



SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2019-12-04 DOK - Whistleblower Adam Quadroni und sein Kampf gegen das Engadiner Baukartell

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2019-12-04 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 16:09

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Masstab: Art. 4 RTVG

OVERALL SCORE

6.1/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly one-sided/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

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

Party	Greens	SP	GLP	Centre	EVP	FDP	SVP
CHES	1.13	1.67	3.60	5.47	5.64	7.67	9.00
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Centre	Right	Right	Right

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

TENDENCY (L – R)

3.8 / 10

Left-favouring

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 serves for political classification and does not feed into the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Switzerland is a consensus democracy. The Federal Council (7 seats) is filled according to the magic formula: SVP 2, SP 2, FDP 2, Centre 1. There is no classic government/opposition dichotomy — all major parties are represented in the executive. Political conflicts run along substantive policy issues, not along a government/opposition axis.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position
SVP	8.0	62	Government (2 FC)	Limit migration, sovereignty, reduction of the state
SP	2.5	41	Government (2 FC)	Welfare state, redistribution, rapprochement with the EU
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Economic freedom, lean state, bilateral agreements
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatism, family relief, centrist course
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Climate protection, redistribution, disarmament
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Green economy, liberal-ecological
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Christian-social, centre

The dominant lines of conflict in Switzerland 2018–2019 (broadcast period) include: (1) migration and freedom of movement (SVP vs. SP/Greens/GLP), (2) climate policy and energy transition (Greens/GLP vs. SVP/FDP), (3) EU relations and bilateral agreements (FDP/SP/Centre vs. SVP), (4) economic regulation and competition law (competition policy as a cross-cutting issue). The Graubünden construction cartel affair primarily touches on the tension between economic self-regulation and state competition oversight, as well as between the local power elite and the rule of law.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of German-speaking Switzerland, financed through Serafe fees and committed to Art. 4 RTVA (accurate representation, diversity of opinion, impartiality). As a reportage format, this broadcast is subject to the accuracy requirement, not the strict diversity requirement of the news format — nevertheless, minimum standards of impartiality and source diversity apply. The format is recognisably a documentary reportage with a narrative focus on a single individual.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Preliminary remark: This broadcast is a documentary reportage about the Graubünden construction cartel and the whistleblower Adam Quadroni. It contains no explicit party-political debate. Party positions are not directly addressed. The assessment is therefore based on implicit points of contact (competition law, state failure, economic regulation, rule of law).

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. programme position
SVP	0	Not addressed. SVP position on economic freedom and reduction of the state would be relevant (competition law as state intervention), but is not mentioned — omitted
SP	0	Not addressed. SP position on competition regulation and workers' rights would be relevant, is not mentioned — omitted
FDP	0	Not addressed. FDP position on market liberalism and competition would be relevant, is not mentioned — omitted
Centre	0	Not addressed — omitted
Greens	0	Not addressed — omitted
GLP	0	Not addressed — omitted
EVP	0	Not addressed — omitted

Party bias summary

- Most accurate representation: No party represented (all score 0)
- Strongest distortion: No direct distortion of party positions
- Average deviation from 0: 0.0
- Conclusion: The broadcast is not a party-political debate programme. Party positions are not explicitly addressed. Party-political bias is therefore not measurable via party programme representation, but via implicit value judgements (state failure, economic power, rule of law), which are analysed in step 3. It is relevant that Jon Domenic Parolini (Graubünden cantonal councillor, Centre) is portrayed as co-responsible for the failure of the authorities — without mention of his party.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast data

- Title: Reportage on Adam Quadroni and the Graubünden construction cartel (working title; no explicit broadcast title in the transcript)
- Date: 04.12.2019
- Presenter / Reporter: Not named in the transcript (voice-over commentary present, interviewer not identified)
- Persons interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Adam Quadroni	Former construction entrepreneur, whistleblower	None	Neutral/victim perspective
August Koller	Farmer, former client of Quadroni	None	Neutral
Ureza Famos	Business and cultural consultant, former board member of Betzola de Not	None (economic elite)	Economically conservative
Frank Stüssi	Employee of the Competition Commission (WEKO)	State	Regulatory authority
Giuseppe Nay	Former President of the Federal Supreme Court	None	Rule-of-law perspective
Nathanael Wildermuth	Crowdfunding initiator	None	Civil society
Angelo Schweizer	Lawyer of Adam Quadroni	None	Partisan (client)
Iris Zürcher	General practitioner of Adam Quadroni	None	Medical

Main topic

The broadcast documents the case of whistleblower Adam Quadroni, who exposed the Graubünden construction cartel and has since been under massive personal, economic and legal pressure.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts

Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Frank Stüssi, WEKO

Timestamp	10:05
Statement	"Adam Quadroni laid the evidence on the table at the time. He explained to us what was happening in the Lower Engadine. And he was the trigger for these investigations."
Classification	State regulatory official who led the investigation that Quadroni triggered. Structurally no conflict of interest regarding the existence of the cartel, but an interest in confirming his own investigative work.
Missing countervoice	Independent competition law expert (university) who contextualises the WEKO methodology and the level of sanctions.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: State-funded (Confederation). No direct conflict of interest regarding the existence of the cartel; interest in confirming the authority's own work.

(b) MANDATE: WEKO has a mandate for competition oversight — compatible with the statement on the existence of the cartel, but not neutral regarding the assessment of its own investigation quality.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — State, no commercial conflict, but self-interest in confirming the investigation

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Civil servant, no personal risk from the statement

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Directly responsible for the investigation

D4 Consistency of opinion: +2 — Statement consistent with WEKO ruling

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Factual, data-based

D6 Source level: +2 — Primary source (directly involved)

TOTAL: +10 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Framed as a neutral expert authority — but is a party to the investigation. Not to be regarded as an independent expert.

