



## YLE DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-10-04\_Kohti rauhaa - Gazan neuvotteluiden käänneet

Broadcast: YLE-Sendung | 2025-10-04 | Analysed: 2026-05-22 20:11

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

### TOTAL SCORE

**4.7/10**

*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	Green	SDP	Centre	KD	Nat. Coalition	Finns
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](https://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. In opposition are SDP, Centre Party, Greens, Left Alliance and Liike Nyt.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Core position
Left Alliance	1.6 (left)	11	Opposition	Redistribution, trade unions, climate
SDP	3.6 (left)	43	Opposition	Welfare state, workers' rights
Greens	3.9 (left)	13	Opposition	Climate, liberal immigration
Centre Party	5.7 (right)	23	Opposition	Rural areas, decentralisation, agriculture
SFP/RKP	6.4 (right)	9	Government	Bilingualism, economic liberalism
KD	7.6 (right)	5	Government	Family values, Christian ethics
LN	7.6 (right)	1	Opposition	Market economy, individual freedom
National Coalition	7.8 (right)	48	Government (PM Orpo)	Tax cuts, competitiveness
Finns Party	8.2 (right)	46	Government	Strict immigration, EU scepticism

The Orpo government's economic policy — in particular cuts to social security, labour market reforms and fiscal consolidation — has generated a strong confrontation between the government and the left-wing opposition. The rise in unemployment to 10 per cent has intensified the debate over whether structural reforms or expansionary fiscal policy is the right remedy. The exploitation of foreign labour and trade unions' right of action have emerged as new points of contention. The question of recognising Palestine has additionally divided the governing parties.

Yle is Finland's public broadcasting company, whose operations are governed 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 media enjoys high public trust. However, the Finns Party has repeatedly criticised Yle for a "left-green bubble" and demanded funding reform.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

### Assessment of the representation of parties

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. party programme
SDP	-1	49:10 "When SDP served as the prime minister's party for four years under Marin, they did not make changes to the right of action, did not criminalise underpayment, and did not address the shocking situation of berry pickers" — Party programme: SDP advocates workers' rights and the position of trade unions — Representation partially distorted: the minister was able to present SDP's conduct as inconsistent without a counter-argument or a comment from an SDP representative
National Coalition	-2	36:05 "Orpo promised voters 100,000 new jobs" — Party programme: National Coalition promises competitiveness reforms and structural changes, not a direct job guarantee — Representation partially distorted: the promise is presented as a simplified numerical pledge without structural context; on the other hand, the minister was given ample opportunity to explain his position
Finns Party	0	The party does not appear in the broadcast at all — Not assessable
Centre Party	0	Centre Party is mentioned as having submitted an interpellation (30:55), but the party's positions are not presented and no representative is interviewed — Not assessable in terms of content
Greens	0	Does not appear in the broadcast — Not assessable
Left Alliance	0	Mentioned as "left-wing opposition" (49:10, 50:20), but no representative or positions — Not assessable in terms of content
SFP/RKP	0	Does not appear in the broadcast — Not assessable

### Summary of party bias

- Most accurate representation: National Coalition (-2) — the minister was given ample opportunity to explain his position, even though promises were challenged
- Strongest distortion: National Coalition (-2) — the promise of 100,000 jobs is presented in simplified form without structural context; SDP (-1) — the minister was able to criticise SDP without a counter-argument
- Average deviation from zero: 0.4
- Conclusion: The party-political bias of the broadcast is moderate. The main problem is that the minister of the governing party was able to criticise the opposition (SDP, left-wing opposition) without the opposition being given a right of reply. The objectives of National Coalition's government programme were presented in partly simplified terms, but the minister was given ample opportunity to defend his positions.

### Left-right overall tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -0.8

CLASSIFICATION: Slightly favouring the right

Justification: The broadcast gave the minister of the governing party (National Coalition) extensive interview time without a counter-argument from an opposition representative. The journalist challenged the minister actively, which partly balances the setup. However, the minister was repeatedly able to criticise the opposition (SDP, left-wing opposition) without a right of reply, which structurally favours the government's narrative.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND TOPIC FRAMING

### Broadcast information

- Title: Ykkösaamu (YLE Ykkönen)
- Date: Not explicitly mentioned in the transcript; based on content, spring/autumn 2025 (Trump's peace plan for Gaza, Orpo government in office)
- Duration (estimated from transcript): approximately 54 minutes (00:00–53:55)
- Journalist/presenter: Unnamed presenter (not mentioned by name in the transcript)
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Role	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Hannu Juusola	Professor of Middle East Studies	Academic, no party affiliation	Neutral/expert
Antti Kuronen	Yle foreign correspondent	Yle	Journalist
Vilma Ronsi	Yle journalist, East Jerusalem	Yle	Journalist
Matias Marttinen	Minister of Employment	National Coalition (government)	Right (7.8)

### Main topic

The broadcast covers two separate topics: Hamas's response to Trump's Gaza peace plan and Finland's deteriorating employment situation and the government's economic policy.

