



SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2021-11-29 10 vor 10 vom 29.11.2021

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2021-11-29 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 13:28

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

OVERALL SCORE

6.8/10

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)

3.2 / 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 divide — all major parties are represented in government. Political conflicts therefore do not run along a government/opposition axis, but along substantive issues (referendums, popular votes).

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position (relevant to broadcast)
SVP	8.0	62	Government (2 FC)	Sceptical of Covid measures, scepticism of the state, sovereignty
SP	2.5	41	Government (2 FC)	Pro measures, solidarity, trust in the state
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Economic freedom, pragmatic measures
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatic, compromise
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Pro measures, climate refuge, solidarity
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Liberal-green, pro measures
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Christian-social, moderate

The main line of tension in this broadcast runs between supporters of measures (predominantly left-centre) and opponents of measures (predominantly right-libertarian, but also left-libertarian elements). The Covid vote of 28 November 2021 (62% yes to the Covid Act) sharpened this line. A second line of tension concerns the relationship between state institutions and civil society distrust — a question that cuts across all parties but is particularly virulent among SVP-aligned and libertarian circles.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of Switzerland, financed through reception fees (Serafe). Art. 4 RTVA obliges SRF to provide accurate representation, diversity of opinion and a balanced selection of interlocutors. As Switzerland's largest media organisation, SRF bears special responsibility for democratic opinion formation.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast representation vs. programme position
SVP	-2	Approx. 06:00–15:00: Opponents of measures are framed as a potential parallel society, without the SVP position (scepticism of measures as a legitimate political stance) being correctly contextualised. Programme position: critical of measures, personal responsibility — in broadcast: framed as a social danger. Distorted through framing.
SP	0	Not directly mentioned. The pro-measures position (62% yes) is presented as social consensus, which implicitly supports SP positions without explicit representation. Omitted.
FDP	0	Not mentioned. Omitted.
Centre	0	Not mentioned. Omitted.
Greens	0	Not mentioned. Omitted.
GLP	0	Not mentioned. Omitted.
EVP	0	Not mentioned. Omitted.

Party bias summary

- Most accurate representation: SP (Score 0 — not explicitly represented, but implicitly favoured)
- Strongest distortion: SVP (Score -2 — scepticism of measures framed as social pathology)
- Average deviation from 0: 0.3
- Conclusion: The broadcast does not address parties directly, but the anti-measures position — which structurally overlaps with SVP positions — is consistently framed as a social danger. The sociologist Marko Kovic (07:42) describes alternative media as a source of "conspiracy theories and false information", without any dissenting voice being heard. The pro-measures position (62% yes) is presented as a stable social consensus, which implicitly delegitimises the minority position (38% no).



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast data

- Title: SRF 10 vor 10
- Date: 29.11.2021
- Presenter / Reporter: Presenter (not named in transcript); Reporters: Biljana Gogic (Omicron), Vivian Manz (Epstein/Maxwell), Alexandra Kubsa (Jel/France)

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Marko Kovic	Sociologist / social scientist	No party; known as a critic of "conspiracy theories"	Left-liberal / academic
Michael Hermann	Political geographer	No party; Sotomo research institute	Academic, tendency left-liberal
Christoph Flurger	Publisher, Transition TV	Anti-measures camp	Right-libertarian / system-critical
Michael Bubendorf	Board member, Friends of the Constitution	Opponent of measures	Right-libertarian / system-critical
Caroline Jockel	Teacher, private school	Opponent of measures	System-critical
Demonstrator 1 (anonymous)	Demonstrator, Federal Square	Opponent of measures	System-critical
Demonstrator 2 (anonymous)	Demonstrator, Federal Square	Opponent of measures	System-critical (civil war statement)
Andreas Züllig	President, Hotellerie Suisse	Industry association	Economically pragmatic

Main topic

The broadcast examines whether the defeat of the opponents of measures in the Covid Act vote is leading to the emergence of a parallel society, and assesses this development as a social danger.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts

Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

1. EXPERT SELECTION

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Expert 1: Marko Kovic, sociologist

Timestamp: 07:33

Statement: "But one can see that in the alternative media there are no journalistic standards. There is no obligation towards truth. And instead there is a great deal of activism, a great deal of conspiracy theorising and a great deal of false information."

Assessment: Kovic is known as a public critic of "conspiracy theories" and alternative media. He has no institutional neutrality on this question — his public positioning is clearly on the side of the supporters of measures.

Missing dissenting voice: A media lawyer or media scholar with a different research focus (e.g. media pluralism, loss of trust in mainstream media) would have provided a counter-perspective.