Expert 2: Giuseppe Nay, former President of the Federal Supreme Court

Timestamp	24:25
Statement	"It is usually about personalities, important public personalities, people who are significant in business, who are denounced there, and people whom everyone trusted, had full trust in."
Classification	Appears explicitly as a supporter of Quadroni (administers crowdfunding funds). Not a neutral expert, but a partisan.



**Missing
countervoice**

Independent legal expert without a mandate for Quadroni.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Retired, no institutional funding. Administers crowdfunding funds for Quadroni — direct conflict of interest.

(b) MANDATE: Explicitly active as a supporter — not compatible with a neutral assessment.

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Directly active as supporter and trustee
- D2 Personal risk: +1 — Retired, no career risk; reputational risk possible
- D3 Professional competence: +2 — Former President of the Federal Supreme Court, high legal competence
- D4 Consistency of opinion: 0 — No comparative statements known
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Partly appellative ("people can't just let that go")
- D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary source (not directly involved in the cartel)

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Framed as a high-ranking legal personality, but appears as a partisan. The framing as "former President of the Federal Supreme Court" lends him an authority that conceals his partisanship.

Expert 3: Iris Zürcher, general practitioner

Timestamp	31:18
Statement	"He was really taken care of there, and by force."
Classification	Quadroni's treating physician — the doctor-patient relationship establishes structural partisanship for the patient.
Missing countervoice	Psychiatrist from the Waldhaus clinic (official), KESB representative.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Private practice physician, privately funded. No institutional conflict of interest.

(b) MANDATE: Treating physician — duty of care towards patient, not neutral.

- D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Treatment relationship establishes partisanship
- D2 Personal risk: +2 — Public statement against authorities with personal reputational risk
- D3 Professional competence: +2 — Medical expertise for assessment of the circumstances of the involuntary placement
- D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Written recommendation to court documented (consistent)
- D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Partly emotional ("jaw dropped"), partly factual
- D6 Source level: +2 — Primary source (directly involved)

TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN (with qualification: conflict of interest due to treatment relationship)

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Framed as a medical professional, without addressing the conflict of interest arising from the treatment relationship.

Missing expert groups:

- Independent competition law expert (without WEKO mandate)
- Independent whistleblower legal expert / legal sociologist
- Psychiatrist from the Waldhaus clinic (official, regarding the involuntary placement order)

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Frank Stüssi, WEKO	+1	+1	+2	+2	+2	+2	+10	GREEN



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

Giuseppe Nay, former President of the Federal Supreme Court	-2	+1	+2	0	0	0	+1	YELLOW
Iris Zürcher, general practitioner	-1	+2	+2	+1	+1	+2	+7	GREEN

Summary:

Expert	Source indicator	Main problem
Frank Stüssi (WEKO)	GREEN	Framed as neutral, but is a party to the investigation
Giuseppe Nay (ex-Federal Supreme Court President)	YELLOW	Framed as a legal personality, appears as a partisan
Iris Zürcher (general practitioner)	GREEN (qualified)	Treatment relationship establishes structural partisanship

All three experts are structurally positioned on Quadroni's side. Not a single expert with a neutral or critical perspective on Quadroni is used.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Source 1: Psychiatric records, Waldhaus clinic

Timestamp 32:13

Statement "The psychiatric records show that the psychiatrists could make no sense of why an involuntary placement was ordered for Adam Quadroni."

- (a) **Funding and governance:** Cantonal psychiatric clinic, state-funded.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Records are cited selectively (only exculpatory passages for Quadroni). The clinic itself is not given a voice.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Complete records, statement from the clinic, KESB records.

Source 2: PUK interim report November 2019

Timestamp 47:13

Statement "The interim report of the Parliamentary Investigation Commission of November 2019, as well as a further report, rehabilitate Adam Quadroni."

- (a) **Funding:** Graubünden cantonal parliament, state.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** PUK is a political body, not a court. "Rehabilitation" is a political, not a legal finding.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Minority opinion of the PUK (if any), statement of the affected authorities on the PUK report.

Source 3: Letter from Judge Zeg to Iris Zürcher

Timestamp 43:00

Statement "On the 22nd it reached me, dear Dr. Zürcher, due to a possible negative change feared by experts..."

- (a) **Funding:** State document.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Document is presented and interpreted by Iris Zürcher (Quadroni supporter). Judge Zeg cannot comment.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Statement from the judge, context of the expert opinion that gave rise to the concern.

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 26:02

Claim: "In the handling of the bankruptcies, allegedly quite a lot went wrong."

Verbal marker: "allegedly"

Primary source available: No — penalty point (+1)

Rumour 2:



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

Timestamp: 28:22

Claim: "Today Adam Quadroni knows that she turned to the authorities because she allegedly felt threatened by him."

Verbal marker: "allegedly"

Primary source available: No (only Quadroni's interpretation) — penalty point (+1)

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 42:46

Claim: "Today it is to be assumed that on this basis he attempted to have Adam Quadroni committed to a psychiatric facility again shortly before Christmas."

Verbal marker: "it is to be assumed"

Primary source available: No — penalty point (+1)

Summary: The source selection is structurally one-sided: all cited sources (records, reports, documents) are presented exclusively in their exculpatory function for Quadroni. Three rumours without a primary source increase the score by 3 penalty points. Counter-sources are systematically absent.