### Relevant perspectives for a balanced broadcast

- Government perspective: structural reforms and fiscal consolidation
- Opposition perspective: expansionary fiscal policy and the effects of social security cuts
- The unemployed's own experience: how cuts and the deterioration of services affect everyday life
- Employers'/businesses' perspective: barriers to investment and willingness to hire
- Trade unions' perspective: right of action, monitoring of employment conditions, cases of exploitation
- Independent assessment by economists: stimulus vs. consolidation in the current economic situation
- Municipalities'/employment areas' perspective: practical problems with the transfer of employment services
- Young people's and graduates' perspective: brain drain and employment opportunities
- Palestinian perspective on the Gaza peace plan
- The Israeli government's official position on the peace plan

### Check: Was each perspective addressed?

[A] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 30:55–53:41 — Quote: "The government stands by all its objectives, we will not give in." — Assessment: Minister Marttinen presented the government's position extensively and repeatedly.

[B] HINTED AT

Timestamp: 36:05 — Quote: "There are now 82,000 more unemployed than when the government took office." — Assessment: The journalist presented oppositional figures, but no opposition representative was interviewed; the perspective was left to rest on the journalist's questions.

[C] OMITTED



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

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single unemployed person was interviewed; experiential knowledge is entirely absent.

[D] HINTED AT

Timestamp: 50:55 — Quote: "I receive a very large number of messages from entrepreneurs saying that when an entrepreneur wants to invest, he walks into a bank, and sometimes the entrepreneur is turned away at the bank's entrance." — Assessment: The employers' perspective is conveyed through the minister, not directly.

[E] HINTED AT

Timestamp: 47:30 — Quote: "The opposition demanded that the government submit a proposal on trade unions' right of action" — Assessment: The trade unions' own voice is absent; the matter is dealt with as a political dispute.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No independent economist was interviewed; the Ministry of Finance's forecasts are mentioned but not critically analysed.

[G] HINTED AT

Timestamp: 43:00 — Quote: "There have been a great many questions about employment services that were transferred to municipalities." — Assessment: No municipal representative was interviewed; problems are conveyed through audience questions.

[H] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 40:10 — Quote: "Is it worth completing a university degree if there is no guarantee of work?" — Assessment: The topic is addressed through an audience question; young people's own voice is not heard directly.

[I] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 22:30 — Quote: "Palestinians are looking at the peace plan with hope, particularly regarding humanitarian aid." — Assessment: Vilma Romsig reports on Palestinian reactions, but no Palestinian representative was interviewed directly.

[J] ADDRESSED

Timestamp: 20:05 — Quote: "Netanyahu initially regarded Hamas's response as a refusal." — Assessment: Israel's position is conveyed through the journalist's reporting; no official Israeli representative was interviewed.

### **Completeness score: 5/10**

---

Justification: The broadcast covers the government's position and the international situation reasonably well, but key voices are systematically absent. In particular, an independent economic expert, an opposition representative, a trade union representative and the unemployed's first-hand experience are entirely missing. In the Gaza segment, direct interviews with Palestinians and Israelis are absent.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard facts — countable and scientifically reliable

### Hard facts — 9 countable and scientifically verifiable techniques

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 4/10

Definition: Who gets to speak as an expert?

Expert 1: Hannu Juusola, Professor of Middle East Studies

Timestamp: 03:15

Statement: "This is a positive step forward in implementing the plan."

Positioning: Academic Middle East expert; no apparent party affiliation

Missing counter-voice: An Israeli or Palestinian political analyst would have brought an insider perspective

In-depth source check:

**(a) FUNDING:** Finnish university (public funding); no apparent conflict of interest on Middle East issues

**(b) MANDATE:** Academic Middle East research is compatible with a neutral assessment

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

- U1 Conflict of interest: +2 — No apparent institutional interest in favour of either party
- U2 Personal risk: +1 — Academic position provides protection, but not completely
- U3 Expertise: +2 — Middle East research directly corresponds to the subject of the statement
- U4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — No contradictory previous statements known
- U5 Emotion vs. data: +1 — Mainly analytical, some assessments
- U6 Source level: +1 — Secondary analysis of primary events
- TOTAL: +8 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Presented as a neutral expert; no structural bias detectable

Expert 2: Matias Martinen, Minister of Employment (National Coalition)

Timestamp: 30:55

Statement: "The government stands by all its objectives, we will not give in."

