



RAI DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-01-15_portaaporta_Regular_January_2026

Broadcast: RAI Programme | 2026-01-15 | Analysed on: 2026-05-24 11:40

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Riferimento: Contratto di servizio RAI Art. 7

OVERALL SCORE

6.4/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly unbalanced/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) classifies political parties on a left-right scale (0 = far left, 10 = far right). We use the Pew Research Center thresholds (2025): values <4.5 = Left, 4.5–5.5 = Centre, >5.5 = Right. This allows for an objective classification of the detected party bias.

Party	AVS	PD	M5S	Azione	NM	FI	Lega	Fdi
CHES	1.85	3.38	3.46	5.08	5.80	6.46	8.00	8.54
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Centre	Right	Right	Right	Right

The overall tendency is presented on a scale from 0 to 10 (0 = strongly favourable to the left, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly favourable to the right). The calculation is based on the difference in the average favouritism of left-wing vs. right-wing parties (grouping according to CHES 2024).

TENDENCY (L – R)

5.2 / 10

Balanced

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

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

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



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Italian government in office since October 2022 is led by Prime Minister Giorgia Meloni (Fdi) and consists of a centre-right coalition formed by Fratelli d'Italia (Fdi), Lega, Forza Italia (FI) and Noi Moderati (NM). The main opposition is the Partito Democratico (PD), flanked by Movimento 5 Stelle (M5S), Alleanza Verdi Sinistra (AVS), Azione, Italia Viva (IV) and +Europa.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Key position
AVS	2,30	12	Opposition	100% renewables, ius soli, wealth tax
PD	3,40	69	Opposition (main)	Minimum wage, pro-EU, civil rights
+Europa	3,80	2	Opposition	Pro-European integration, liberal-progressive
M5S	4,20	52	Opposition	Citizens' income, anti-corruption
Azione	4,90	21	Opposition	Liberal-reformist, centre
IV	5,00	(in Az)	Opposition	Centre, liberal-centrist
NM	5,80	7	Government	Moderate-right, Christian democratic
FI	6,50	45	Government	Liberal-conservative, guarantism
Lega	8,10	66	Government	Sovereignism, flat tax, differentiated autonomy
Fdi	8,30	119	Government (PM)	National-conservative, naval blockade, made in Italy

The main lines of political conflict in Italy concern: (1) the management of irregular immigration and repatriations, with the government focusing on restrictive measures and the opposition calling for humanitarian corridors and integration; (2) the relationship between the executive and the judiciary, with the justice reform and the separation of careers at the centre of the debate; (3) public security and the role of law enforcement, with the government proposing a criminal shield and the opposition denouncing authoritarian tendencies; (4) foreign policy, in particular support for Ukraine, which is generating internal tensions within the governing coalition itself, especially within Lega.

RAI is the Italian public radio and television service, subject to the Service Contract with the Ministry of Economy, which under Art. 6 requires pluralism, completeness, impartiality of information and separation between news and commentary. Historically RAI has been characterised by the so-called "lottizzazione", i.e. the division of channels according to party affiliations; under the Meloni government, the management of TG1 and the Board of Directors are influenced by the governing coalition. Porta a Porta, hosted by Bruno Vespa on Rai 1, is one of the longest-running and most influential political current affairs programmes in the Italian television landscape.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY BIAS

Assessment by party

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Representation in the broadcast vs. programmatic position
Fdl (Fratelli d'Italia)	+2	00:07:19 "With the government we are changing things" — Programmatic position: security, repatriations, sovereignty — Donzelli presents the Fdl positions in a broad and not systematically contradicted manner; the broadcast offers significant space to the government narrative. Partially accurate, with some simplifications.
PD (Partito Democratico)	-1	00:05:27 "We in these three years have voted... a government that was elected to have greater security" — Programmatic position: regulated reception, investment in law enforcement, minimum wage — Furfaro presents criticisms of the government but is frequently interrupted and put on the defensive; the PD's position on security is reduced to reactive criticism rather than an autonomous proposal. Partially distorted by reduction to a defensive position.
M5S	0	Not present in the broadcast as an active subject. Cited marginally (00:30:14) for the abstention on the Iran motion. Programmatic position not represented.
Lega	+1	00:30:26 discussion on the Vannacci/Ukraine vote — Programmatic position: sovereignty, flat tax, autonomy — Donzelli defends Lega as a solid part of the coalition; the internal tension (Vannacci) is mentioned but minimised. Partial representation, tending to favour the coherence of the coalition.
Forza Italia	0	Not present as an autonomous subject in the broadcast. Programmatic position not represented.
AVS (Alleanza Verdi Sinistra)	0	Not present in the broadcast. Programmatic position not represented.

Summary of Party Bias

- Most accurate representation: Fdl (Score +2) — the government positions are presented in a relatively complete manner through Donzelli.
- Strongest distortion: PD (Score -1) — the PD's position is reduced to reactive criticism, with no space for an autonomous programmatic proposal.
- Average deviation from 0: 0.7
- Conclusion: The broadcast offers a structurally asymmetric space: the government representative (Donzelli/Fdl) presents his narrative in an extensive and relatively undisturbed manner, while the opposition representative (Furfaro/PD) is constantly put on the defensive and interrupted. Opposition parties other than PD (M5S, AVS, Azione, IV) are completely absent, making the political picture one-dimensional.

Overall Left-Right Tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: -1.8

CLASSIFICATION: Favourable to the right

Rationale: The broadcast structurally favours the positions of the governing coalition through: (1) the choice of guests (Donzelli/Fdl as the only governmental political representative with ample space; Secchi of Libero as an editorial voice aligned with the centre-right); (2) the framing of the security decree as a necessary response to a real problem,



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

without systematic critical contextualisation; (3) the narrative on irregular immigration as the main cause of urban insecurity, presented as a given fact by multiple voices. The presence of Furfaro (PD) and Merlo (Il Domani) introduces critical elements, but the overall weight of the broadcast — in terms of time, framing and agenda — is oriented towards the positions of the governing centre-right.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast Data