Source in-depth check Kovic:

(a) FUNDING: Kovic is the founder of ZIPAR (Zurich Institute of Public Affairs Research), funded through project grants and public contracts. No obvious private conflict of interest, but institutional interest in maintaining relevance as an "expert on disinformation".

(b) MANDATE: ZIPAR has specialised in disinformation research — structurally not neutral in the assessment of "alternative media", as these constitute his field of research.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Institutional interest in the relevance of the topic "disinformation"

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public positioning entails reputational risk

D3 Professional competence: +1 — Sociologist, but statements about "journalistic standards" go beyond his field

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent public positioning

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Sweeping statements without evidence ("a great deal of conspiracy theorising")

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary assessment, no primary data presented

TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Kovic is framed as a neutral sociologist, although he is a clearly positioned voice in the debate. The broadcast does not identify him as a party to the dispute.

Expert 2: Michael Hermann, political geographer

Timestamp: 11:43

Statement: "And that is actually now rather the phase, precisely because it is so clear, where things can also calm down again."

Assessment: Hermann is head of the Sotomo research institute, known for vote analyses. Tends towards a left-liberal positioning in public statements. No direct party affiliation.



Missing dissenting voice: A political scientist with a different research focus (e.g. minority rights, theories of democracy) would have contextualised the question of the legitimacy of minority positions differently.

Source in-depth check Hermann:

(a) FUNDING: Sotomo is a private research institute that produces vote analyses for SRF itself, among others — structural conflict of interest: Hermann analyses for SRF and is invited by SRF as an expert.

(b) MANDATE: Vote analysis is compatible with a neutral assessment, but the question of the "dangerousness" of parallel societies goes beyond his core mandate.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Business relationship with SRF (Sotomo produces analyses for SRF)

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public positioning

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Political geography, vote analysis is his core area

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent positioning

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly data-based

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary analysis

TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The business relationship between Sotomo and SRF is not disclosed. Hermann is presented as an independent expert.

Missing expert groups:

- Constitutional lawyer (fundamental rights, freedom of association)
- Epidemiologist critical of measures
- Media scholar (media pluralism)

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Marko Kovic, sociologist	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	0	+1	YELLOW
Michael Hermann, political geographer	-2	+1	+2	+1	+1	0	+3	YELLOW

Summary:

Expert	Source indicator	Main problem
Kovic	YELLOW	Positioned voice framed as neutral; sweeping statements without data evidence
Hermann	YELLOW	Undisclosed business relationship with SRF; questions go beyond his field of expertise

Both experts represent the pro-measures perspective. Not a single expert with a dissenting assessment was invited.



2. SOURCE SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Marko Kovic (sociologist)

Timestamp 07:33 — Statement: "a great deal of conspiracy theorising and a great deal of false information"

(a) Funding: ZIPAR, project grants, public contracts

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Kovic has an institutional interest in the relevance of "disinformation" as a field of research

(c) Missing counter-source: Media scholar who defends media pluralism as a democratic value

Source 2: Michael Hermann (Sotomo)

Timestamp 11:43 — Statement: "that the population actually co-governs the Federal Council in this kind of politics"

(a) Funding: Sotomo — private institute with a contractual relationship with SRF

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Business relationship with SRF not disclosed

(c) Missing counter-source: Political scientist without a business relationship with SRF

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 00:10

Claim: "After the clear adoption of the Covid Act, for some of the losing voters yesterday's decision is a reason to distance themselves even further from the state."

Word marker: Implicit causal claim without evidence ("is a reason")

Primary source available: No — penalty point. The claim that the vote result leads to estrangement from the state is presented as fact, without a primary source or representative survey.

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 05:41

Claim: "Already a kind of parallel society is forming in certain circles."

Word marker: "certain circles", "a kind of"

Primary source available: No — penalty point. No data on the size, spread or representativeness of these "circles".

Summary: Both experts are structurally positioned on the pro-measures side. Two rumours without primary sources are presented as facts. Not a single source with a dissenting scientific assessment.



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

Estimated speaking time (focus segment, approx. 00:10–15:43):

Actors/position	Speaking time	Share
Presenter (introduction/questions)	approx. 2:30 min.	~16%
Marko Kovic (expert, pro-measures perspective)	approx. 1:30 min.	~10%
Michael Hermann (expert, pro-measures perspective)	approx. 3:30 min.	~23%
Christoph Flurger (opponent of measures)	approx. 1:00 min.	~7%
Michael Bubendorf (opponent of measures)	approx. 0:45 min.	~5%
Caroline Jockel (opponent of measures)	approx. 1:00 min.	~7%
Anonymous demonstrators (opponents of measures)	approx. 1:00 min.	~7%
Off-commentary/framing (editorial)	approx. 3:30 min.	~23%

Summary: Experts with a pro-measures perspective (Kovic + Hermann) together receive approx. 33% of speaking time, while opponents of measures together receive approx. 26% — but without academic legitimation and with negative framing through off-commentary. The editorial off-commentary (23%) frames the opponents of measures consistently negatively. The time distribution is formally less asymmetric than the qualitative asymmetry.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

The constitutionally protected right to private schools, alternative media and community formation is never mentioned.