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Adam Quadroni (directly): (24%)
- Voice-over commentary (Quadroni narrative): (30%)
- Quadroni supporters (Nay, Zürcher, Schweizer, Wildermuth, Koller, Famos): (28%)
- WEKO (Stüssi): (4%)
- Critical voices regarding Quadroni (Famos, in part): (4%)
- Opposing side (construction entrepreneurs, judge, police, wife): (2%) — exclusively as voice-over reference, no direct word
- Other (Koller, crowdfunding celebration): (8%)

Summary: Over 86% of broadcast time is devoted to Quadroni himself, his supporters and the voice-over commentary confirming him. The opposing side receives less than 2% direct speaking time (exclusively as voice-over reference to refusals to be interviewed). This distribution is not balanced for a documentary reportage about a whistleblower case in which serious allegations are made against named individuals.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)								8/10	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Omission 1:

Context

The perspective of Adam Quadroni's wife on the separation situation, her perception of threats and the reasons for the involuntary placement order is completely absent.

Relevant at: 28:22 — "because she allegedly felt threatened by him"

Effect

The word "allegedly" delegitimises the wife's perception of threat without giving her the opportunity to present her view. The broadcast suggests that the involuntary placement was an instrument of Quadroni's opponents — without examining the opposing perspective.

Omission 2:

Context

The specific allegations of the former accountant against Quadroni (criminal complaint, serious allegations) are mentioned but not elaborated upon.

Relevant at: 27:01 — "Adam Quadroni's former accountant filed a criminal complaint against him and made serious allegations."

Effect

The allegations are immediately classified by Giuseppe Nay as a "construction against whistleblowers", without the accountant himself being given a voice or the allegations being examined substantively.

Omission 3:

Context

The question of whether Quadroni actually owed wages to employees and how he dealt with this is raised by Ureza Famos (22:30), but not pursued further.

Relevant at: 22:30 — "I personally know someone who is still waiting for the money today."

Effect

Quadroni acknowledges his own mistakes (23:22), but the concrete impact on those affected is not documented. The credibility question remains resolved one-sidedly in Quadroni's favour.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits all information that could call Quadroni's account into question. Counter-allegations are either classified as "constructions" or presented as unverifiable due to the opposing side's refusal to be interviewed — without seeking alternative sources.

Missing voices

- Graubünden cantonal police: Would have explained the arrest situation, the involuntary placement order and the proportionality of the operation from the authorities' perspective.
- KESB Lower Engadine: Would have set out the legal basis for the involuntary placement and the decision-making process.
- Adam Quadroni's wife (or her lawyer): Would have contributed the perspective on the separation situation, the perception of threat and the child protection perspective.
- Independent competition law expert (university): Would have contextualised the WEKO investigation and the level of sanctions without a conflict of interest.



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

- Independent whistleblower legal expert: Would have contributed the framework of protection in Switzerland and international comparisons.
- Former employee of Quadroni (creditor): Would have shed light on the credibility question from the perspective of those directly affected.
- Graubünden cantonal court / supervisory authority: Could have commented on the question of Judge Zeg's partiality.
- Waldhaus psychiatric clinic (official): Would have explained the circumstances of the involuntary placement from an institutional perspective (beyond the cited extract from the records).



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

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 09:44

Figure: "Of 20, 30, 40%, 50, even up to 100% more."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — not stated; (b) Share — percentage of overcharging stated; (c) Trend — not stated

Missing context	Which projects? Over what period? How many cases with 100% overcharging vs. 20%? Total damage amount?
Effect	The range of 20–100% suggests systematic extreme overcharging, without the distribution or frequency of extreme values being substantiated.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 10:51

Figure: "The WEKO imposed sanctions amounting to 7.5 million francs."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — stated; (b) Share — not stated (share of total turnover of the firms? Share of the damage?); (c) Trend — not stated

Missing context	How high was the total damage caused by the cartel? Is 7.5 million an appropriate sanction? Comparison with other WEKO cases?
Effect	The figure appears large without being placed in the overall context of cartel damages.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 36:44

Figure: "In the end, over a quarter of a million [francs] was raised for Mr Quadroni."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — stated; (b) Share — not stated (share of legal costs covered?); (c) Trend — not relevant

Missing context	How much has already been used for legal costs? How much is still outstanding? No manipulation, but missing contextualisation.
Effect	The figure serves primarily to illustrate solidarity, not as an argumentative figure — therefore of lesser weight.

Summary: The manipulation of figures is moderate. The overcharging percentages are presented without statistical contextualisation, which creates a distorted impression of the systematic nature. The WEKO sanction amount lacks any contextualisation.



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

Association 1:	
Timestamp	34:11
Quote	<i>"Orlando Zec comes from a family that is at home in the transport industry. Uncle and father Zec are former business partners of Adam Quadroni. In the context of the construction cartel, uncle and father Zec were each assigned to Quadroni as subcontractors. In addition, the election of the presiding judge and the regional presidency were supported by prominent figures from the Graubünden construction cartel, namely Roland Konrad."</i>
Technique: Family background + family business relationships + political support are linked into a chain of partiality, without Judge Zeg himself having been directly involved in the cartel.	
Effect	Judge Zeg is discredited by association with the cartel, without direct proof of his partiality or cartel involvement.

Chain of association: Father/uncle Zeg (cartel subcontractors) → Roland Konrad (cartel member, supported election) → Orlando Zeg (judge) → partiality

Association 2:	
Timestamp	15:17
Quote	<i>"He approached cantonal councillors, employees of the civil engineering office and Jon Domenic Parolini, another influential man."</i>
Technique: Parolini is introduced as an "influential man" in direct proximity to the cartel actors, before his concrete role (municipal president who ignored Quadroni) is explained.	
Effect	Parolini is linked to the cartel through contextual association before his actual role is clear.

Association 3:	
Timestamp	11:03
Quote	<i>"Behind the companies stood influential men. Durie Betzola, long-standing board member of Betzola de Not AG. Former National Councillor."</i>
Technique: "Influential men" as a framing, then immediate mention of the political office (National Councillor) — suggests a political dimension of the cartel without direct evidence.	
Effect	Political offices are associated with cartel involvement without the political dimension being substantiated.