- Title: Porta a Porta
- Date (from file name): Not specified in the text; content consistent with January 2025 (references to the Annabella Martinelli case, Piantedosi security decree, Ferragni acquittal)
- Duration (estimated from transcript): Approximately 80 minutes
- Host: Bruno Vespa
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Giovanni Donzelli	Vice-President FdI, MP	FdI	Right, government
Marco Furfaro	Head of political initiatives PD	PD	Centre-left, opposition
Mario Secchi	Editor-in-chief Libero	None (centre-right editorial)	Centre-right
Giulia Merlo	Journalist Il Domani	None (centre-left/liberal editorial)	Centre/centre-left
Flaminia Bolzano	Criminologist	None	Technical
Concita (Borrelli)	Journalist	None	Not classifiable
Massimo Lugli	Journalist and writer	None	Not classifiable
Agnese Pini	Editor-in-chief Quotidiano Nazionale/Il Giorno/La Nazione	None	Not classifiable
Massimiliano Dona	President Unione Nazionale Consumatori	None (consumer association)	Technical
Nicole Ronchi	Digital creator (micro-influencer)	None	Not classifiable
Nicola Santini	Editor-in-chief Vero	None	Not classifiable

Main Topic

The broadcast addresses the new security package of the Meloni government (Piantedosi decree), interweaving the political debate with crime news stories (self-defence, suicide of Annabella Martinelli, Nada Cella case, Crans-Montana tragedy) and the acquittal of Chiara Ferragni in the Pandoro Gate case.

Context of the Debate

The security decree presented by Minister Piantedosi is set against a backdrop of growing perception of insecurity in Italian cities, fuelled by episodes of youth violence (baby gangs), burglaries and the presence of irregular immigration. The centre-right government has made security one of its electoral battlehorses, but after three years in government the crime data show an increase, as admitted by President Meloni herself. The debate is polarised between those who attribute insecurity to irregular immigration and an "ideologised" judiciary (right) and those who denounce the insufficiency of resources for law enforcement and the propagandistic nature of the measures (opposition). The self-defence case in Pozzolo (Varese) — a 33-year-old who killed a Roma burglar who had entered his home — becomes the concrete symbol around which the debate on the reform of self-defence law is articulated.



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

Completeness Score: 3/10

Rationale: The broadcast adequately covers only the government perspective (A) and touches in a fragmentary way on a few others (B, D, E, G, J). Five out of ten perspectives are completely omitted (C, F, H, I and partly J). The absence of independent technical experts, voices from the communities affected by the regulations and contextualised statistical data renders the informational picture seriously incomplete with respect to public service standards.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hardfacts — 9 quantifiable and scientifically verifiable techniques

1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Mario Secchi — Editor-in-chief of Libero*

Timestamp: 00:14:48

Statement: "In Milan the left, which governs, until the day before yesterday denied that a crime problem existed."

Framing: Editor-in-chief of a newspaper with an explicitly centre-right orientation; he is not an expert in criminology, sociology or criminal law.

Missing critical voice: An urban sociologist or criminologist with empirical data could have contextualised the statement.

In-depth source verification:

(a) FUNDING: Libero is a private newspaper, historically close to the Italian centre-right; its editorial orientation is explicitly political.

(b) MANDATE: The mandate of a newspaper editor is editorial, not scientific; it is not compatible with a neutral assessment of criminological data.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source traffic light, 6 dimensions):

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Editorial orientation explicitly aligned with the government narrative on the topic discussed.

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No personal risk in expressing positions consistent with one's own editorial line.

D3 Technical expertise: -1 — Journalistic competence, not criminological or sociological.

D4 Consistency of opinions: +1 — Positions consistent with the newspaper's historical line.

D5 Emotionality vs. data: -1 — Predominantly assertive statements, without supporting data ("The numbers are staggering. You just have to go and look at them.").

D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary/tertiary source; no reference to primary data.

• TOTAL: -4 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The broadcast presents Secchi as an authoritative voice on the topic of urban security, without signalling his editorial orientation as a contextualising element. This constitutes a case of technique no. 2 (source selection).

Expert 2: Flaminia Bolzano — Criminologist

Timestamp: 00:44:18

Statement: "in certain situations that are of psychiatric interest such as for example the so-called twilight states... certain actions are carried out in an automatic manner"

Framing: Criminologist; relevant competence for the Annabella Martinelli case.

Missing critical voice: A psychiatrist or clinical psychologist could have integrated the criminological perspective with the therapeutic one.

In-depth source verification:

(a) FUNDING: Not specified in the broadcast; presumably a self-employed professional.

Präsident: Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



(b) MANDATE: Relevant competence for the criminological analysis of the case.

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No evident conflict.

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Neutral.

D3 Technical expertise: +2 — Criminologist, relevant competence.

D4 Consistency of opinions: +1 — Cautious and calibrated positions.

D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 — Predominantly analytical approach.

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source (direct expert).

- TOTAL: +6 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

Missing expert groups:

- Independent criminal/constitutional law expert (for the security decree)
- Representative of the ANM (for the accusations against the judiciary)
- Sociologist/criminologist with empirical data on immigration and crime

Summary (matrix result per expert):

- Secchi: YELLOW (-4) — editorially oriented source, presented as an authoritative voice without contextualisation.
- Bolzano: GREEN (+6) — relevant competence, analytical approach.
- Systematic absence of independent technical experts on the main topic (security decree).



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Statements without primary source = penalty points (claim verification)

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

Source 1: Repatriation data cited by Furfaro

Timestamp: 00:10:36 — Statement: "Repatriations under the Gentiloni government 6,500, repatriations under the Conte government 7,000, repatriations under the Meloni government 4,000."

- (a) Funding and ownership:** Data cited by an opposition representative without indication of the primary source (Ministry of the Interior? ISTAT? Eurostat?).
- (b) Structural conflict of interest:** Furfaro has a political interest in presenting the data in a manner unfavourable to the government.
- (c) Missing contrary source:** The data are neither verified nor challenged by the host; Donzelli denies them without providing alternative data.

Missing contrary source: Official data from the Ministry of the Interior or Eurostat.

Source 2: Secchi's statement on crime figures linked to immigration

Timestamp: 00:15:41 — Statement: "a long series of crimes is linked to irregular immigration, to the presence of foreigners. The numbers are staggering. You just have to go and look at them. They are pure statistics. They are public."

- (a) Funding:** Editorially oriented source (see above).
- (b) Conflict of interest:** Editorial orientation aligned with the government narrative.
- (c) Missing contrary source:** No ISTAT or Ministry of the Interior data are cited to verify or challenge the statement; no criminology expert intervenes.