Relevant at: 09:17 (Caroline Jockel, private school) and 06:51 (Transition TV)

Effect

The broadcast suggests that the founding of private schools and alternative media constitutes a social danger — without mentioning that these activities are protected by fundamental rights and are normal in a democracy.

Omission 2:

Context

The 38% no votes are never acknowledged as a substantial democratic minority with a claim to representation.

Relevant at: 05:18 — "Switzerland said a clear yes with 62%"

Effect

The vote result is presented as an unambiguous social consensus. The 38% no votes (approx. 1.4 million voters) are treated exclusively as a problem, never as a legitimate minority.

Omission 3:

Context

Not a single scientist with a critical stance on Covid measures is heard, even though there was a broad international scientific debate about proportionality.

Relevant at: 07:33 (Kovic on "false information")

Effect

The broadcast suggests there is a scientific consensus on the correctness of all measures — which was factually not the case.

Summary: The three central omissions — fundamental rights, minority legitimacy, scientific debate — result in the anti-measures position appearing exclusively as a social pathology, never as a legitimate democratic stance.

Missing voices

- Constitutional lawyer: Would have contributed: contextualisation of the right to private schools, alternative media and community formation as constitutionally protected fundamental rights
- Epidemiologist with a dissenting assessment (e.g. from Sweden/Denmark): Would have contributed: scientific legitimisation of criticism of measures
- Media researcher/media lawyer: Would have contributed: contextualisation of media pluralism as a democratic value, not a danger
- Sociologist with a different research focus: Would have contributed: counter-perspective to Kovic's assessment of radicalisation
- SVP politician: Would have contributed: political contextualisation of the anti-measures position as part of the democratic spectrum



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

- Lawyer (fundamental rights): Would have contributed: legal contextualisation of the measures and the reactions to them
- Historian: Would have contributed: systematic historical contextualisation of parallel societies as a democratically productive phenomenon
- Representative of the 38% no votes with an academic background: Would have contributed: factual articulation of the minority position without a radicalisation narrative



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 05:18

Figure: "Switzerland said a clear yes to the Covid Act with 62%."

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: 62% yes — shown
- (b) Share: Percentage shown, but: voter turnout not mentioned; absolute number of no votes (~1.4 million) not stated
- (c) Trend: No contextualisation in relation to earlier Covid votes (June 2021: 60.2% yes)

Missing context

The voter turnout (approx. 65%) and the absolute number of no votes are missing. "62%" sounds like an overwhelming majority; in reality approx. 1.4 million people voted against.

Effect

The result appears as a clear social consensus; the size of the minority is obscured.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 12:16

Figure: "historically high voter turnout"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: Not stated
- (b) Share: Not stated
- (c) Trend: "historically high" without a comparative figure

Missing context

The actual voter turnout (~65%) and comparative values are missing.

Effect

"Historically high" suggests exceptional social mobilisation, without the viewer being able to contextualise this.

Summary: The figures are used selectively to present the vote result as an overwhelming consensus. The absolute size of the no minority is systematically concealed.



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

Association 1:	
Timestamp	07:42
Quote	<i>"in the alternative media there are no journalistic standards [...] a great deal of conspiracy theorising and a great deal of false information [...] then one radicalises very, very quickly"</i>
Technique: Transition TV (Flurger's medium) is sweepingly associated with conspiracy theories and radicalisation through Kovic's statement about "alternative media", without Transition TV being specifically analysed.	
Effect	Anyone who consumes or produces alternative media is presented as potentially radicalised.

Association 2:	
Timestamp	10:19
Quote	<i>"I would prefer peace, but if one imagines that this continues for 20, 30 years, then we would rather have a civil war than this crap."</i>
Technique: This statement by an anonymous demonstrator is embedded in the segment about the parallel society, without distancing or identification as an individual opinion. It is placed immediately after the moderate statements by Flurger, Bubendorf and Jockel.	
Effect	The entire anti-measures movement is contaminated by the most extreme statement.

Association 3:	
Timestamp	00:21
Quote	<i>"Is a new parallel society developing in Switzerland, one that instead of filling in ditches prefers to tear down bridges."</i>
Technique: The introduction sets the frame: opponents of measures = bridge-destroyers. This association is formulated as a question, but confirmed as an answer through the segment.	
Effect	Opponents of measures are framed as socially destructive from the outset.