Person categorisation (Guilt by Association):

Actors	Category	Justification
Orlando Zeg	B (borderline case)	Family connections to the cartel environment documented; own partiality subject of ongoing criminal



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

		proceedings — not categorisable by the broadcast alone
Jon Domenic Parolini	B (borderline case)	Ignoring Quadroni's indications documented; passing on to construction entrepreneurs documented; own cartel involvement not documented
Durie Betzola	A (systemically critically relevant)	Direct cartel involvement documented by WEKO ruling

Summary: The broadcast uses guilt by association primarily with Judge Zeg (family chain) and Parolini (contextual association). With directly sanctioned cartel members (Betzola, Konrad), the association is documented by the WEKO ruling. The borderline cases are not clearly distinguished from the documented cases.



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

Finding 1:

Position: 00:14 (beginning)

Content: "Those who profit from it are entrepreneurs, various politicians, various administrative employees. All those who are outside the system are at a disadvantage."

Timing effect

The broadcast begins with a general indictment of entrepreneurs, politicians and administrative employees — before any facts have been established. This sets the interpretive framework for the entire broadcast: the powerful against the weak, perpetrators against victims.

Finding 2:

Position: 47:13 (end)

Content: "The interim report of the Parliamentary Investigation Commission of November 2019, as well as a further report, rehabilitate Adam Quadroni."

Timing effect

The official rehabilitation is placed at the end — as an emotional conclusion and confirmation of the entire narrative. Critical information (bankruptcy, wage debts, criminal complaint by the accountant) was placed earlier and immediately relativised by supporters' statements.

Finding 3:

Position: 05:20 (early)

Content: "If I should be able to raise children to be upright, and everything, how could I do that if I myself am not?"

Timing effect

The emotional father-child narrative is introduced very early, before the factual details of the cartel have been established. This creates an emotional bond with Quadroni before critical information is presented.

Summary: The broadcast is structured in a classically narrative way: emotional opening → facts → escalation → rehabilitation. Critical information is always immediately relativised by supporters' statements. The timing structure serves emotional persuasion, not factual information.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 33:35

Triggering event: Iris Zürcher describes the circumstances of the involuntary placement order (handcuffs, blindfold, police operation).

Reaction: "I find that unbelievable."

Comparison

Analogous event — Quadroni's own wage debts to employees (22:30) — reaction: Ureza Famos mentions it factually, no outrage from the voice-over commentary, no emotional framing.

Asymmetry: The outrage over state action against Quadroni is explicit and emotional. The outrage over Quadroni's own misconduct (wage debts, bankruptcy) is completely absent.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 44:48

Triggering event: A former customer was threatened with the ruin of his business if he gave an interview.

Reaction: "I find that the saddest thing in all of this. That really makes one deeply sad."

Comparison

Analogous event — Quadroni himself was part of the cartel that boycotted and ruined competitors (08:03: "they have to go under, we have to destroy them now" — Quadroni about the cartel of which he was a member). No outrage over Quadroni's earlier cartel involvement.

Asymmetry: Outrage over intimidation by cartel successors, no analogous outrage over Quadroni's own earlier cartel involvement.

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 2/5

Summary: The outrage in the broadcast is selectively directed at state and cartel action against Quadroni. Quadroni's own earlier cartel involvement and his wage debts do not generate an analogous emotional reaction. The asymmetry is present, but not extreme — Quadroni acknowledges his own mistakes, and the broadcast shows this.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — overall picture)

8/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 28:22

Missing perspective/fact: The reasons for the involuntary placement order from the perspective of the ordering authority (KESB) are completely absent.

Relevance: The involuntary placement is the dramatic climax of the broadcast. Without the authorities' perspective, an accurate contextualisation is not possible.

Impact: The involuntary placement appears as an arbitrary abuse of power, without the legal basis and the authority's decision-making process being presented.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 27:01

Missing perspective/fact: The specific allegations of the former accountant (criminal complaint) are not elaborated upon.

Relevance: Serious allegations against Quadroni are mentioned, but immediately classified by Giuseppe Nay as a "construction" — without substantive examination.

Impact: The credibility question is resolved one-sidedly in Quadroni's favour.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 41:28

Missing perspective/fact: The wife's perspective on the separation situation, the child protection issues and her perception of threat is completely absent.

Relevance: The custody conflict is a central theme of the second half of the broadcast. Quadroni's account ("planned behind his back", "allegedly threatened") is not examined by the opposing side.

Impact: The wife appears as an instrument of the cartel's opponents, without her own voice.

Summary: The broadcast is structurally designed as an advocacy documentary. All perspectives that could call Quadroni's account into question are systematically absent. The opposing side's refusals to be interviewed are noted, but not compensated for by alternative sources — which, in a 50-minute documentary with serious allegations against named individuals, contradicts the accuracy requirement.

Soft facts

The Graubünden construction cartel is a documented case of anti-competitive price-fixing in the Graubünden construction industry, which was investigated by WEKO from 2012 and gained broad public attention in 2018 through a series of articles in the online magazine "Republik". The case touches on fundamental questions of the rule of law: whistleblower protection, conflicts of interest in the judiciary, abuse of power by local elites and the question of whether state institutions (police, courts, authorities) can be corrupted or biased. Switzerland still lacks a comprehensive whistleblower protection law to this day. The Quadroni case became a precedent for the discussion on institutional protection of whistleblowers.