Positioning: Minister of the governing party; clear political interest

Missing counter-voice: Opposition politician, independent economist

In-depth source check:

**(a) FUNDING:** In state service; political mandate from National Coalition

**(b) MANDATE:** Not compatible with a neutral assessment — the minister's role is to defend government policy

**(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**



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

- U1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Direct political interest in defending government policy
- U2 Personal risk: -1 — Political position depends on the government's success
- U3 Expertise: +1 — The minister is familiar with his own area of administration
- U4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent government line
- U5 Emotion vs. data: 0 — Mix of data and political rhetoric
- U6 Source level: 0 — Secondary (Ministry of Finance forecasts)
- TOTAL: -1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** The minister is presented as an interviewee, not as a neutral expert — this is appropriate, but the counterbalance is missing

*Missing expert groups:*

- Independent economist (e.g. a representative of ETLA, PTT, VATT directly)
- Opposition politician
- Trade union expert

*Summary (matrix result):*

- Juusola: GREEN (+8) — appropriate expert for the Gaza segment
- Marttinen: YELLOW (-1) — political actor without counterbalance; not an expert but an interviewed politician



## 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: Statistics Finland (unemployment statistics)

Timestamp: 36:20 — Statement: "the most recent Statistics Finland unemployment rate, it is 10"

**(a) Funding and governance:** State agency; public funding

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Not significant — statistics are methodologically established

**(c) Missing counter-position:** Not needed; statistics are facts

Source 2: Ministry of Finance (MoF) forecasts

Timestamp: 38:10 — Statement: "According to the MoF's assessment, the number of hours worked has increased"

**(a) Funding:** State ministry; subordinate to the government

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Significant — the MoF is subordinate to the government; forecasts may reflect political priorities

**(c) Missing counter-position:** Forecasts from independent economic research institutes (ETLA, PTT) are absent

Source 3: VATT (Government Institute for Economic Research)

Timestamp: 52:10 — Statement: "Recently VATT, the Government Institute for Economic Research, published its own study on this, in which the removal of the earnings disregard has not had a very significant impact on the amount of part-time work among the unemployed."

**(a) Funding:** State research institute; public funding

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Mild — state-funded, but academically independent

**(c) Missing counter-position:** Other studies on the effects of the earnings disregard are not mentioned

Source traffic light — VATT:

- U1 Conflict of interest: +1 — State-funded but academically independent
- U2 Personal risk: +1
- U3 Expertise: +2 — Economic research is the core area of competence
- U4 Consistency of opinion: +1
- U5 Emotion vs. data: +2 — Research-based
- U6 Source level: +2 — Primary research
- TOTAL: +9 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

Note: VATT's research finding is presented through the minister's words without the journalist independently verifying or contextualising the result.

Rumour check (penalty points):

No clear rumour-based claims without a primary source. Antti Kuronen's statement "They have given money to Trump. There are golf and hotel projects under way and aeroplanes have been donated" (07:45) is presented as fact without a source reference.

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 07:45



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

Claim: "They have given money to Trump. There are golf and hotel projects under way and aeroplanes have been donated."

Uncertainty marker: No explicit uncertainty marker — presented as fact

Primary source available: Not mentioned — +1 penalty point

*Summary: Source selection is partially one-sided: MoF forecasts dominate the economic analysis without independent counter-sources. The VATT reference is appropriate but not contextualised.*



### 3. DISTRIBUTION OF SPEAKING TIME

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 4/10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time among different positions.

Estimated speaking time:

- Matias Marttinen (National Coalition, government): approximately 18 min. (33 %)
- Hannu Juusola (expert): approximately 10 min. (19 %)
- Antti Kuronen (Yle journalist): approximately 7 min. (13 %)
- Vilma Romsa (Yle journalist): approximately 4 min. (7 %)
- Presenter/journalist: approximately 15 min. (28 %)

Summary: The minister of the governing party receives by far the most speaking time (33 %) without a counterbalancing opposition representative. In the Gaza segment, experts and journalists share the time more evenly. Overall, the distribution of speaking time favours the government's narrative.