Source check for persons framed as "conspiracy theorists":

Christoph Flurger (Transition TV):

- Works with verifiable primary sources: Not verifiable from transcript, but no specific false statements documented in the transcript
- Core statements falsifiable: YES — his statements about the social exclusion of the unvaccinated are factually verifiable
- Losses due to position: Reputational risk, social exclusion
- Gains: Attention, community building
- Net: Risk ≈ gain — no clear credibility bonus
- CATEGORY: B (borderline case)

Michael Bubendorf (Friends of the Constitution):

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

- Core statements: Withdrawal from social dialogue — factually verifiable
- Losses: Social exclusion, reputational risk
- CATEGORY: B (borderline case)

Summary: The broadcast uses guilt by association on three levels: sweeping association of alternative media with conspiracy theories, contamination of the entire movement through an extreme statement, and framing introduction. Flurger and Bubendorf are classified as Category B (borderline case) — the broadcast treats them implicitly as Category C.



7. TIMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 00:10 (beginning — introduction)

Content: "After the clear adoption of the Covid Act, for some of the losing voters yesterday's decision is a reason to distance themselves even further from the state."

Timing effect

The introduction sets the interpretive frame for the entire broadcast before a single piece of evidence is presented. "Distancing oneself from the state" is a value-laden formulation presented as fact. The viewer is already conditioned before hearing the actors themselves.

Finding 2:

Position: 10:19 (shortly before the end of the focus segment)

Content: "then we would rather have a civil war than this crap"

Timing effect

The most extreme statement in the entire segment is placed shortly before the expert interview. It serves as an emotional climax that makes the subsequent expert assessment ("that is very, very dangerous") appear confirmed. The sequence is: extreme statement → expert warning → confirmation of danger.

Finding 3:

Position: 07:33 (middle of the segment)

Content: Kovic's statement about radicalisation through alternative media

Timing effect

Kovic speaks immediately after Flurger's self-presentation — as a direct refutation. Flurger is given no opportunity to reply. The sequence is: opponent of measures speaks → expert refutes → no contradiction.

Summary: The timing is systematically designed so that statements by opponents of measures are immediately refuted by expert statements, while the most extreme statement is strategically placed before the concluding expert warning.



8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

6/10

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 00:21

Triggering event: Opponents of measures withdraw into parallel structures after losing the vote.

Reaction: "one that instead of filling in ditches prefers to tear down bridges" — value-laden formulation in the introduction signalling outrage.

Comparison

Analogous event: Supporters of measures who exclude the unvaccinated from social life (certificate requirement) — no analogous outrage in the broadcast.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. The social division is presented exclusively as a problem of the opponents of measures. The certificate requirement as an exclusion mechanism is not framed as "tearing down bridges".

Finding 2:

Timestamp 08:08

Triggering event: Kovic describes radicalisation through alternative media.

Reaction: No follow-up question, no critical contextualisation by the presenter — statement is left without comment.

Comparison

Analogous event: Flurger describes the social exclusion of the unvaccinated (07:10) — the presenter also leaves this statement standing, but Kovic immediately refutes it.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. Flurger's statements are countered by Kovic's refutation; Kovic's statements are not questioned.

Degree of outrage: 3/5 — Multiple instances, clearly evident in introduction and off-commentary

Selectivity: 3/5 — Clear one-sidedness: outrage exclusively about the behaviour of opponents of measures

Summary: The broadcast expresses outrage at the withdrawal of opponents of measures into parallel structures, without analogous outrage at the exclusion mechanisms (certificate requirement) that co-caused this withdrawal. The triggering event for the parallel society — social exclusion — is not framed as worthy of outrage.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — overall picture)

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 07:33

Missing perspective: Scientific debate on the proportionality of Covid measures

Relevance: In November 2021 there was a broad international scientific debate (Great Barrington Declaration, Swedish model, proportionality studies). Ignoring this debate while framing opponents of measures as "conspiracy theorists" is factually incomplete.

Impact: The viewer receives the impression that criticism of measures is scientifically untenable — which is factually not correct.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 09:17

Missing perspective: Constitutional dimension of the parallel society

Relevance: The right to private schools (Art. 19 FC), freedom of association (Art. 23 FC) and freedom of the media (Art. 17 FC) are constitutionally protected. The broadcast treats the exercise of these rights as a social danger.

Impact: Constitutionally protected behaviour is presented as hostile to democracy.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 11:43

Missing perspective: Analysis of the causes of the loss of trust

Relevance: The loss of trust in institutions is a documented phenomenon with structural causes (communication errors, contradictions in measures policy, transparency deficits). The broadcast treats it exclusively as a symptom of radicalisation.