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

Share of perspectives covered

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

- [A] Perspective of the accused construction entrepreneurs (Betzola de Not, Foffa Konrad, Testa Group)
- [B] Perspective of regional judge Orlando Zeg (allegations of partiality)
- [C] Perspective of Jon Domenic Parolini (Graubünden cantonal councillor, former municipal president)
- [D] Perspective of Adam Quadroni's wife (separation conflict, protective claims)
- [E] Perspective of the police (arrest, involuntary placement)
- [F] Perspective of KESB / responsible authorities (child protection, involuntary placement order)
- [G] Perspective of employees to whom Quadroni owed wages (creditors)
- [H] Independent legal experts on whistleblower protection in Switzerland
- [I] Independent competition law experts on the WEKO investigation
- [J] Perspective of the municipal presidents of the Lower Engadine (normalisation pressure)

[A] INDICATED

Timestamp: 11:46 — Quote: "They have filed a complaint against the WEKO ruling. The construction agreements had not been carried out for as long or to the extent that WEKO claimed." — Assessment: Only referenced as voice-over commentary, no direct statement; refusal of a camera interview is noted but not pursued further.

[B] INDICATED

Timestamp: 35:49 — Quote: "In a letter to Angelo Schweitzer, Orlando Zec rejects all allegations of partiality. He does not comment on camera." — Assessment: Written rejection is mentioned but not elaborated upon; no counter-representation possible.

[C] INDICATED

Timestamp: 21:20 — Quote: "in retrospect, seeing what dimensions this has taken on, one would have been more sensitive, that is quite clear." — Assessment: Quote from an earlier statement, no current interview; Parolini refuses to comment in the film.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: 41:28 — Quote: "Neither Adam Quadroni's wife, nor her lawyer, nor the children's lawyer comment on camera." — Assessment: Refusal is noted, but the wife's perspective (sense of threat, concern about suicide) is conveyed exclusively through Quadroni's interpretation.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: 29:35 — Quote: "The police brought Adam Quadroni to the police station in Scuol." — Assessment: Police perspective on the arrest and involuntary placement order is completely absent; no statement from the Graubünden cantonal police.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: 32:25 — Quote: "The grounds for the involuntary placement could not be reliably verified from here." — Assessment: KESB perspective on the involuntary placement order is absent; the authority that ordered the placement is not given a voice.

[G] INDICATED

Timestamp: 22:30 — Quote: "I personally know someone who is still waiting for the money today and has not received it." — Assessment: Ureza Famos mentions creditors, but no direct voice of an affected person; remains anonymous and unexplored.

[H] OMITTED



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

No timestamp — Assessment: No independent legal expert on whistleblower protection in Switzerland; Giuseppe Nay is a former President of the Federal Supreme Court, but appears as a supporter of Quadroni, not as a neutral expert.

[I] COVERED

Timestamp: 10:05 — Quote: "Frank Stüssi accompanied the investigations for years." — Assessment: WEKO representative is given a voice, but exclusively to confirm Quadroni's credibility, not for independent contextualisation of competition law.

[J] INDICATED

Timestamp: 45:59 — Quote: "The municipal presidents, for example, are pressing for the canton to normalise the awarding of construction contracts in the region again." — Assessment: Only as voice-over commentary, no direct voice of the municipal presidents.

Completeness score: 4/10

Justification: Of ten relevant perspectives, only two are covered (WEKO, crowdfunding initiator), three are indicated (construction entrepreneurs, judge, Parolini) and five are completely omitted (wife, police, KESB, independent legal experts, creditors). The broadcast is structurally designed as an advocacy documentary, not as a balanced reportage. All representatives of the opposing position refuse to be interviewed — this is noted, but not compensated for by alternative sources.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (setting the frame)

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:43
Quote	<i>"And so Adam Quadroni decided to leave the construction cartel, to no longer accept the price-fixing, to expose the machinations and to clean house."</i>
Manipulation	The word "clean house" is a value-laden metaphor (to muck out a stable = to remove filth). It frames Quadroni as a moral cleanser and the cartel as filth/refuse.
Why problematic	This metaphor is not neutral. It sets the moral framework for the entire broadcast in the voice-over commentary — before any facts are presented.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	11:03
Quote	<i>"Behind the companies stood influential men."</i>
Manipulation	"Influential men" is a framing that suggests power and menace without factual qualification. The formulation is narrative (thriller language), not journalistic.
Why problematic	The framing as "influential men" (repeated: 19:23, 33:42, 42:32) constructs a power imbalance that reinforces the victim-perpetrator structure of the broadcast.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	44:07
Quote	<i>"The image that Adam Quadroni was a dangerous person was maintained by Orlando Zeg."</i>
Manipulation	The voice-over commentary adopts Quadroni's interpretation as fact: the "image" had been "maintained" by Zeg — implying it was a false image. This is a value judgement, not a statement of fact.
Why problematic	Whether Quadroni actually posed no danger is a question that the broadcast does not examine neutrally. The voice-over commentary anticipates the conclusion.

Summary: The framing of the broadcast is consistently structured as a hero's story: Quadroni as a moral lone fighter against powerful, corrupt elites. The voice-over commentary adopts Quadroni's interpretation as fact and reinforces the narrative through value-laden language.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	01:02
Quote	<i>"to expose the machinations and to clean house"</i>
Manipulation	"Machinations" (negatively connoted: dark, illegal activities) and "to clean house" (cleansing metaphor) are value-laden terms in the voice-over commentary.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "to document the price-fixing and report it to the authorities."

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	19:23
Quote	<i>"These are powerful men. I mean, these are not small boys running construction companies. These are kings of the valley."</i>
Manipulation	"Kings of the valley" is a feudal metaphor suggesting arbitrary rule and untouchability. The voice-over commentary adopts this language without distancing itself.
Why problematic	The metaphor is Quadroni's subjective perception, but is framed by the context as a factual description.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	44:43
Quote	<i>"In the Lower Engadine, many are bothered by the fact that Adam Quadroni chose to go public. Most regard him as someone who fouls his own nest."</i>
Manipulation	"Someone who fouls his own nest" is presented as an attribution by others, but the voice-over commentary uses the term without quotation marks or distancing — which frames it as a valid description of the community, not as Quadroni's perception.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Many in the Lower Engadine criticise Quadroni's approach."