Claim verification (Penalty points):

Claim 1:

Timestamp: 00:07:25

Statement: "The problems are that there has been uncontrolled immigration in recent years that has brought a series of people... who are often criminals because they don't know what else to do"

Verbal marker: "often" — generalisation without source

Primary source present: No — Penalty point

Claim 2:

Timestamp: 00:08:46

Statement: "many times judges, perhaps a little ideologised, make choices as they have done penalising the Albania option"

Verbal marker: "perhaps", "many times" — undocumented statement

Primary source present: No — Penalty point

Summary: The broadcast relies predominantly on undocumented statements by political figures and editorially oriented journalists, without systematic recourse to verifiable primary sources. The additional penalty score brings the total to 7/10.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time among the different positions.

Estimated speaking time (political segment, approximately 35 minutes):

- Donzelli (Fdl/government): approximately 12 min. (34%)
- Furfaro (PD/opposition): approximately 8 min. (23%)
- Secchi (Libero, centre-right orientation): approximately 7 min. (20%)
- Merlo (Il Domani, critical orientation): approximately 4 min. (11%)
- Vespa (host): approximately 4 min. (11%)

Summary: The distribution of speaking time is asymmetric: voices favourable to or aligned with the government (Donzelli + Secchi) occupy approximately 54% of the time, against 34% for critical voices (Furfaro + Merlo). The host does not compensate for this asymmetry with follow-up questions to the critical voices.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Omission 1:

Context: No official and contextualised data on crime trends in Italy is presented by the editorial team.

Relevant at: 00:05:40 — "crimes have increased in these three years of government"

Effect: Furfaro's statement (increase in crimes) and Donzelli's response (the left's fault) clash without the broadcast providing verifiable data; the viewer cannot form an informed opinion.

Omission 2:

Context: The anti-NGO provisions of the security decree (exclusion from territorial waters) are not discussed on their merits; no voice from NGOs or humanitarian organisations is present.

Relevant at: 00:03:47 — "The anti-NGO crackdown arrives, with the possibility of ordering the temporary exclusion from territorial waters for security reasons."

Effect: The measure is presented as a neutral fact in the introductory report, without any critical contextualisation or contrary voice.

Omission 3:

Context: The self-defence case in Pozzolo is presented with ample space given to the victim's family and the self-defence narrative, but without any voice from the Sinti/Roma community affected, nor a discussion of the tensions at the hospital in Magenta that followed the death of Adamo Massa.

Relevant at: 00:19:40 — "They leave Adamo Massa there, 37 years old, Sinti origins, a long list of prior convictions for property crimes, resident in a Roma camp in Turin."

Effect: The description of the victim (prior convictions, Roma camp) constructs a profile that implicitly justifies the death, with no space for an alternative perspective.

Summary: The most significant omissions concern empirical data on crime trends, the voices of communities affected by the regulations (migrants, NGOs, Sinti communities) and the independent technical assessment of the decree. These systematic omissions produce a structurally incomplete informational picture.

Missing voices

- Independent criminal/constitutional law expert: Could have assessed the constitutional compatibility of the criminal shield and red zones with the principles of the rule of law.
- Representative of the ANM (Associazione Nazionale Magistrati): Could have responded to the accusations of "ideologised judiciary" with data and technical arguments.
- Criminologist or sociologist with empirical data: Could have contextualised the link between irregular immigration and crime, preventing unverified statements from passing as facts.
- Trade union representative of law enforcement (plurality): Could have offered a more complete picture of the operational conditions of the police, including criticism of funding cuts.
- Representative of NGOs or migrant rights associations: Could have illustrated the humanitarian implications of the anti-NGO regulations and the CPR detention centres.
- Expert in adolescent psychology or educationalist: Could have contextualised the anti-baby gang regulations with data on youth hardship and the effectiveness of sanctions on minors.
- Representative of Roma or Sinti communities: In the self-defence case in Pozzolo, the victim is described as having "Sinti origins, resident in a Roma camp"; no voice from these communities is present.



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

- Expert in public policies on urban security: Could have comparatively assessed the effectiveness of the proposed measures against international experiences.



5. DATA MANIPULATION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:10:36

Data: "Repatriations under the Gentiloni government 6,500, repatriations under the Conte government 7,000, repatriations under the Meloni government 4,000."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — shown; (b) Share — not shown (% of total irregular migrants present); (c) Trend — not shown (annual trend, not just legislative term total).

Missing context: The data are not attributed to a primary source; it is not specified whether these are voluntary or forced repatriations, nor the total number of irregular migrants present in the respective periods.

Effect: The comparison between governments appears objective but lacks contextualisation; it could be misleading without data on the total number of irregular migrants present.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:08:07

Data: "we have increased the number of uniformed officers in Italy by 4,000 net, 37,400 more since we have been in government"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — shown; (b) Share — not shown (% of total workforce); (c) Trend — not shown (how many vacancies existed at the start of the mandate).

Missing context: It is not specified whether these are actual new hires or personnel already in training; no comparison is made with the declared staffing requirement.

Effect: The figure appears as evidence of effective action, but without contextualisation it cannot be verified.

Summary: Numerical data are used selectively by both political sides, without the host or editorial team providing systematic contextualisation. The failure to resort to verifiable primary sources makes it impossible for the viewer to assess the reliability of the figures cited.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Discrediting by association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 00:07:25

Quote: "The problems are that there has been uncontrolled immigration in recent years that has brought a series of people... who are often criminals because they don't know what else to do"

Technique: Direct association between irregular immigration and crime, presented as a causal explanation for urban insecurity.

Effect: Suggests that irregular immigrants are structurally predisposed to crime, without distinction between categories and without supporting data.

Association 2:

Timestamp: 00:19:40

Quote: "They leave Adamo Massa there, 37 years old, Sinti origins, a long list of prior convictions for property crimes, resident in a Roma camp in Turin."

Technique: The description of the victim accumulates identity markers (Sinti origins, Roma camp, prior convictions) that construct a profile of a "typical criminal", implicitly justifying the death.

Effect: The victim is dehumanised through the accumulation of negative characteristics; ethnic origin is associated with criminality.

Association 3:

Timestamp: 00:08:46

Quote: "many times judges, perhaps a little ideologised, make choices as they have done penalising the Albania option"

Technique: Association between the judiciary critical of the government and "ideologisation", suggesting that judicial decisions unfavourable to the government are politically rather than legally motivated.

Effect: Delegitimises the judiciary as an independent institution, preparing the ground for the criminal shield narrative.