Impact: The institutional co-responsibility for the loss of trust is completely blanked out.

Summary: The broadcast is incomplete in three central dimensions: scientific debate, constitutional contextualisation and causal analysis. The result is a structurally incomplete picture that presents opponents of measures as a social danger without analysing the structural causes of their stance.

Soft facts

The Covid Act vote of 28 November 2021 ended with 62% yes — a clear result that nonetheless conceals 38% no votes. The anti-measures movement encompasses a broad spectrum from libertarian civil rights advocates to vaccine sceptics and conspiracy theorists. The question of parallel societies is of high social relevance and touches on fundamental rights (freedom of association, freedom of expression, freedom of education). Internationally there are comparable phenomena (Tea Party, Yellow Vests, Querdenker) that are assessed differently.

Share of perspectives covered

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



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

- [A] Legitimate democratic minority rights:** 38% no is a substantial minority with a claim to representation
[B] Historical contextualisation: Parallel societies as a normal democratic phenomenon (trade unions, churches, cooperatives)
[C] Constitutional dimension: Right to one's own schools, media and communities is constitutionally protected
[D] Scientific criticism of Covid measures: Epidemiologists, economists with dissenting assessments
[E] Media criticism as a legitimate concern: Loss of trust in mainstream media is a documented phenomenon
[F] Criticism of the state as a democratic virtue: Historical function of dissent and minority positions
[G] Socioeconomic causes: Who are the opponents of measures? Education, income, regional distribution
[H] Proportionality of measures: Scientific debate on benefits/harms
[I] International comparisons: Countries without strict measures (Sweden, Denmark)
[J] Long-term consequences of social division: Both sides bear responsibility

[A] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The 38% no votes are never acknowledged as a legitimate democratic minority with a claim to representation; instead they are framed as a danger.

[B] INDICATED

Timestamp: 13:56 — Quote: "in the 19th century there were the Catholic conservatives" — Assessment: Michael Hermann mentions historical parallel societies, but only as a comparison, not as a legitimation.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The constitutionally protected right to one's own schools, media and communities is never mentioned; private school and alternative media are implicitly presented as problematic.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single scientist with a critical stance on Covid measures is heard.

[E] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Media criticism is presented exclusively as a symptom of radicalisation, not as a legitimate democratic concern.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Criticism of the state as a democratic virtue is not addressed.

[G] INDICATED

Timestamp: 06:00–10:00 — Quote: "when people lose their jobs" — Assessment: The socioeconomic dimension is briefly indicated but not systematically analysed.

[H] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The scientific debate on the proportionality of measures is not mentioned.

[I] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: International comparisons with less restrictive countries are completely absent.

[J] INDICATED



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

Timestamp: 06:05 — Quote: "From us sceptical people it is not desired that society be divided" — Assessment: Only the anti-measures side addresses mutual responsibility; the broadcast itself does not.

Completeness score: 2/10

Justification: Of 10 relevant perspectives, 7 are completely omitted and 3 are only indicated. The broadcast addresses exclusively the question of whether the anti-measures movement constitutes a social danger — not whether its concerns are legitimate. Not a single voice from the academic or scientific sphere that factually represents criticism of measures is heard.



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	00:21
Quote	<i>"Is a new parallel society developing in Switzerland, one that instead of filling in ditches prefers to tear down bridges."</i>
Manipulation	The introduction sets the frame as a rhetorical question that already contains the answer. "Tearing down bridges" is a strongly negative connotation attributed to opponents of measures before a single piece of evidence is presented.
Why problematic	The viewer is conditioned to perceive opponents of measures as destructive before hearing their statements. This is not neutral framing of an open question.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	05:32
Quote	<i>"It is a no to the entire Covid policy. A no to the Federal Council, indeed even a no to the Swiss state as such."</i>
Manipulation	The off-commentary escalates the interpretation of the vote result from "no to the Covid Act" to "no to the state". This escalation is an editorial interpretation, not a documented fact.
Why problematic	The broadcast equates a no to a specific law with hostility to the state — a politically highly charged equation without empirical basis.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	11:34
Quote	<i>"Among some opponents of Corona measures, the unease towards authorities, media and science appears to be growing."</i>
Manipulation	"Unease towards science" is framed as a pathology. Critical thinking towards institutions is equated with hostility to science.
Why problematic	Criticism of institutions is a democratic virtue. The equation of institutional criticism with hostility to science is a rhetorical technique that delegitimises legitimate dissent.