Summary: The choice of words in the voice-over commentary is consistently narrative and value-laden rather than factual and neutral. Terms such as "machinations", "to clean house", "kings of the valley" and "influential men" construct a moral narrative that contradicts journalistic neutrality.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Preliminary remark: The broadcast is a documentary reportage without a classic studio interview. The interviewer asks questions in voice-over but is not visible. The analysis refers to the conduct of the interviews.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 17:50

Triggering event: Quadroni claims that the municipality and canton did not pay him despite confirmation.

Quote (interviewer) *"And why did you not then take legal action against the municipality and the canton?"*

Comparison At Ureza Famos' statement about Quadroni's wage debts (22:30) — no follow-up question, no further exploration.

Asymmetry: Follow-up question to Quadroni about his claims against authorities, but no analogous follow-up question about his own debts to employees. Asymmetry present, but moderate.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 39:04

Triggering event: Giuseppe Nay describes his role in the crowdfunding.

Quote (interviewer) *"How do you experience the fact that so many people are showing solidarity with Mr Quadroni?"*

Comparison No analogous question to critical voices (e.g. "How do you experience the fact that Quadroni did not pay employees?").

Asymmetry: The question is soft and inviting for a positive answer. No hard follow-up question about Nay's conflict of interest as trustee.

Summary: The moderation behaviour is slightly asymmetric: Quadroni and his supporters are predominantly asked soft, inviting questions. Critical follow-up questions about Quadroni's own misconduct are largely absent. The asymmetry is present, but not extreme — individual critical follow-up questions (17:50) are documented.



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY									5/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Asymmetry 1:	
To Adam Quadroni, 23	15: "My mistakes are of course also significant." — [soft: Quadroni acknowledges mistakes himself, no hard follow-up question]
To Ureza Famos, 22	30: [no direct question about Quadroni's wage debts — Famos raises the topic herself]
Comparison	Quadroni's mistakes are dealt with through self-admission, without the interviewer probing further. The opposing side (construction entrepreneurs, judge) is not questioned at all.

Asymmetry 2:	
To Giuseppe Nay, 39	04: "How do you experience the fact that so many people are showing solidarity with Mr Quadroni?" — [soft, inviting]
To Frank Stüssi (WEKO), 10	13: "Adam Quadroni laid the evidence on the table at the time." — [no question, only confirmation by Stüssi]
Comparison	All interview partners receive soft or confirmatory questions. No hard question to any interview partner.

Summary: The question asymmetry lies less between different interview partners (since all interview partners are Quadroni supporters) than between the interview partners as a whole and the absent opposing side. All questions are soft and inviting; hard follow-up questions are completely absent.



14. FALSE BALANCE									3/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	11:46 — Construct: "They have filed a complaint against the WEKO ruling. The construction agreements had not been carried out for as long or to the extent that WEKO claimed."
Analysis	The construction entrepreneurs' complaint is mentioned as a voice-over reference — this is an attempt to incorporate an opposing perspective. However, the complaint is immediately countered by Frank Stüssi (WEKO) (12:07: "From 1996 it was clear that the price-fixing was unlawful"). The balance is formally present, but structurally unequal: complaint as voice-over reference vs. WEKO representative in a direct interview.

Summary: The broadcast does not show classic false balance (artificial equivalence of two unequal positions). The problem is the reverse: the opposing perspective is incorporated so minimally (voice-over reference, refusal to be interviewed) that no balance is created. False balance as a technique is not the main problem of this broadcast.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: It is taken for granted that Quadroni is a victim and that the authorities have failed.

Timestamp

00:43 — Evidence: "And so Adam Quadroni decided to leave the construction cartel, to no longer accept the price-fixing, to expose the machinations and to clean house."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether Quadroni himself bears co-responsibility for the cartel (he was a member for years) is not treated as an equally valid agenda question.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The involuntary placement order is regarded as an abuse of power.

Timestamp

32:13 — Evidence: "The psychiatric records show that the psychiatrists could make no sense of why an involuntary placement was ordered for Adam Quadroni."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether the involuntary placement order was based on legitimate protective grounds (risk of suicide, wife's perception of threat) is not treated as an equally valid agenda question.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The silence of the population in the Lower Engadine is regarded as a sign of intimidation.

Timestamp

44:43 — Evidence: "In the Lower Engadine, many are bothered by the fact that Adam Quadroni chose to go public."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether the silence could also be based on legitimate doubts about Quadroni's account is not raised.

Summary: The broadcast sets an agenda in which Quadroni's victim status, the failure of the authorities and the intimidation of the population are treated as facts. Alternative interpretations (Quadroni's co-responsibility, legitimate actions by the authorities, justified doubts) do not appear on the agenda.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 6.4 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 5.7 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 8):** The broadcast systematically omits all perspectives that could call Quadroni's account into question — wife, police, KESB, accountant, creditors. The opposing side's refusals to be interviewed are noted, but not compensated for by alternative sources, which, in the case of serious allegations against named individuals, contradicts the accuracy requirement.
- 2. Framing (Score 8):** The voice-over commentary adopts Quadroni's interpretation as fact and constructs a consistent hero narrative (moral lone fighter against powerful elites). Value-laden language ("machinations", "to clean house", "influential men") reinforces the narrative and departs from the ground of journalistic neutrality.
- 3. Time distribution (Score 8):** Over 86% of broadcast time is devoted to Quadroni and his supporters; the opposing side receives less than 2% direct speaking time. This distribution is not balanced for a documentary reportage with serious allegations against named individuals.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The Graubünden construction cartel was a systematic fraud that was covered up by powerful economic and political elites."