Verification for persons framed as "ideologised":

- Donzelli uses the term "ideologised magistrates" without providing specific evidence (documented cases, rulings, names).
- The statements are not falsifiable in the context of the broadcast.
- Category: B (borderline case) — the statement is partially documentable (Albania case), but the generalisation lacks a systematic empirical basis.

Summary (category assignment with matrix rationale):

- Immigration/crime: Category C — undocumented generalisation, not falsifiable in context.
- Adamo Massa: Category C — accumulation of negative identity markers without contextualisation.
- "Ideologised" judiciary: Category B — partially documentable, but excessive generalisation.



7. TIMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Position: 00:00:21 (beginning, preview)

Content: "Then we will deal with self-defence, homeowner kills burglar Rom in his home."

Timing effect: The self-defence case is previewed in the introduction with the ethnic specification ("Roma burglar"), before the case is even discussed on its merits. This prepares the viewer to frame the case in ethnic terms from the outset.

Finding 2:

Position: 00:17:38 (end of political segment)

Content: Satirical clip by Osho on "maranza" — "You can't live in Italy anymore. You'd have to drop everything and move to Iran."

Timing effect: The satirical clip closes the political debate with an element of irony that reduces the complexity of the security topic to a joke, relieving the accumulated tension but also trivialising the criticisms of the opposition.

Summary: The most significant timing concerns the preview of the self-defence case with the ethnic specification in the introduction, which orients the viewer's perception before the case is even discussed. The closing with the satirical clip produces a normalising effect on the government narrative.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Definition: Outrage towards certain positions but not towards comparable ones.

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:09:12

Triggering event: Furfaro asks Donzelli to respond to the criticism about the increase in crimes during the centre-right government.

Reaction: Vespa intervenes with "Donzelli, make it clear, after three years of government crimes have increased in these three years of government because of the left, the magistrates, the mayors, I don't know what, but what are you doing in this country?" — ironic-critical tone towards Donzelli.

Comparison: When Donzelli states that insecurity is caused by irregular immigration brought by the left (00:07:25), Vespa does not intervene with an analogous critical tone.

Asymmetry: Partially documentable — Vespa shows a moment of critical pressure towards Donzelli, but does not maintain the same critical standard towards Donzelli's undocumented statements on immigration and the judiciary.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:35:38

Triggering event: News of the investigations into the Privacy Guarantor.

Reaction: Donzelli: "look, it is a portrait of the worst Italy... moreover appointed when we were in opposition and the PD was in government" — explicit outrage with attribution of responsibility to PD.

Comparison: No critical voice towards the government for the political appointment of other oversight bodies under the current majority.

Asymmetry: Documentable — the outrage over corruption at the Privacy Guarantor is used to attack PD, without the broadcast contextualising the system of political appointments that runs through all governments.

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 2/5

Summary: Selective outrage is present but not systematic. The most significant moment is the use of the news about the Privacy Guarantor to attack PD, without contextualising the lottizzazione system that has historically characterised all political appointments in Italy.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — GENERAL PICTURE

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How completely does the broadcast represent the topic? Are relevant perspectives, facts or actors systematically omitted?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:03:47

Missing perspective/fact: The anti-NGO provisions of the security decree.

Relevance: The provisions on the exclusion of NGOs from territorial waters have significant humanitarian implications and have been the subject of international debate.

Impact of absence: The measure is presented as a neutral fact in the introductory report, without any critical voice or humanitarian contextualisation.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:15:41

Missing perspective/fact: Empirical data on the link between immigration and crime.

Relevance: Secchi's statement ("a long series of crimes is linked to irregular immigration... The numbers are staggering") is presented as a given fact without verification.

Impact of absence: The viewer has no tools to assess the reliability of the statement; the immigration=crime narrative consolidates without empirical counterargument.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:19:40

Missing perspective/fact: Voice of the Sinti/Roma community in the self-defence case in Pozzolo.

Relevance: The victim belongs to an ethnic minority; the tensions at the hospital in Magenta involve the community; the broadcast offers no perspective from this community.

Impact of absence: The case is narrated exclusively from the perspective of the 33-year-old's family and the self-defence narrative, with no space for the social complexity of the case.

Summary: The systematic omissions concern the voices of communities affected by the regulations (migrants, NGOs, Sinti communities), independent empirical data and the technical assessment of the decree. The resulting informational picture is structurally incomplete and oriented towards the government narrative.

End of Hardfacts — Beginning of Softfacts

Share of perspectives covered

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

[A] Government position on the security decree (FdI/Lega/FI)

[B] Position of the centre-left opposition (PD, M5S, AVS)

[C] Technical-legal assessment of the decree by independent criminal law experts

[D] Official statistical data on crimes (ISTAT, Ministry of the Interior) with contextualisation

[E] Perspective of law enforcement and their trade unions (plurality, not only those favourable to the government)

[F] Perspective of human rights organisations on CPR detention centres and expulsions

[G] Perspective of the judiciary (ANM or individual magistrates) on the decree and the criminal shield



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

[H] Perspective of criminology experts on the relationship between immigration and crime

[I] Perspective of immigrant community associations or NGOs

[J] Perspective of parents and educators on the anti-baby gang regulations

[A] COVERED

Timestamp: 00:07:19 — Quote: "With the government we are changing things. I'm sorry, you won't like it." —

Assessment: Donzelli presents the government position in an extensive and repeated manner.

[B] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 00:05:27 — Quote: "We can build more DASPOs, more red zones, more crimes, but the point is that if you don't also increase those who have to ensure that those laws are observed..." — Assessment: Furfaro presents the PD criticism but in a reactive and fragmented manner, with no space for an autonomous programmatic proposal; M5S, AVS and other opposition parties are completely absent.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No independent criminal law expert was invited to assess the constitutionality or technical effectiveness of the decree.

[D] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 00:10:36 — Quote: "Repatriations under the Gentiloni government 6,500, repatriations under the Conte government 7,000, repatriations under the Meloni government 4,000." — Assessment: Some data are cited by Furfaro, but without a verifiable source and without systematic contextualisation by the editorial team.

[E] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 00:09:28 — Quote: "Only the trade union close to the CGIL says that. The other police trade unions are happy with the regulations we are implementing." — Assessment: The plurality of police trade unions is mentioned only to be dismissed by Donzelli; no trade union representative is present.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No voice from human rights organisations on CPR detention centres, expulsions or anti-NGO regulations.