#### 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: The opposition representative's right of reply is entirely absent

Relevant at: 30:55–53:41 (entire ministerial interview)

Effect: The minister is able to criticise SDP (49:10) and the left-wing opposition (50:20) without a counter-argument; the viewer receives a one-sided picture of the political situation

Omission 2:

Context: No alternative research findings on the effects of removing the earnings disregard are presented

Relevant at: 52:10 — "In VATT's study, the removal of the earnings disregard has not had a very significant impact"

Effect: The viewer gets the impression that the research evidence is unanimous, even though there are different interpretations of the subject

Omission 3:

Context: Criticism of Trump's peace plan from the perspective of Palestinian self-determination remains superficial

Relevant at: 24:15 — "Trump's peace plan does not include a two-state model or guarantees for the realisation of Palestinian self-determination"

Effect: The structural problem of the plan is mentioned but not analysed in depth; the Palestinian voice is absent

Summary: The most significant omission is the absence of an opposition representative from the ministerial interview, which makes the political debate one-sided.

#### Missing voices

- Opposition politician (SDP/Left Alliance/Centre Party): Would have brought an alternative economic policy perspective and could have responded to the minister's criticism of SDP's time in government
- Independent economist: Would have impartially assessed the effects of stimulus vs. consolidation in Finland's situation
- Trade union representative: Would have brought a concrete perspective on the right of action and the exploitation of foreign labour
- Unemployed person: Would have brought experiential knowledge of how cuts and the deterioration of services affect everyday life
- Municipal/employment area representative: Could have commented directly on the practical problems of transferring employment services
- Palestinian negotiator representative or expert: Would have brought a direct Palestinian perspective on the peace plan
- Exploited foreign worker or their representative: Would have brought a human dimension to the exploitation debate
- Banking sector representative: Could have commented on the minister's claim about difficulties in obtaining loans



## 5. NUMBER MANIPULATION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Total score: 5/10

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 36:20

Figure: "There are now 82,000 more unemployed than when the government took office."

Dimensions: Absolute value (a) presented; relative share (b) mentioned (10 %); trend (c) presented via graph

Missing context: International comparison is presented (comparison of EU countries), but the effect of Southern Europe's debt-financed stimulus is not explained to the viewer — the minister has to correct this himself (38:45)

Effect: The figures give an accurate picture, but the international comparison without context can be misleading

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 43:00

Figure: "The number of young unemployed is now at a record high, just under 37,000, i.e. almost as many as the number of inhabitants in your home city of Rauma."

Dimensions: Absolute value (a) presented; relative share (b) missing; trend (c) mentioned ("record high")

Missing context: The relative share of youth unemployment within the age group is missing; comparison with other EU countries is missing

Effect: The Rauma comparison is emotionally striking but does not provide statistical context

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 44:30

Figure: "Long-term unemployment has increased. In August, just under 130,000 people had been unemployed for more than a year. The increase compared to a year ago is 32,000."

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

Missing context: Comparison with the recession of the 1990s is mentioned later (46:10), but not in this context

Effect: The figures are correct, but the historical context is missing from the immediate context

*Summary: The use of figures is mainly appropriate, but the international comparison without a stimulus policy context is misleading — the minister has to correct this deficiency himself.*



## 6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 2/10

Definition: Discrediting through association with negative groups/ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 50:20

Quote: "This change raised by the left-wing opposition would be a significant change to our legal system."

**Technique:** The minister links the demand for the right of action to the "left-wing opposition" as a political label, even though the government's own Minister of Justice Leena Meri (KD) also supported the matter

Effect: The right of action is presented as a left-wing agenda, not as a broad legal policy question

Association 2:

Timestamp: 49:10

Quote: "When the left-wing opposition and SDP have been making such a loud fuss..."

**Technique:** The expression "loud fuss" associates the opposition's actions with inappropriate behaviour

Effect: The opposition's legitimate political criticism is presented as "fuss"

*Summary: The guilt by association technique appears mainly in the minister's speech, not through the journalist's framing. The journalist corrects one association (50:30: "Leena Meri does not belong to the left-wing opposition. She is your ministerial colleague."), which is appropriate.*



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

*Total score: 3/10*

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

Finding 1:

Position: 36:05 (ministerial interview begins)

Content: Presentation of the Orpo election promise clip at the very start of the interview: "National Coalition promises that during the next parliamentary term, 100,000 new jobs will be created in Finnish companies."

Timing effect: The interview begins with a reminder of a promise that is unfavourable to the minister; this puts the entire interview on the defensive

Finding 2:

Position: 53:20 (interview ends)

Content: "I must say that it has been wonderful to see the large orders for the Turku shipyard and the construction of the Fazer chocolate factory in recent weeks."