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

Summary: The framing of the broadcast is consistent throughout: opponents of measures = social danger, enemies of the state, potential radicals. This framing is established in the introduction and maintained throughout the entire segment.



11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	00:21
Quote	<i>"prefers to tear down bridges"</i>
Manipulation	"Tearing down bridges" is a strongly negative connotation implying destructiveness.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "wanting to build their own structures" or "withdrawing from social dialogue". "Tearing down bridges" implies active destruction, not passive withdrawal.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	05:41
Quote	<i>"Already a kind of parallel society is forming in certain circles."</i>
Manipulation	"Parallel society" is a term with negative connotations from the migration discourse (keyword: parallel societies of migrants). Transferring it to opponents of measures implicitly equates them with socially problematic groups.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "alternative community structures" or "independent networks". "Parallel society" is a politically charged term.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	07:53
Quote	<i>"a great deal of conspiracy theorising"</i>
Manipulation	"Conspiracy theorising" is a polemical term used to discredit statements without engaging with their content. Kovic uses it sweepingly for "alternative media".
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "unsubstantiated claims" or "unverified information". "Conspiracy theorising" is a social attribution, not an analytical category.

Summary: The word choice of the broadcast is systematically selected to make opponents of measures appear destructive, socially problematic and irrational. Neutral alternatives would have been available in all three cases.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 11:47

Triggering event: Presenter asks the first question to Michael Hermann after the focus segment.

Quote (presenter) *"We have been talking for some time about a divide, about a rift through society. After yesterday's clear yes, how large is the divide, in your opinion?"*

Comparison No representative of the anti-measures side is interviewed in the studio and confronted with comparable questions. Flurger, Bubendorf and Jockel only speak in the segment, without follow-up questions.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. Hermann is interviewed with open, inviting questions. Opponents of measures are given no opportunity to respond to Kovic's criticism in the studio.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 12:57

Triggering event: Presenter asks about Omicron and new measures.

Quote (presenter) *"We have a new virus, a new mutation, there will probably be new measures again in the future, many say. What does that mean?"*

Comparison The formulation "there will probably be new measures again" is not a neutral question but a presupposition. A neutral formulation would be: "How might the situation develop?"

Asymmetry: The presenter adopts the pro-measures perspective as the premise of the question.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 08:08

Triggering event: Kovic makes sweeping statements about alternative media without evidence.

Quote (presenter) *[No follow-up question — statement is left without comment]*

Comparison Flurger's statements are countered by Kovic's refutation; Kovic's statements are not questioned.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. Statements by opponents of measures are refuted by expert statements; expert statements are not questioned.

Summary: The moderation is asymmetric: opponents of measures only speak in the segment (without follow-up questions), while the expert with a pro-measures perspective is interviewed in the studio. Kovic's unsubstantiated sweeping statements are not questioned.



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

Asymmetry 1:

To Michael Hermann, 11	47: "How large is the divide, in your opinion?" — soft/inviting
To Christoph Flurger (in the segment, no studio interview)	No direct question — only statements in the segment
Comparison	Hermann receives a full studio interview with open questions. Flurger, Bubendorf and Jockel are given no opportunity to respond to Kovic's criticism. The asymmetry lies not in the hardness of the questions but in the format: experts in the studio, opponents of measures only in the segment.

Asymmetry 2:

To Michael Hermann, 13	42: "How will this develop? Are there more and more people who are, so to speak, distancing themselves from the state?" — open, future-oriented
To Marko Kovic	No direct question identifiable in the transcript — Kovic speaks in the segment, not in a studio interview
Comparison	Both experts are given space for their assessments without critical follow-up questions. The asymmetry lies in the fact that no representative of the anti-measures side with an academic background was invited.

Summary: The question asymmetry lies less in the hardness of individual questions than in the structural format: pro-measures experts in the studio with open questions, opponents of measures only in the segment without follow-up questions and without the opportunity to reply to Kovic's criticism.



14. FALSE BALANCE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp

06:00–10:00 — Construct: Opponents of measures are given speaking time, but exclusively with statements that confirm or reinforce the negative framing.

Analysis

The broadcast gives opponents of measures speaking time (Flurger, Bubendorf, Jockel, demonstrators), but:

1. Their statements are immediately refuted by Kovic
2. The most extreme statement (civil war) is embedded without being identified as an individual opinion
3. No opponent of measures with an academic background is heard
4. No opponent of measures is given the opportunity to respond to Kovic's criticism

The formal balance (both sides are heard) conceals the substantive asymmetry (one side is refuted by experts, the other is not).

Summary: The broadcast creates the appearance of balance by including anti-measures voices, without giving them comparable academic legitimation or opportunities to reply. This is false balance in the classic sense: formal balance with substantive asymmetry.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The vote result (62% yes) is a stable social consensus that legitimises the measures policy.