[G] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 00:13:51 — Quote: "it seems to me that the very fact that the judiciary investigates only against thieves is proof that the magistrate has evidently interpreted the situation" — Assessment: Merlo defends the judiciary in a generic manner; no magistrate or ANM representative is present.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No independent criminologist or sociologist analyses the causal link between immigration and crime, which is instead assumed as a given fact by Donzelli and Secchi.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No voice from immigrant communities, NGOs or advocacy associations is present.

[J] TOUCHED UPON

Timestamp: 00:16:57 — Quote: "Parents are called into question, which is a very important thing" — Assessment: The topic is mentioned by Secchi in an approving manner, without any voice from educators, psychologists or child welfare experts.



Softfacts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How is the topic fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:02:43

Quote: "The text includes the so-called anti-maranza regulations"

Manipulation: The term "maranza" (slang, with ethnic and class connotations) is used in the introductory report as an official category, normalising a stigmatising label.

Why problematic: The term is not neutral; its adoption in the language of the public service broadcaster contributes to constructing a category of "internal enemy" based on socio-ethnic characteristics.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:07:19

Quote: "The problems are that there has been uncontrolled immigration in recent years that has brought a series of people... who are often criminals"

Manipulation: The frame "uncontrolled immigration = crime" is presented as a causal explanation for urban insecurity, without contextualisation.

Why problematic: This frame reduces a complex phenomenon (urban insecurity) to a monocausal explanation (immigration), excluding structural factors (poverty, inequality, lack of services).

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:20:12

Quote: "the responsibility for security even in cities is, according to the constitutional mandate, not of the mayors, not of the magistrates, it is of the government"

Manipulation: Furfaro attempts to shift the frame from the opposition's fault to the government's responsibility, but this attempt is immediately neutralised by Donzelli and is not developed by the host.

Why problematic: The dominant frame of the broadcast remains that of "the left's fault", even when the data (increase in crimes under the centre-right government) contradict this narrative.

Summary: The dominant frame of the broadcast is that of security as an emergency caused by irregular immigration and the "ideologised" judiciary, with the government presented as the necessary solution. This frame is structurally favourable to the government narrative and is not systematically challenged by the host.



11. WORD AND TERM CHOICE

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:00:21

Quote: "homeowner kills Roma burglar in his home"

Manipulation: The ethnic specification ("Roma") in the preview of the case, before the case is even discussed on its merits.

Why problematic: The ethnicity of the victim is not relevant to the legal assessment of self-defence; its mention in the preview orients the viewer's perception in ethnic terms. Neutral alternative: "homeowner kills burglar in his home".

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:10:09

Quote: "You will find the illegal immigrant that you let in when you were in government, who will threaten you with a knife"

Manipulation: The term "clandestino" (with strong negative connotation) is used by Donzelli in a hypothetical statement presented as a realistic scenario.

Why problematic: The term "clandestino" is politically connoted; the neutral alternative is "irregular migrant". The statement constructs a scenario of direct threat to the viewer ("tonight someone will go to catch a train... They will find the illegal immigrant").

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:55:59

Quote: "Who is this woman? She looks like Cruella de Vil."

Manipulation: The reference to the Disney character Cruella De Vil to describe Jessica Moretti (owner of the venue in Crans-Montana) is an undocumented personal judgement, expressed by Massimo Lugli without the host intervening.

Why problematic: This type of demonising language, in the absence of a counterargument, violates the principle of separation between news and commentary.

Summary: The choice of language in the broadcast is systematically oriented towards negatively connoted terms for the categories associated with the insecurity narrative (immigrants, magistrates, the left), while government positions are expressed with neutral or positive language.



12. HOST BEHAVIOUR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

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 events with other guests have not produced an analogous intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:10:16

Triggering event: Donzelli interrupts Furfaro with "You will find the illegal immigrant that you let in when you were in government".

Quote (host): "Excuse me, but explain the rules of the game to me. If you have to keep interrupting each other..."

Comparison: When Donzelli interrupts Furfaro earlier (00:09:22 — "Shout, shout, shout, shout"), Vespa does not intervene with the same promptness.

Asymmetry: Partially documentable — Vespa intervenes to regulate the debate, but not in a systematically equitable manner; Donzelli's interruptions of Furfaro are more frequent and less sanctioned.

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:09:12

Triggering event: Furfaro criticises the government for the increase in crimes.

Quote (host): "Donzelli, make it clear, after three years of government crimes have increased in these three years of government because of the left, the magistrates, the mayors, I don't know what, but what are you doing in this country?"

Comparison: When Donzelli states that insecurity is caused by irregular immigration (00:07:25), Vespa does not pose an analogous question ("but what are you doing?").

Asymmetry: Documentable — Vespa poses a critical question to Donzelli, but the tone is ironic-rhetorical rather than genuinely critical; the question is not developed into a systematic counterargument.

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:32:38

Triggering event: Donzelli expresses a positive assessment of the government's foreign policy.

Quote (host): "come on Donzelli, there's really nowhere to go with this propaganda"

Comparison: When Furfaro expresses critical assessments of the government, Vespa does not use the term "propaganda".

Asymmetry: Documentable — Vespa uses the term "propaganda" for Donzelli, but in a good-natured manner and without critical development; the term is not used for Donzelli's undocumented statements on immigration and the judiciary.

Summary: The host's behaviour is characterised by a moderate asymmetry: Vespa occasionally poses critical questions to the government representative, but does not maintain the same critical standard towards the undocumented statements of Donzelli and Secchi. Donzelli's interruptions of Furfaro are tolerated for longer before a regulatory intervention.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Differently tough/soft questions to different people.

Asymmetry 1:

To Furfaro (PD), 00:05:00: "But is there nothing, nothing, nothing to save [in the security decree]?" — rhetorical question that puts Furfaro on the defensive, forcing him to justify his criticism.

To Donzelli (FdI), 00:07:09: "How do you respond to the fundamental criticism though? You talk, talk, talk, crimes, crimes, crimes, and then in the end the situation is what it is." — critical question, but formulated in a way that allows Donzelli to respond with the "left's fault" narrative.

Comparison: The question to Furfaro forces him to defend his critical position; the question to Donzelli, though critical, offers a narrative escape route (the fault of the left, the magistrates, the mayors).

Asymmetry 2:

To Donzelli (FdI), 00:09:12: "after three years of government crimes have increased in these three years of government because of the left, the magistrates, the mayors, I don't know what, but what are you doing in this country?" — critical question.

To Secchi (Libero), no critical question about the undocumented statements on the "staggering numbers" of immigration and crime.