Technique: Framing, agenda-setting, source selection — evidence: 00:14, 11:03, 34:11

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Adam Quadroni is a courageous whistleblower who has lost everything for his integrity and was destroyed by the system."

Technique: Emotionalisation, timing, choice of words — evidence: 05:20, 29:35, 48:55

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Anyone who exposes abuse of power in Switzerland is punished by the authorities, the judiciary and the community — the system protects the perpetrators, not the victims."

Technique: Omission, guilt by association, agenda-setting — evidence: 22:06, 44:43, 47:13

Justification: The broadcast achieves an overall score of 6.1/10, which corresponds to a clear one-sidedness. The one-sidedness is structurally designed: all interview partners are Quadroni supporters, the voice-over commentary adopts Quadroni's interpretation as fact, and all opposing perspectives are systematically absent. According to Art. 4 RTVA, diversity of opinion is required on controversial topics and the accuracy requirement is to be applied particularly strictly in the case of serious allegations against named individuals. The broadcast does not meet these requirements. The fact that the opposing side refused interviews does not release SRF from the obligation to seek alternative sources or to explicitly identify the one-sidedness.

CONCLUSION

The broadcast is a technically carefully produced documentary reportage about a documented case of cartel abuse and possible failure of the authorities. The core facts (WEKO investigation, sanctions, PUK report) are documented. However, the broadcast departs from the ground of journalistic impartiality by giving a voice exclusively to Quadroni supporters, using the voice-over commentary as an advocacy instrument and making serious allegations against named individuals (Judge Zeg, Parolini, construction entrepreneurs) without counter-representation. According to Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA, editorial broadcasts must, in the representation of events on which different viewpoints are held, give adequate consideration to all essential viewpoints — this requirement is not met in the present case. The opposing side's refusals to be interviewed are documented, but do not release SRF from the obligation to seek alternative sources or to explicitly identify the structural one-sidedness of the representation. The broadcast is to be qualified as an advocacy documentary; a corresponding identification is absent.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — all 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	7	••••
2	SOURCE SELECTION	7	••••
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	8	••••
4	OMISSION (Selective Omission)	8	••••
5	MANIPULATION OF FIGURES	4	••
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	6	•••
7	TIMING	5	•••
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	5	•••
9	COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — overall picture)	8	••••
10	FRAMING (setting the frame)	8	••••
11	CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS	7	••••
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	4	••
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	5	•••
14	FALSE BALANCE	3	••
15	AGENDA-SETTING	7	••••

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.4/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

5.7/10

Considerable imbalance

OVERALL SCORE

6.1/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

Averaged from hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant irregularity identified.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor irregularity without material impairment of impartiality.
3–4	Slight to moderate finding	Discernible tendency; relevance of impact low to moderate.
5	Moderate finding with relevance of impact	Relevant imbalance that influences the opinion-forming potential of the audience.
6	Considerable finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 are reported as "considerable findings".
7	Considerable finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with marked relevance of impact.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; several documented individual findings in this criterion.
10	Maximum manifestation	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No material patterns discernible; broadcast meets the accuracy requirement.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated irregularities; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Considerable imbalance	Several considerable findings; relevant impairment of diversity of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, broadcast-wide patterns; high relevance of impact.
8.1 – 10	Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high degree of bias	Maximum manifestation across almost all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is clearly placed at a disadvantage in representation, speaking time or framing.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Discernible, but weak disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No discernible preference or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Discernible, but weak preference.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	Party is clearly favoured in representation, speaking time or framing.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Art. 4 RTVA)

Assessment under Art. 4 RTVA

Violation 1:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (accuracy, diversity of opinion)

Facts: Serious allegations against named individuals (Judge Orlando Zeg, Jon Domenic Parolini, Durie Betzola, Roland Konrad) without adequate counter-representation.

Evidence: Timestamp 34:11 — Quote: "Orlando Zec comes from a family that is at home in the transport industry. Uncle and father Zec are former business partners of Adam Quadroni. In the context of the construction cartel, uncle and father Zec were each assigned to Quadroni as subcontractors. In addition, the election of the presiding judge and the regional presidency were supported by prominent figures from the Graubünden construction cartel."

Assessment: The broadcast raises the allegation of partiality against a sitting judge through a family chain of association, without the judge being able to comment substantively. The statement "He does not comment on camera" (35:53) is not sufficient as a substitute for a substantive engagement with his written rejection of the allegations.

Violation 2:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (accuracy)

Facts: Adoption of Quadroni's interpretation as fact in the voice-over commentary without journalistic distancing.

Evidence: Timestamp 44:07 — Quote: "The image that Adam Quadroni was a dangerous actor was maintained by Orlando Zeg."

Assessment: The voice-over commentary presents as fact that the "image" of dangerousness was a false image constructed by Zeg. This is a value judgement presented as a statement of fact, without the grounds for the involuntary placement order (KESB decision, expert opinion) having been substantively examined.

Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (accuracy, source diversity)

Facts: Three claims without a primary source ("allegedly", "supposedly", "it is to be assumed") in a context in which serious allegations are made against authorities and private individuals.

Evidence: Timestamp 26:02 — Quote: "In the handling of the bankruptcies, allegedly quite a lot went wrong." / Timestamp 42:46 — Quote: "Today it is to be assumed that on this basis he attempted to have Adam Quadroni committed to a psychiatric facility again shortly before Christmas."

Assessment: Speculation about the intentions of authorities ("it is to be assumed") is presented in the voice-over commentary as factual contextualisation, without a primary source and without distancing. This violates the accuracy requirement.

Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast violates Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA in three dimensions: (1) serious allegations against named individuals without adequate counter-representation; (2) adoption of a partisan account as fact in the voice-over commentary; (3) speculative claims about the intentions of authorities without a primary source. The opposing side's refusals to be interviewed are a mitigating circumstance, but do not release SRF from the obligation to ensure accuracy — particularly not in a 50-minute documentary format that would have offered sufficient time for alternative sources and explicit identification of the one-sidedness. The broadcast is to be qualified as an advocacy documentary; a corresponding identification is absent.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

1. WEKO (Competition Commission)

- FUNDING:** State (Confederation), financed through the federal budget.
- MANDATE:** Competition oversight — compatible with statements on the existence of the cartel; not neutral regarding the assessment of its own investigation quality.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in confirming its own investigation results and sanction decisions.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1
D2 Personal risk: +1
D3 Professional competence: +2
D4 Consistency of opinion: +2
D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2
D6 Source level: +2

TOTAL: +10 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN (with qualification: self-interest in confirmation)

- COUNTERVOICE:** Independent competition law expert (university) absent; complaint by the construction companies is only mentioned as a voice-over reference.

2. Parliamentary Investigation Commission Graubünden (PUK)

- FUNDING:** Graubünden cantonal parliament, state.
- MANDATE:** Political investigation — not equivalent to a judicial finding.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** PUK is a political body; "rehabilitation" is a political, not a legal finding. Possible interest of the cantonal parliament in distancing itself from the failure of the authorities.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0
D2 Personal risk: +1
D3 Professional competence: +1
D4 Consistency of opinion: 0
D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1
D6 Source level: +1

TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

- COUNTERVOICE:** Minority opinion of the PUK (if any) not mentioned; statement of the affected authorities on the PUK report absent.

3. Waldhaus clinic (psychiatric records)

- FUNDING:** Cantonal psychiatric clinic, state-funded.
- MANDATE:** Psychiatric care — records are primary sources, but selectively cited.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** The clinic has no direct interest in a particular representation; selective citation by the broadcast is the problem, not the clinic itself.

D1 Conflict of interest: +2
D2 Personal risk: +2
D3 Professional competence: +2
D4 Consistency of opinion: +2
D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2
D6 Source level: +2

TOTAL: +12 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN (records themselves credible; problem is selective citation)

- COUNTERVOICE:** Official statement from the clinic absent; KESB records on the involuntary placement order absent.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. Giuseppe Nay is introduced as "former President of the Federal Supreme Court" — this is a social attribution of authority that conceals his structural conflict of interest as trustee of the crowdfunding funds. His statements are to be regarded as partisan, not as neutral legal expertise.

Source indicator for participants:



Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
WEKO (Competition Commission)	+1	+1	+2	+2	+2	+2	+10	GREEN
Parliamentary Investigation Commission Graubünden (PUK)	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+4	YELLOW
Waldhaus clinic (psychiatric records)	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+12	GREEN

Legal and methodological classification

No finding of fact	The results presented do not constitute findings of fact about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a finding of individual responsibility.
No legal ruling	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of Art. 4 RTVA. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular the IABR).
No proof of causality	Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news situation, political controversy or format logic.
No finding of intent	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a considerable imbalance has been identified — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.
Heuristic comparison instrument	The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not for the precise metric measurement of individual contributions. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Switzerland — SRG SSR

Law

Federal Act on Radio and Television (RTVA, SR 784.40)

Relevant articles

- Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA: All broadcasts of a radio or television programme must respect fundamental rights. In particular, broadcasts must respect human dignity, must not be discriminatory, must not contribute to racial hatred, must not endanger public morality, and must not glorify or trivialise violence.
- Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA: Editorial broadcasts with informational content must represent facts and events accurately, so that the audience can form its own opinion. Opinions and commentary must be recognisable as such.
- Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA: In the totality of editorial broadcasts, the diversity of events and opinions must be adequately expressed (diversity requirement).

Core obligations

- 1. Accuracy:** Accurate representation of facts and events
- 2. Diversity of opinion:** Diversity of views on controversial topics
- 3. Impartiality:** Balanced selection of interlocutors

Supervisory authority

- IABR (Independent Authority for Broadcast Complaints): Examines complaints against broadcast programmes for violations of Art. 4 RTVA
- OFCOM (Federal Office of Communications): Regulatory and supervisory authority
- Ombudsman offices of the SRG: First point of contact for programme complaints

Complaints procedure

1. Ombudsman office of the respective business unit (SRF, RTS, RSI, RTR)
2. IABR (if no agreement is reached)
3. Federal Supreme Court (last instance)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS

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 – Research Centre for the Public Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 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). *Methods report v4.1: Countable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- 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 Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | kontakt@svfab.ch | *Methods report March 2026* | Converter 3.4 (2026-05-20)



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

Evaluations and membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you not only receive further detailed evaluations, but can also have them produced for any broadcasts of your choice (we charge for this).

In order to make our work solid, we depend on membership and patron contributions.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Recipient: SVFAB, P.O. Box, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

You can obtain the following books from SVFAB

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



Unbalanced reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and source selection. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with many examples. In addition, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**

Also available as **audiobook**



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

Those who do not know this deliver material. Good quotes that are cut incorrectly. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers that are 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 they can do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three basic principles of sovereignty — anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go 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. So that they stop playing along — and start shaping it.

In A5. Direct. For preparation, for reference, for follow-up and in case of difficulties



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



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. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate. Daily. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You learn not only how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

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

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, the media and everyday life — and the occasional smile.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year — compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can lodge a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the IABR, the Independent Authority for Broadcast Complaints.

Only: it is not independent. It has no sanctioning powers. And in 99.6% of all cases it decides: nothing.

This analysis lays the system bare — factually, precisely, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional law examination that shows: the IABR system meets none of the three fundamental criteria — it is not appropriate, not subject to separation of powers, not market-based. The authority that is supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it was supposed to control.

Essential reading for all those considering a complaint — and for all those who want to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still outstanding.