Timestamp

13:09 — Evidence: "it is now not simply politics, but it is politics and a clear majority of the population that stands behind measures"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether majority decisions may restrict minority rights, and how democracies deal with substantial minorities, is not raised.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Opponents of measures are the problem of social division.

Timestamp

00:21 — Evidence: "one that instead of filling in ditches prefers to tear down bridges"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether the measures policy itself contributed to the division (certificate requirement as an exclusion mechanism) is not raised.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Alternative media are inherently dangerous.

Timestamp

07:33 — Evidence: "in the alternative media there are no journalistic standards"

Alternative agenda: The question of the loss of trust in mainstream media and its structural causes is not raised. Media pluralism as a democratic value is not addressed.

Summary: The broadcast sets three agenda elements as self-evident: majority consensus = legitimation, opponents of measures = problem, alternative media = danger. All three are politically contested positions that are presented as facts.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 6.8 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 6.7 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Framing (Score 8):** The broadcast establishes in the introduction the frame "opponents of measures = bridge-destroyers" and maintains this throughout the entire segment. Every statement by opponents of measures is embedded in this frame, so that even moderate positions (private school, alternative media) appear as a social danger.
- 2. Omission / Completeness (Score 8/8):** The broadcast systematically omits three central perspectives: the constitutional legitimacy of the described activities, the scientific debate on the proportionality of measures, and the institutional co-responsibility for the loss of trust. The result is a structurally incomplete picture.
- 3. Agenda-Setting (Score 8):** The broadcast sets three politically contested positions as self-evident: the vote result as a stable consensus, opponents of measures as a social problem, and alternative media as a danger. These agenda elements are presented not as opinions but as facts.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "Anyone who rejected the Covid Act and withdraws into parallel structures is endangering democracy."

Technique: Framing + Agenda-Setting — Evidence: 00:21, 05:32, 10:42

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Anyone who consumes or produces alternative media radicalises themselves and loses touch with reality."

Technique: Guilt by Association + Expert Selection — Evidence: 07:33, 07:42, 08:08

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL): "The 62% majority represents the social consensus; the 38% minority is a problem that is marginalising itself."

Technique: Manipulation of Figures + Omission — Evidence: 05:18, 13:09, 12:16

Justification: With an overall score of 6.7, the broadcast lies at the boundary between "clear one-sidedness" and "systematic imbalance". The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in several dimensions: it does not accurately represent the anti-measures position (not a single expert with a dissenting assessment), it offers no diversity of opinion on a contested topic (all experts represent the same perspective), and the selection of interlocutors is structurally one-sided (opponents of measures without academic legitimation, supporters of measures with two experts in the studio). The broadcast cannot be qualified as obvious propaganda, but the combination of framing, omission and agenda-setting produces a systematically one-sided picture.

CONCLUSION

The broadcast of 29 November 2021 treats the reaction of opponents of measures to the Covid Act vote as a social danger, without addressing the constitutional legitimacy of the described activities (private schools, alternative media, community structures). The expert selection is structurally one-sided: both invited experts (Kovic, Hermann) represent the pro-measures perspective; not a single scientist with a critical stance on the measures is heard. The framing of the introduction ("tearing down bridges") and the off-commentary ("no to the Swiss state as such") sets a value-laden frame that is incompatible with the accuracy requirement of Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA. The broadcast does not fulfil the statutory mandate for balanced representation of contested topics: the 38% no votes are never acknowledged as a legitimate democratic minority, and the structural causes of the loss of trust in institutions are completely blanked out.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — all 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.8/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.7/10

Serious deviation from the impartiality requirement. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.8/10

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 balance.
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	Substantial finding (threshold)	Scores from 6 onwards are reported as "substantial findings".
7	Substantial finding	Clear, well-documented imbalance with marked relevance of impact.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple 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 complies with the accuracy requirement.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated irregularities; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Substantial imbalance	Multiple substantial 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 disadvantaged 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 (accurate representation)

Facts: The introduction presents a value-laden interpretation as fact.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:21 — Quote: "one that instead of filling in ditches prefers to tear down bridges"

Assessment: The formulation "tearing down bridges" is a value-laden attribution, not a factual description. Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA requires that editorial opinions be recognisable as such. The introduction presents a political value judgement as a statement of fact.

Violation 2:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (diversity of opinion on contested topics)

Facts: On a highly contested social topic (Covid measures, parallel society), exclusively experts with a pro-measures perspective are heard.