Comparison: Vespa poses critical questions to the government politician but not to the journalist editorially aligned with the government, whose undocumented statements pass without verification.

Summary: The question asymmetry is moderate but systematic: critical questions are posed predominantly to the government representative (Donzelli), but in a way that offers narrative escape routes; Secchi's undocumented statements are not subjected to critical verification.



14. FALSE BALANCE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance despite a real imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:13:15 — Construct: The broadcast presents the debate on the security decree as a balanced confrontation between government (Donzelli) and opposition (Furfaro), with two "neutral" voices (Secchi and Merlo).

Analysis: The false balance consists in presenting Secchi (Libero) as a "neutral" or "expert" voice when he is editorially aligned with the centre-right; the effective weight of voices favourable to the government (Donzelli + Secchi) significantly exceeds that of critical voices (Furfaro + Merlo). The 2+2 structure suggests balance, but conceals a substantial asymmetry.

Summary: False balance is present in the structure of the guests: the presence of two voices per side (government/opposition) creates an appearance of parity that conceals the asymmetry between an editorially oriented newspaper editor (Secchi) and a journalist from a critical newspaper (Merlo), with significant differences in terms of speaking time and perceived authority.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is taken for granted/normal? What does not enter the agenda?

Finding 1:

Agenda item set: Urban security as an emergency caused primarily by irregular immigration.

Timestamp: 00:02:43 — Evidence: "The text includes the so-called anti-maranza regulations" — the introductory report presents the regulations as a response to a real emergency, without critical contextualisation.

Alternative agenda: An analysis of the structural causes of urban insecurity (poverty, inequality, lack of social services, understaffing of law enforcement) would have offered a more complete picture.

Finding 2:

Agenda item set: The judiciary as an obstacle to public security.

Timestamp: 00:08:46 — Evidence: "many times judges, perhaps a little ideologised, make choices as they have done penalising the Albania option" — this narrative is also taken up by Secchi (00:17:32: "that ideologised magistrate, we have very many of them") without systematic challenge.

Alternative agenda: An analysis of the functioning of the judiciary, data on the efficiency of the judicial system and the technical reasons for the contested decisions would have offered a more balanced picture.

Summary: The most significant agenda-setting concerns the construction of irregular immigration and the judiciary as the main causes of insecurity, taking for granted a causal relationship that is not empirically verified. This orients the debate towards the solutions proposed by the government (security decree, criminal shield, justice reform) as necessary responses to problems taken as certain.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of Individual Scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	7	Systematic absence of independent technical experts; Secchi presented as an authoritative voice without contextualisation of his editorial orientation.
2	Source selection	H	7	Undocumented statements pass without verification; data cited without primary source.
3	Time distribution	H	6	Voices favourable to the government (54%) vs. critical voices (34%); structural asymmetry.
4	Omissions	H	8	Systematic absence of voices from communities affected by the regulations and of independent empirical data.
5	Data manipulation	H	6	Data used selectively by both sides without editorial contextualisation.
6	Guilt by association	H	7	Immigration/crime and judiciary/ideology associations presented as facts without empirical basis.
7	Timing	H	5	Preview of the self-defence case with ethnic specification orients the viewer's perception.
8	Selective outrage	H	5	Use of the Privacy Guarantor news to attack PD without contextualising the lottizzazione system.
9	Completeness	H	8	Structurally incomplete informational picture; five out of ten perspectives completely omitted.
10	Framing	S	7	Dominant frame: security as an emergency caused by irregular immigration and the "ideologised" judiciary.
11	Word choice	S	6	Language negatively connoted for categories associated with the insecurity narrative.
12	Host behaviour	S	6	Moderate asymmetry: occasional critical questions to the government, but standard not maintained towards undocumented statements.
13	Question asymmetry	S	6	Critical questions to the government politician, but with narrative escape routes; Secchi's statements not verified.
14	False balance	S	5	2+2 structure suggests parity but conceals substantial asymmetry between the voices.
15	Agenda-setting	S	7	Immigration and judiciary constructed as main causes of insecurity without empirical verification.

Results

- HARDFACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 6.6 / 10
- SOFTFACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 6.2 / 10



- OVERALL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 6.4 / 10

Dominant Techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omissions (Score 8):** The broadcast systematically omits the voices of communities affected by the regulations (migrants, NGOs, Sinti/Roma communities), independent empirical data on crime trends and the technical assessment of the decree by independent experts. These omissions produce a structurally incomplete informational picture that favours the government narrative by default.
- 2. Completeness (Score 8):** Five of the ten perspectives relevant to a balanced treatment of the topic are completely absent from the broadcast. The absence of criminal law experts, ANM representatives, criminologists with empirical data, NGO voices and immigrant community voices makes it impossible for the viewer to form an informed opinion.
- 3. Framing (Score 7):** The dominant frame — security as an emergency caused by irregular immigration and the "ideologised" judiciary — is constructed through the accumulation of undocumented statements by Donzelli and Secchi, not systematically challenged by the host. This frame orients the debate towards the solutions proposed by the government as necessary responses to problems taken as certain.

Key Messages of the Broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT): "The security decree is a necessary response to a real emergency caused by irregular immigration and the ideologised judiciary."

Technique: Framing + Agenda-setting — Evidence: 00:07:25, 00:08:46, 00:15:41

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Those who criticise the security decree are responsible for the current insecurity, because they governed badly in the past."

Technique: Guilt by association + Omissions — Evidence: 00:07:25, 00:11:20

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "Italy is an unsafe country because the left has favoured uncontrolled immigration and ideologised magistrates protect criminals."

Technique: Framing + Word choice + Agenda-setting — Evidence: 00:07:25, 00:08:46, 00:19:40

Classification of the Degree of Manipulation

Rationale: With an overall score of 6.4/10, the broadcast falls into the category of "clear one-sidedness". The systematic omissions (score 8), the oriented framing (score 7) and the expert selection (score 7) produce an informational picture structurally favourable to the government narrative. The broadcast does not comply with the principle of completeness and impartiality required by Art. 6 of the RAI Service Contract, as it systematically omits the voices of communities affected by the regulations, independent empirical data and the technical assessment of the decree. The presence of critical voices (Furfaro, Merlo) mitigates the judgement compared to the category of "systematic imbalance", but is not sufficient to guarantee the informational balance required by the public service broadcaster.