Timing effect: The interview ends with the minister's positive message; the last word goes to the government

*Summary: The timing is partly unfavourable to the minister (the interview begins with a reminder of a promise), but the minister gets the last word, which balances the effect.*



## 8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Total score: 3/10

*Definition: Indignation 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: 38:45

Triggering event: The journalist presents an EU countries' unemployment comparison without a stimulus policy context

Reaction: "Yes, the journalist did not tell viewers that behind this there is a great deal of influence from the fact that in Southern Europe, staggering sums of public money have been used for debt-financed stimulus"

Comparison: The journalist does not react with indignation to the minister's own simplifications (e.g. the explanation of the promise of 100,000 jobs)

Asymmetry: The minister is allowed to be indignant at the journalist's presentation; the journalist is not indignant at the minister's explanations — however, this is not a clear editorial asymmetry, as it concerns the interviewee's reaction

Degree of indignation: 2/5

Selectivity: 1/5

*Summary: No clear editorial selective indignation is detected. The minister's indignation at the journalist's manner of presentation is a normal reaction from an interviewee. The journalist challenges the minister consistently throughout the interview.*



## 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 depict the topic?

### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 30:55–53:41

Missing perspective/fact: Opposition representative's right of reply

Relevance: The minister criticises SDP and the left-wing opposition on several occasions; impartiality would require a right of reply

Effect: The viewer receives a one-sided picture of political responsibility

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 47:30–51:00

Missing perspective/fact: Trade unions' direct voice in the right of action debate

Relevance: The right of action directly concerns trade unions; their perspective is central

Effect: The debate remains a political dispute without practical expertise

### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 40:10–42:00

Missing perspective/fact: Young people's or graduates' own voice

Relevance: The topic directly addresses the situation of young people; an audience question is presented, but the minister is the respondent

Effect: Experiential knowledge is absent; the situation appears statistical rather than human

*Summary: The broadcast is structurally incomplete: the government's voice dominates, the opposition and civil society are absent. This is a systematic problem, not an isolated deficiency.*

## Hard facts end — Soft facts begin



## Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 5/10

Definition: How is the topic fundamentally framed?

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp: 36:05

Quote: "Orpo promised voters 100,000 new jobs. He demanded commitment to this as the government formation leader. That 100,000 new jobs has been written into the government programme. This is what the situation looks like now."

Manipulation: The government's economic policy is framed exclusively through a failed promise; structural reforms and long-term objectives are pushed into the background

Why problematic: The frame automatically puts the minister on the defensive; an alternative frame (e.g. "what reforms have been made?") would be more balanced

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 43:22

Quote: "Isn't their fate rather bleak at the moment?"

Manipulation: The situation of the long-term unemployed is framed as a "bleak fate" — an emotionally charged expression

Why problematic: The frame is emotionally powerful but not analytical; it steers the minister towards responding to emotions rather than policy

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 07:45

Quote: "Trump has close ties with Arab countries such as Qatar, the United Arab Emirates and the Saudis. They have given money to Trump. There are golf and hotel projects under way and aeroplanes have been donated."

Manipulation: Trump's peace initiative is framed partly through financial interests; this may undermine the credibility of the plan

Why problematic: Mentioning the conflict of interest is relevant, but it is presented as fact without a source reference and may lead the viewer to doubt the entire initiative

Summary: Framing is partly problematic: economic policy is framed through a failed promise, and the situation of the long-term unemployed is framed emotionally. These frames are not neutral.



## 11. WORD CHOICES AND CONCEPTS

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 4/10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 43:22

Quote: "Isn't their fate rather bleak at the moment?"

Manipulation: "Fate" and "bleak" are emotionally charged words

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "How would you assess the situation of the long-term unemployed at the moment?"

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 50:20

Quote: "When the left-wing opposition and SDP have been making such a loud fuss..."

Manipulation: "Loud fuss" is a demeaning expression for political criticism (used by the minister)

Why problematic: The journalist does not challenge this connotation of the word choice; a neutral alternative would be "have been making demands"

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 20:05

Quote: "Netanyahu's far-right coalition partners have not yet commented on the latest development."

Manipulation: "Far-right" is a politically charged term; the parties are not named

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be to name the parties (Otzma Yehudit, Religious Zionism) and describe their positions; "far-right" is a value-laden label

Summary: Word choices are mainly appropriate, but individual emotionally charged expressions ("bleak fate", "far-right") reflect editorial framing.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 4/10

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: 48:30

Triggering event: The minister evades the right of action question by talking about other measures

Quote (journalist): "The question was about the right of action."