Evidence: Timestamp 07:33 — Quote: "a great deal of conspiracy theorising and a great deal of false information" — and 11:43 (Hermann interview without dissenting voice)

Assessment: Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA requires the representation of various viewpoints on contested topics. The broadcast presents exclusively one perspective through academically legitimised experts, while the counter-perspective is represented only by non-academic actors who are immediately refuted by expert statements.

Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (accurate representation of facts)

Facts: The claim "A no to the Swiss state as such" is presented as fact without empirical basis.

Evidence: Timestamp 05:35 — Quote: "It is a no to the entire Covid policy. A no to the Federal Council, indeed even a no to the Swiss state as such."

Assessment: This escalation from "no to the Covid Act" to "no to the state" is an editorial interpretation without a source reference. It violates the accuracy requirement, as it presents a politically highly charged equation as fact.

Violation 4:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA (balanced selection of interlocutors)

Facts: The business relationship between Michael Hermann's institute Sotomo and SRF is not disclosed.

Evidence: Timestamp 11:43 — Hermann is presented as an independent expert.

Assessment: The non-disclosure of a business relationship between an expert presented as independent and the broadcaster violates the transparency requirement derivable from Art. 4 RTVA.

Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in four demonstrable dimensions: accurate representation (value-laden introduction as fact), diversity of opinion (exclusively pro-measures experts), balanced selection of interlocutors (structural asymmetry between academically legitimised supporters and non-academic opponents) and transparency (undisclosed business relationship). The violations are not limited to individual formulations but run through the entire broadcast structure — from the introduction through the expert selection to the off-commentary. A complaint to the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television (ICA) would be justifiable on the basis of these findings.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

Marko Kovic (ZIPAR)

- 1. FUNDING:** ZIPAR (Zurich Institute of Public Affairs Research) — private institute, funded through project grants, public contracts and consulting mandates. No full transparency regarding funders.
- 2. MANDATE:** Disinformation research and political communication — structurally not neutral in the assessment of "alternative media", as these constitute his field of research.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in the relevance of "disinformation" as a field of research. The more "disinformation" is regarded as a social problem, the more relevant Kovic's research becomes.
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 (institutional interest)
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 (public positioning)
 - D3 Professional competence: +1 (sociologist, but statements about "journalistic standards" go beyond his field)
 - D4 Consistency: +1 (consistent positioning)
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: -1 (sweeping statements without evidence)
 - D6 Source level: 0 (secondary assessment)**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**
- 5. DISSENTING VOICE:** A media scholar with a research focus on media pluralism (e.g. Vinzenz Wyss, ZHAW) would have provided a counter-perspective. Not cited.

Michael Hermann (Sotomo)

- 1. FUNDING:** Sotomo — private research institute that regularly receives commissions from SRF (vote analyses, election analyses). Structural conflict of interest: Hermann analyses for SRF and is invited by SRF as an expert.
- 2. MANDATE:** Political geography and vote analysis — compatible with a neutral assessment of vote results, but the question of the "dangerousness" of parallel societies goes beyond his core mandate.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Business relationship with SRF not disclosed. Sotomo has an institutional interest in maintaining this business relationship.
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2 (business relationship with SRF)
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 (public positioning)
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 (political geography is his core area)
 - D4 Consistency: +1 (consistent positioning)
 - D5 Emotion vs. data: +1 (predominantly data-based)
 - D6 Source level: 0 (secondary analysis)**TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**
- 5. DISSENTING VOICE:** A political scientist without a business relationship with SRF (e.g. Adrian Vatter, University of Bern) would have provided a more independent perspective. Not cited.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. Both Kovic and Hermann are recognised researchers in their fields — but "recognised" does not mean "neutral" or "without conflict of interest". The broadcast presents both as neutral experts without disclosing the structural conflicts of interest. This is a social attribution that must itself be questioned.

Legal and methodological classification

No finding of fact

The results presented do not constitute findings of fact regarding individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are to be understood as the result of a standardised operationalisation, not as a determination of individual responsibility.

No legal ruling

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of Art. 4 RTVA. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory



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

requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular the ICA).

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 judgement of intent

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a substantial 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 segments. 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. Broadcasts must in particular 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 viewpoints on contested topics
3. **Balance:** Balanced selection of interlocutors

Supervisory authority

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

Complaints procedure

1. Ombudsman office of the respective business unit (SRF, RTS, RSI, RTR)
2. ICA (if no agreement is reached)
3. Federal Supreme Court (final 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 can not only obtain 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. After that, 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 an **audiobook**



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

Anyone who does not know this delivers 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 everyone who has a microphone in front of their face and wants 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 everyone who is exposed and wants 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 difficult situations



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, 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. Anyone who feels unfairly treated can lodge a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the ICA, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

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

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

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