CONCLUSION

The episode of Porta a Porta analysed presents a clear structural one-sidedness in the treatment of the Meloni government's security decree, with an overall score of 6.4/10. The most significant omissions concern the absence of independent technical experts, voices from communities affected by the regulations (migrants, NGOs, Sinti/Roma communities) and verifiable empirical data on crime trends and the link between immigration and crime. The dominant frame — security as an emergency caused by irregular immigration and the "ideologised" judiciary — is constructed through the accumulation of undocumented statements that are not systematically challenged by the host. Under Art. 6 of the RAI Service Contract, which requires pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information as well as separation between news and commentary, the broadcast presents relevant violations: the lack of pluralism in sources and experts, the absence of completeness in the representation of relevant perspectives and the mixing of news and commentary (in particular in the statements of Donzelli and Secchi not verified by the host) constitute elements of non-compliance with public service broadcaster standards. The broadcast does not reach the level of "systematic imbalance" thanks to the presence of critical voices (Furfaro, Merlo) and moments of critical pressure from the host, but the overall structure documentably favours the narrative of the governing coalition.



OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
2	SOURCE SELECTION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
5	DATA MANIPULATION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
7	TIMING	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — GENERAL PICTURE	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
10	FRAMING	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
11	WORD AND TERM CHOICE	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
12	HOST BEHAVIOUR	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
15	AGENDA-SETTING	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>

HARDFACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.6/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

SOFTFACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.2/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.4/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



LEGEND — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly detected.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
3–4	Mild-moderate finding	Recognisable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance that influences the public's opinion-forming potential.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores equal to or greater than 6 are classified as "significant findings".
7	Significant finding	Clear and well-documented imbalance with evident impact relevance.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple individual findings documented under this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic and pervasive imbalance under this criterion.

Aggregate deviation index — Interpretation intervals

0.0 – 2.5	No anomaly	No significant pattern detected; the broadcast complies with the principle of balance.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but still within the tolerance margin.
4.1 – 6.0	Considerable imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant compromise of the plurality of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation	Pronounced patterns across broadcasts; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Maximum systemic partiality. Very high degree of bias	Maximum severity on almost all criteria; systematically one-sided coverage.

Political-party bias (from -5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	The party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime or presentation.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognisable but mild disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No detectable favouritism or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Recognisable but mild favouritism.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	The party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL FRAMEWORK (Service Contract Art. 6)

Assessment under RAI Service Contract Art. 6

The RAI Service Contract requires pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information, as well as separation between news and commentary.

Violation 1:

Provision: Service Contract Art. 6 — Pluralism and completeness of information

Facts: The broadcast systematically omits the voices of communities affected by the provisions of the security decree (migrants, NGOs, Sinti/Roma communities) and does not invite independent technical experts (jurists, criminologists, sociologists) to assess the decree on its merits.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:03:47 — Quote: "The anti-NGO crackdown arrives, with the possibility of ordering the temporary exclusion from territorial waters for security reasons." — presented without a critical voice or humanitarian contextualisation.

Assessment: The systematic absence of voices representative of the affected communities and of independent experts violates the principle of pluralism and completeness of information required by Art. 6.

Violation 2:

Provision: Service Contract Art. 6 — Impartiality of information

Facts: The dominant frame of the broadcast — irregular immigration and the "ideologised" judiciary as the main causes of insecurity — is constructed through undocumented statements by political figures and editorially oriented journalists, not systematically verified by the host.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:15:41 — Quote: "a long series of crimes is linked to irregular immigration, to the presence of foreigners. The numbers are staggering. You just have to go and look at them. They are pure statistics. They are public." — Secchi's statement not verified by the host.

Assessment: The failure to verify undocumented statements and their presentation as established facts violates the principle of impartiality of information.

Violation 3:

Provision: Service Contract Art. 6 — Separation between news and commentary

Facts: In the self-defence case in Pozzolo, the description of the victim ("Sinti origins, a long list of prior convictions for property crimes, resident in a Roma camp in Turin") accumulates negative identity markers that constitute an implicit judgement, not separated from the narration of the facts.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:19:40 — Quote: "They leave Adamo Massa there, 37 years old, Sinti origins, a long list of prior convictions for property crimes, resident in a Roma camp in Turin."

Assessment: The accumulation of negative identity markers in the narration of the facts constitutes a mixing of news and commentary that violates the principle of separation required by Art. 6.

Overall Assessment Service Contract Art. 6

The broadcast analysed presents three relevant violations of Art. 6 of the RAI Service Contract: (1) lack of pluralism and completeness due to the systematic absence of voices from communities affected by the regulations and of independent technical experts; (2) lack of impartiality due to the presentation of undocumented statements as established facts, without editorial verification; (3) mixing of news and commentary in the description of the victim in the self-defence case in Pozzolo. These violations do not reach the level of "extreme imbalance" thanks to the presence of critical voices and moments of critical pressure from the host, but are sufficiently documented and systematic to constitute non-compliance with the standards of the Italian public service broadcaster. In any potential proceedings before AGCOM or in court, the findings documented in this analysis — with reference to timestamps,



direct quotes and asymmetric comparisons — would constitute relevant evidentiary elements for the assessment of the broadcast's compliance with public service obligations.

IN-DEPTH SOURCE VERIFICATION (Mandatory for all technical instances/NGOs/associations cited)

1. Mario Secchi — Editor-in-chief Libero*

1. FUNDING: Libero is a private newspaper; its ownership has over time been linked to figures of the Italian centre-right. Private funding with an explicitly political editorial orientation.

2. MANDATE: The mandate of a newspaper editor is editorial, not scientific or technical; it is not compatible with a neutral assessment of criminological or sociological data.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Editorial orientation explicitly aligned with the government narrative on the topic discussed (security, immigration); institutional interest in supporting the positions of the governing coalition.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX (6D Traffic Light):

D1 Conflict of interest: -2

D2 Personal risk: 0

D3 Technical expertise: -1

D4 Consistency of opinions: +1

D5 Emotionality vs. data: -1

D6 Source level: -1

• TOTAL: -4 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

5. CONTRARY VOICE: A criminologist or sociologist with empirical data could have challenged Secchi's statements on the immigration/crime link. Not cited.

IMPORTANT: "Editor-in-chief of Libero" is not a neutral technical qualification. It is an editorial position that must be contextualised when dealing with public policy topics.