Comparison: The journalist repeats the question three times (48:30, 49:00, 49:20) — consistent pressure

Asymmetry: Not detectable — the journalist applies pressure consistently

### Finding 2:

Timestamp: 43:17

Triggering event: The journalist makes a claim about the non-functioning of employment services

Quote (journalist): "You say that there are no jobs and that employment exchanges or employment offices do not work."

Comparison: The minister disputes the claim (43:25: "I cannot agree with the journalist's claim that employment services are not working anywhere in Finland.") — the journalist does not challenge the denial

Asymmetry: The journalist makes the claim but does not defend it when the minister disputes it — mild asymmetry

### Finding 3:

Timestamp: 50:30

Triggering event: The minister links the right of action to the "left-wing opposition" even though KD's minister also supported it

Quote (journalist): "Leena Meri does not belong to the left-wing opposition. She is your ministerial colleague."

Comparison: The journalist immediately corrects the erroneous association — appropriate intervention

Asymmetry: Not detectable — the correction is impartial

Summary: The journalist challenges the minister consistently and corrects erroneous associations. A mild asymmetry appears in the fact that the journalist does not always defend his own claims when the minister disputes them.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 4/10

Definition: Differences in the hardness/softness of questions put to different persons.

Asymmetry 1:

Juusola/Kuronen, 03:15: "Hannu Juusola, can we say that this is some kind of turning point?" — soft/open

Marttinen, 36:05: "Orpo promised voters 100,000 new jobs... Is that target of 100,000 new jobs still in force?" — hard/confrontational

Comparison: Experts are asked open analytical questions; the minister is asked confrontational accountability questions — this is partly appropriate (the minister bears political responsibility), but the asymmetry is still detectable

Asymmetry 2:

Marttinen, 48:30: "Do you intend as minister to submit a proposal for legislating the right of action?" — direct, hard

Marttinen, 53:20: "How does that fit with your optimism?" — softer, allows the minister to end the interview positively

Comparison: The interview begins with hard questions and ends with a softer one — this gives the minister the opportunity for the last word

Summary: Question asymmetry is partly justified (the minister bears political responsibility), but the interview ends with a softer question, which gives the minister the last word.



#### 14. FALSE 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: 36:20 — Structure: "The government appeals to the economic cycle and the global situation... but the same economic cycle applies to other EU countries too."

Analysis: The journalist presents the EU comparison as if the cyclical effect were the same for all countries, even though countries' structures, stimulus capacity and starting positions differ significantly — the minister has to correct this simplification himself

Summary: False balance appears mainly in the EU comparison, where the different starting positions of countries are disregarded. However, this is an isolated case, not a systematic problem.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Total score: 5/10

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

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The government's economic policy is framed exclusively through failure

Timestamp: 36:05 — Evidence: "This is what the situation looks like now" (graph of 10 % unemployment)

Alternative agenda: What structural reforms have been made? What are the long-term effects? What is the government's own assessment of its successes?

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The question of recognising Palestine is presented as the Finnish government "getting off the hook"

Timestamp: 27:30 — Evidence: "Does the government get off the hook now that the situation is changing, or is it still topical?"

Alternative agenda: What is Finland's foreign policy line on Palestine? What would recognition mean in practice?

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The exploitation of foreign labour is presented exclusively as a right of action question

Timestamp: 47:30 — Evidence: "The opposition demanded that the government submit a proposal on trade unions' right of action"

Alternative agenda: How widespread is the exploitation? What are the structural causes? How do victims get help?

*Summary: Agenda-setting favours a critical frame towards the government's economic policy, but leaves structural questions (the extent of exploitation, the content of recognising Palestine) superficial.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

### Summary of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	4	Juusola is an appropriate expert; the minister is a political actor without counterbalance
2	Source selection	H	5	MoF forecasts dominate without independent counter-sources; one rumour-based claim
3	Distribution of speaking time	H	4	The minister of the governing party receives 33 % of speaking time without a counterbalancing opposition representative
4	Omission	H	6	Opposition representative, trade unions and experiential knowledge are systematically absent
5	Number manipulation	H	5	EU comparison without stimulus policy context; the journalist has to correct the deficiency
6	Guilt by association	H	2	Mild association in the minister's speech; the journalist corrects one instance
7	Timing	H	3	Interview begins with an unfavourable reminder of a promise; the minister gets the last word
8	Selective indignation	H	3	No clear editorial selective indignation; the journalist challenges consistently
9	Completeness	H	6	The government's voice dominates; the opposition and civil society are systematically absent
10	Framing	S	5	Economic policy is framed through a failed promise; emotionally charged language
11	Word choices	S	4	Individual emotionally charged expressions; mainly appropriate language
12	Moderation behaviour	S	4	The journalist challenges consistently; mild asymmetry in defending claims
13	Question asymmetry	S	4	Open questions for experts; confrontational for the minister — partly justified
14	False balance	S	3	EU comparison without structural context is an isolated case
15	Agenda-setting	S	5	The government's economic policy is framed as failure; structural questions remain superficial

