bias rate	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	Slightly disadvantaged	Identifiable but slight disadvantaging.
0	Neutral	No detectable favouring or disadvantaging.
+1 ... +2	Slightly favoured	Identifiable but slight 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 under Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy

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

Violation 1:

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

Facts: Israel's official position and the broader context of Hamas terrorist attacks are entirely absent from the coverage of the Gaza conflict

Evidence: Timestamp 01:45 — Quote: "An increasingly widespread perception is that Israel is committing genocide. What do you think Israel is doing there?"

Assessment: The view of one party to the conflict (Israel) is not presented at all; this is in conflict with the requirement for diverse information provision. The use of the genocide concept without legal analysis or Israel's response reinforces one-sided framing.

Violation 2:

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

Facts: The internal government disagreement (Finns Party's Jani Mäkelä's position) is presented as a problematic deviation without a statement from a Finns Party or KD representative

Evidence: Timestamp 22:45 — Quote: "According to Jani Mäkelä, there is more fuss about Gaza than there should be. Are you bothered by the dissenting voices in the government?"

Assessment: The word "dissenting voice" is negatively charged; the Finns Party's position is presented as a disruptive factor without the party being given the opportunity to explain its position. This is in conflict with the requirement to promote pluralism.

Violation 3:

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

Facts: The concrete content of Finland's arms purchases, strategic justification and ethical assessment remain unaddressed, even though the topic is raised as the central question of the broadcast already in the opening text

Evidence: Timestamp 00:01 — Quote: "Finland continues its arms purchases from Israel. Why?" — and timestamp 20:00 — Quote: "No actual other procurement, especially unrelated to this, takes place from Israel to any significant extent."

Assessment: The broadcast places arms purchases in a morally questionable light right at the start, but does not provide sufficient information about their content, strategic significance or ethical assessment. This is contrary to the requirement for comprehensive information provision.

Overall assessment under Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy

The broadcast violates the requirement for diverse, comprehensive and impartial information provision under Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy in three key areas: the absence of Israel's voice from the coverage of the Gaza conflict, the absence of Finns Party and KD representatives' own voice from the coverage of the internal government disagreement, and the inadequate coverage of arms purchases relative to the moral weight they are given in the broadcast. The violations are not extreme nor apparently deliberate, but they are documentable with concrete timestamps and direct quotations. The broadcast does not meet the impartiality requirement of public broadcasting, particularly in the coverage of the Gaza conflict, where one-sided framing is systematic and consistent throughout the entire broadcast.



SOURCE DEEP CHECK (Mandatory for all cited expert instances / civil society organisations / advisory services)

Elina Valtonen, Foreign Minister (National Coalition)

- FUNDING:** State budget; minister of a government party (National Coalition)
- MANDATE:** Represents the government's foreign policy line — not compatible with neutral assessment
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in presenting the government's line in a positive light; political interest in avoiding emphasis on internal government conflicts
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: -2, D2: -1, D3: +2, D4: +1, D5: 0, D6: +1 → TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- COUNTERVOICE:** Opposition politician or independent foreign policy expert — not cited

Martti (former Ministry for Foreign Affairs official)

- FUNDING:** Retired; no direct institutional funding
- MANDATE:** No official mandate; appears as a commentator
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Possible loyalty to former employer (Ministry for Foreign Affairs); no direct conflict of interest
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: +1, D2: +1, D3: +2, D4: +1, D5: +1, D6: 0 → TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTERVOICE:** Critical foreign policy researcher — not cited

Johanna Rainio-Niemi, researcher

- FUNDING:** Likely employed by a university; public funding
- MANDATE:** Academic researcher; compatible with neutral assessment
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No apparent conflict of interest; academic freedom provides protection
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: +1, D2: +1, D3: +1, D4: +1, D5: +1, D6: 0 → TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTERVOICE:** Critical foreign policy researcher — not cited

Unto (expert / commentator)

- FUNDING:** Not mentioned; background unclear
- MANDATE:** No official mandate; appears as a commentator
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Cannot be assessed due to insufficient background information
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1: 0 (no information), D2: +1, D3: +1 (experience apparent), D4: +1, D5: +1, D6: 0 → TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- COUNTERVOICE:** Critical commentator — not cited

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that is itself open to question. All four sources have been assessed on the basis of the above criteria, not on the basis of their social status.

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 under 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).



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

**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.

**Not an assessment
of intent**

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant bias 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 parts. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not precise legal classification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Finland — YLE (Yleisradio Oy)

Act

Act on Yleisradio Oy (1380/1993), zuletzt geändert 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) — nowhere explicitly

Die Unparteilichkeitspflicht kommt aus YLEs internen Ethikrichtlinien (YSO):

> "We set impartiality as a goal in our overall programme and content production as well as in individual programmes."

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

Core obligations (Act + 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



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 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 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 want 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 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 that they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Straightforward. As a preparation guide, reference work, for follow-up 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 the 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 – and how – ja 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 imposed on them so easily.

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

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.