2. Flaminia Bolzano — Criminologist

1. FUNDING: Not specified; presumably a self-employed professional.

2. MANDATE: Relevant competence for the criminological analysis of the Annabella Martinelli case.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: No evident conflict in the context of the broadcast.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX (6D Traffic Light):

D1 Conflict of interest: +1

D2 Personal risk: 0

D3 Technical expertise: +2

D4 Consistency of opinions: +1

D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1

D6 Source level: +1

• TOTAL: +6 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN

5. CONTRARY VOICE: A psychiatrist or clinical psychologist could have integrated the criminological perspective with the therapeutic one on the topic of youth suicide.

3. Massimiliano Dona — President Unione Nazionale Consumatori

1. FUNDING: Consumer association; mixed funding (membership fees, public contributions, private sponsorships).

2. MANDATE: The mandate is consumer protection; compatible with an assessment of the Ferragni case from the perspective of consumer rights.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: The Unione Nazionale Consumatori participated in the settlement with Ferragni (withdrawal of the complaint in exchange for compensation); this constitutes a potential conflict of interest in the assessment of the outcome of the proceedings.

4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX (6D Traffic Light):

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Participation in the settlement.

D2 Personal risk: 0

D3 Technical expertise: +1 — Competence in consumer law.

D4 Consistency of opinions: +1

D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1

D6 Source level: +1



• TOTAL: +3 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

5. CONTRARY VOICE: An independent criminal law jurist could have assessed the outcome of the proceedings without the conflict of interest arising from participation in the settlement.

Source credibility traffic light:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
Mario Secchi — Editor-in-chief *Libero*	-2	0	-1	+1	-1	-1	?	?
Flaminia Bolzano — Criminologist	+1	0	+2	+1	+1	+1	?	?
Massimiliano Dona — President Unione Nazionale Consumatori	-1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	?	?

Legal and methodological framework

Not a determination of facts	The findings presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.
Not a legal judgement	The aggregate deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under RAI Service Contract Art. 7. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular AGCOM).
Not proof of causality	Statistical correlations must not be interpreted as proof of causal links or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by the choice of topics, the informational context, political controversy or the logic of the format.
Not a judgement on intentionality	The analysis measures the observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant imbalance has been detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no statements about motivations or strategic objectives.
Heuristic comparison tool	The index serves for the comparative recognition of patterns across thousands of broadcasts, not for the precise metric measurement of individual segments. The threshold values serve as heuristic guidance, not as precise legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Italy — RAI

Laws

- RAI Service Contract 2023-2028
- Legislative Decree 208/2021 — Consolidated Text of Audiovisual Media Services (TUSMA)
- Law 28/2000 — Par Condicio

Relevant articles

RAI Service Contract 2023-2028

- Art. 3: The public radio, television and multimedia service is characterised by pluralism, completeness, objectivity and impartiality of information.
- Art. 6: Quality obligations — plurality of opinions, balanced representation.
- Art. 25: Separation between information and opinion.

Legislative Decree 208/2021 (TUSMA)

- Art. 3: Fundamental principles — pluralism of opinions, objectivity, completeness.
- Art. 7: Radio and television news activity is guided by principles of objectivity, completeness, fairness, impartiality, openness to different opinions and political, social, cultural and religious tendencies.

Law 28/2000 (Par Condicio)

- Art. 2: Equal access to information media during electoral campaigns.
- Art. 3: Equal treatment of all political subjects in information.
- Art. 4: Prohibition of political advertising on public media outside electoral campaigns.

RAI Code of Ethics (2017)

Impartiality, fact-checking, separation of news/commentary.

European reference framework

- ECHR Art. 10: Freedom of expression (European Convention on Human Rights)
- EU Rule of Law Report: Annual assessment of media freedom in Italy
- RSF Press Freedom Index: Reporters Without Borders, annual ranking
- EMFA (European Media Freedom Act, 2024): EU minimum standards for media freedom
- Media Pluralism Monitor (EUI Florence): Annual assessment of media pluralism

Structural context

The "lottizzazione" — the historical division of RAI channels according to criteria of party proportionality — continues to influence the structural independence of RAI to this day. The formal legal framework (Service Contract, TUSMA) is correct, but practical implementation is influenced by politics.

Supervisory authorities

- AGCOM (Autorità per le Garanzie nelle Comunicazioni): Media regulation, sanctions
- Parliamentary supervisory committee for RAI: Parliamentary oversight

Complaint procedure

1. RAI internal complaints office
2. AGCOM



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

3. Regional Administrative Court (TAR)



ANNEX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

Bibliography

- 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 Balanced Information | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | kontakt@svfab.ch | *Methodological 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 of SVFAB

On SVFAB.ch you will find not only further detailed assessments, but you can also request customised ones for any broadcast (paid service).

To keep our work solid, we depend on the contributions of members and supporters.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via www.svfab.ch or kontakt@svfab.ch



Unbalanced information is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are illustrated in detail, starting from the selection of personnel and sources. 15 principles are then illustrated: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, decontextualisation and many others, with numerous examples. You also discover where we ourselves apply these techniques — which promotes not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book includes **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage — and someone else wrote the script.

Those who don't know this provide material. Good quotes badly cut. Correct statements in the wrong context. Sincere answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolkit — for all those who have a microphone in front of them and want to know what to do. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three fundamental principles of sovereignty — anchor, reframe, delimit. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when something goes wrong. And what counts after the interview. For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for all those who are exposed and want to understand how the game works. To stop being subjected to it — and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, consultation, follow-up and in difficult moments



You think you see the world. In reality, you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It does not change the facts — it changes what we make of the facts. What we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry manual. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You don't just learn how others frame you. You learn how you frame yourself — and how to use it consciously and correctly.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Listen to the news differently. Conduct conversations with more confidence. And can no longer so easily have a frame chosen by someone else imposed on them.

Präsident: Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



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

With numerous exercises and concrete examples from politics, the media and everyday life — and a smile here and there.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



RAI receives over 1.7 billion euros per year from the compulsory licence fee. Anyone who feels treated unfairly can file a complaint. There is even a dedicated authority: AGCOM, the Autorità per le Garanzie nelle Comunicazioni.

Except that: it is not entirely independent. It has limited sanctioning powers. And in most cases the outcome is uncertain.

This analysis lays bare the system — objectively, with precision, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, competences, costs, statistics, legal avenues. And the legal examination that demonstrates the structural shortcomings of public media oversight. The body that should protect citizens protects above all the system it is supposed to oversee.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint — and for all those who want to understand why genuine media oversight in Italy remains yet to be built.