### Results

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



## Dominant techniques

---

- 1. Omission (Score 6):** The systematic absence of an opposition representative, trade unions and experiential knowledge makes the ministerial interview one-sided. The minister is able to criticise the opposition without a counter-argument, which is the single clearest impartiality problem.
- 2. Completeness (Score 6):** The broadcast covers the government's position extensively but systematically omits alternative perspectives. This is not an isolated deficiency but a structural problem that affects the entire ministerial interview segment.
- 3. Framing (Score 5):** Framing economic policy exclusively through a failed promise and emotionally charged language ("bleak fate") guide the viewer's interpretation without constituting explicit manipulation.

## Core messages of the broadcast

---

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "The Orpo government's economic policy has failed — promises have not been fulfilled and unemployment has risen to a record level."

**Technique:** Framing through the promise, statistical evidence — Evidence: 36:05, 36:20

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "Minister Marttinen defends the government's line but is unable to give concrete answers to the long-term unemployed."

**Technique:** Repeated follow-up questions without a satisfactory answer — Evidence: 46:10, 48:30

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "Progress has been made in the Gaza peace process, but a lasting solution is far off — Palestinian self-determination is marginalised in the plan."

**Technique:** Expert analysis, journalist reporting — Evidence: 24:15, 27:30

## Classification of degree of manipulation

---

Justification: The broadcast's total score (4.2/10) falls within the "mild tendency" range. The most significant problem is the absence of an opposition representative from the ministerial interview, which is in conflict with the diversity requirement of Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy. The journalist challenges the minister actively, which partly compensates for the structural imbalance. The Gaza segment is more balanced and expert-based. Overall, the broadcast does not fully meet the diverse and comprehensive information provision required by Section 7.

## CONCLUSION

---

The Ykkösaamu broadcast is journalistically reasonable but structurally imbalanced, particularly in the ministerial interview segment. The journalist challenges the minister actively and repeats questions when the minister evades them — this is appropriate journalism. However, the absence of an opposition representative, an independent economic expert and a trade union representative is a clear deficiency contrary to the diversity requirement of Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy: the minister is able to criticise the opposition (SDP, left-wing opposition) without a right of reply. Presenting the EU unemployment comparison without a stimulus policy context is misleading, even though the minister is allowed to correct the deficiency himself. The Gaza segment is more balanced: expert Juusola is credible (source traffic light green), and the positions of the various parties are presented analytically. Overall, the broadcast meets the requirements of Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy partly but not fully: diversity and comprehensiveness fall short, particularly in the domestic economic policy segment.



## OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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

**4.6/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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

**4.7/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### TOTAL SCORE

**4.7/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*Hard facts and soft facts average*



## LEGEND — Meaning of scores

### Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

### Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

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

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

<b>-5 ... -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	The party is significantly under-represented in framing, airtime or presentation.
<b>-2 ... -1</b>	<b>Mildly disadvantaged</b>	Identifiable but mild disadvantaging.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No detectable favouring or disadvantaging.
<b>+1 ... +2</b>	<b>Mildly favoured</b>	Identifiable but mild favouring.
<b>+3 ... +5</b>	<b>Strongly favoured</b>	The party is significantly over-represented 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 — diversity and pluralism

Facts: The ministerial interview (30:55–53:41) takes place without an opposition representative's right of reply; the minister criticises SDP (49:10) and the left-wing opposition (50:20) without a counter-argument

Evidence: Timestamp 49:10 — "When SDP served as the prime minister's party for four years under Marin, they did not make changes to the right of action, did not criminalise underpayment, and did not address the shocking situation of berry pickers"

Assessment: The governing party minister's criticism of the opposition without a right of reply is in conflict with the diversity requirement of Section 7; the viewer receives a one-sided picture of political responsibility

#### Violation 2:

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

Facts: The EU unemployment comparison is presented without a stimulus policy context (38:20), giving a misleading picture of the causes of Finland's situation

Evidence: Timestamp 38:20 — "but the same economic cycle applies to other EU countries too" — presented without explanation of the different stimulus capacities of countries

Assessment: Comprehensive information provision requires that statistical comparisons be appropriately contextualised; in this case the journalist omits essential context, and the minister has to correct the deficiency himself

#### Violation 3:

Norm: Act on Yleisradio Oy, Section 7 — impartiality

Facts: Framing economic policy exclusively through a failed election promise clip (36:05) automatically puts the minister on the defensive without a balancing frame

Evidence: Timestamp 36:05 — presentation of the Orpo election promise clip at the very start of the interview without a corresponding examination of opposition promises

Assessment: Impartiality requires that framing does not systematically favour one political position; in this case the frame is one-sidedly critical of the government without a corresponding critical examination of the opposition

### Overall assessment under Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy

The broadcast meets the requirements of Section 7 of the Act on Yleisradio Oy partly but not fully. The Gaza segment is expert-based and balanced, and no significant Section 7 violations are detected in it. However, the ministerial interview segment has three clear deficiencies: the absence of an opposition representative, the lack of contextualisation of the EU comparison, and framing exclusively through a failed promise. These deficiencies do not individually meet the threshold of a serious Section 7 violation, but together they constitute a structural imbalance that is in conflict with the diversity and comprehensiveness requirements. The recommendation is that in comparable ministerial broadcasts, an opposition representative should be offered a right of reply or an interview in the same broadcast.

### IN-DEPTH SOURCE CHECK (Mandatory for all cited expert institutions / civil society organisations / advisory services)

#### 1. Statistics Finland



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

- FUNDING:** State agency; public funding; under the administrative branch of the Ministry of Finance
- MANDATE:** The production of statistics is compatible with neutral information provision
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** No significant institutional interest in the content of the statistics; methodology is internationally standardised (ILO)
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** U1: +2 / U2: +2 / U3: +2 / U4: +2 / U5: +2 / U6: +2 → TOTAL: +12 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTER-POSITION:** Not needed; statistics are facts, not interpretations

## 2. Ministry of Finance (MoF)

- FUNDING:** State ministry; subordinate to the government
- MANDATE:** The production of economic forecasts is part of the mandate, but subordination to the government creates a structural interest
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Significant — MoF forecasts may reflect the government's political priorities; however, the forecasts are public and can be compared with independent institutions
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** U1: -1 / U2: +1 / U3: +2 / U4: +1 / U5: +1 / U6: +1 → TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN (borderline case)
- COUNTER-POSITION:** Forecasts from ETLA, PTT or the Bank of Finland are absent; these would have provided an independent point of comparison

## 3. VATT (Government Institute for Economic Research)

- FUNDING:** State research institute; under the administrative branch of the Ministry of Finance; academic independence
- MANDATE:** Economic policy research is compatible with a neutral assessment
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Mild — state-funded, but academic independence provides protection; studies are peer-reviewed
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** U1: +1 / U2: +1 / U3: +2 / U4: +1 / U5: +2 / U6: +2 → TOTAL: +9 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
- COUNTER-POSITION:** VATT's research finding is presented through the minister's words without the journalist independently contextualising it; other studies on the effects of the earnings disregard are not mentioned

## 4. Akava (Central Organisation of Finnish Academic Professionals)

- FUNDING:** Membership-fee-funded trade union organisation; represents graduate employees
- MANDATE:** Not compatible with a neutral assessment — Akava is an interest organisation whose role is to advance its members' interests
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Significant — Akava has an institutional interest in highlighting the unemployment problems of graduates
- CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** U1: -1 / U2: +1 / U3: +1 / U4: +1 / U5: 0 / U6: +1 → TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
- COUNTER-POSITION:** The perspective of employer organisations (EK) or independent researchers on graduate unemployment is absent

*IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a substantive qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be verified.*

## 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



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

statutory requirements falls exclusively within the competence of the relevant authorities (in particular Traficom).

**Not proof of causality**

Statistical correlations must 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 the 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 for comparative pattern recognition among thousands of broadcasts, not for precise metric measurement of individual segments. The 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 everyone's opportunities for participation 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 stated

The impartiality obligation comes from YLE's internal ethics guidelines (YSO):

> "We set impartiality as a goal in our programme and content production as a whole 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*

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Fair Broadcasting | PO Box, 8021 Zürich 1 | [www.svfab.ch](http://www.svfab.ch) | [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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 will 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](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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. Then 15 principles are 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 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 wants to know, what can be done about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. 7 most common traps. The three basic 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. For preparation, as a 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 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 realising it. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook – playful, direct 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 ja fairly. For 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, the media and everyday life – and with the occasional smile.

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**