



SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2022-05-25 10 vor 10 vom 25.05.2022

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2022-05-25 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 13:17

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

OVERALL SCORE

5.6/10

Significant bias

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	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

The overall tendency is 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 factor 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 the executive. Bias therefore does not manifest in government-vs.-opposition asymmetries, but in the relative over- or under-representation of individual parties and positions relative to their share of the vote.

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, EU rapprochement
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Economic freedom, lean state
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatism, family relief
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Climate protection, disarmament, redistribution
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Green economy, liberal-ecological
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Christian-social, centre

The dominant fault lines in 2022 are: (1) Energy prices and purchasing power relief — the right demands tax cuts on fuels, the left demands public transport subsidies; (2) Climate policy vs. economic freedom — bans and steering levies vs. technological openness; (3) Relationship with the EU and the bilateral agreements; (4) Social policy and distribution issues in the context of rising living costs.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is Switzerland's public broadcaster, financed through reception fees (Serafe). Art. 4 RTVA obliges SRF to provide accurate representation, diversity of opinion on controversial topics 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 portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	-2	13:17 "From the right, demands are being made to make driving cheaper now" — Programme position: tax cuts, personal responsibility — portrayed as a reactive demand without substantive justification; no SVP voice given airtime; position is used as a foil for the left-wing public transport solution. Distorted by omission.
SP	+2	18:03 SP transport politician Matthias Ebischer is given uncommented airtime; 20:28 "For me it is clear, we must tell the Federal Council..." — Programme position: public transport expansion, relief — correctly and fully portrayed, with its own proposed solution.
FDP	0	Not represented in the broadcast. The topic of petrol prices/relief touches on FDP's core position (tax cuts, market solutions), but no FDP voice is heard.
Centre	0	Not represented in the broadcast.
Greens	+2	18:48 Green transport politician Florence Brenzikhofer is given airtime with a concrete proposal (mobility vouchers, target groups) — Programme position: public transport promotion, climate protection — correctly portrayed.
GLP	0	Not represented in the broadcast.
EVP	0	Not represented in the broadcast.

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: SP, score +2
- Strongest distortion: SVP, score -2
- Average deviation from 0: 0.9
- Conclusion: The broadcast portrays the SVP position (relief for motorists) without substantive justification and without a party representative — merely as a foil for the left-wing public transport solution. SP and Greens are given their own airtime and can formulate their positions themselves. FDP, Centre, GLP and EVP are completely absent, even though the petrol price topic directly concerns several of these parties.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast data

- Title: SRF 10 vor 10
- Date: 25.05.2022
- Presenter/Reporter: Presenter (not named in the transcript); correspondent Vivian Manz (Texas); Miriam Fuchs (9-euro ticket); Matthias Rusch (BirdLife); Eva Wannemacher (Kulturplatz announcement)

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Vivian Manz	SRF correspondent USA	SRF	Journalist
Joseph Stiglitz	Nobel Prize-winning economist, former World Bank Chief Economist	Academic/adviser	Left-progressive
Matthias Ebischer	SP National Councillor, transport politician	SP	Left (2.5)
Florence Brenzikhofer	Green transport politician	Greens	Left (2.0)
Representative SwissPass/Alliance	Public transport industry organisation	Industry association	Neutral/economic
Deborah Fine	Survivor of a shooting attack	Private individual	—
Cody Wilson	Weapons manufacturer/dealer	Private individual	Libertarian-right
BirdLife representative	Nature conservation organisation	NGO	Ecological

Main topic

The broadcast covers the school massacre in Uvalde (Texas) as a hook for broader criticism of US gun laws, supplemented by a WEF interview with Stiglitz on globalisation and growth criticism, a domestic policy segment on the 9-euro ticket as a model for Swiss public transport subsidies, and an anniversary report on BirdLife Switzerland.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

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: Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel Prize-winning economist

Timestamp: 12:27–17:04

Statement: "The fundamental problem remains the excessive concentration of economic power, of production." / "In the end it is a distribution problem. One that the market cannot adequately solve." / "I would put it this way, the nature of economic growth must change."

Assessment: Stiglitz is a renowned economist, but with a clearly recognisable political positioning: he is a well-known critic of the Washington Consensus, the free market and globalisation in its neoliberal form. His positions correspond to the left spectrum of economics. He is presented as the sole economic voice.

Missing countervoice: A market-liberal economist (e.g. a representative of the Chicago School, the Cato Institute or the University of St. Gallen) would have contributed market solutions, the successes of globalisation for developing countries and the limits of state direction.

Source in-depth check:

(a) FUNDING: Columbia University (mixed public/private, USA); advisory mandates for the UN, World Bank, various governments. No direct conflict of interest discernible, but clear ideological positioning.

(b) MANDATE: Stiglitz's academic mandate is compatible with economic analysis, but his public appearances are decidedly political-normative.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No direct financial conflict, but ideological partiality discernible

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Nobel laureate with established reputation; low personal cost of statements

D3 Subject competence: +2 — Nobel laureate in economics; area of statement (globalisation, distribution) is his core field

D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent positions for decades

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly analytical, but normative conclusions without data evidence

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source (own research), but without evidence in the interview

TOTAL: +8 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN

(c) SUBJECT COMPETENCE: Stiglitz is framed as a neutral expert ("people who can make a difference"), even though he advocates a clearly left-wing economic policy agenda. The broadcast does not identify his political positioning.

Expert 2: Matthias Ebischer, SP National Councillor

Timestamp: 18:03–20:44

Statement: "Well, I would of course love to have a 9-euro ticket like that, where you can travel for free the whole month."

Assessment: SP party representative; his position is party-politically motivated and corresponds to the SP programme. He is correctly identified as "SP transport politician".



Missing countervoice: SVP or FDP transport politician.

Source in-depth check:

(a) **FUNDING:** National Councillor, publicly funded; SP member.

(b) **MANDATE:** Party-political mandate; not compatible with neutral assessment.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Party-political interest in public transport subsidies

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Standard position of his party

D3 Subject competence: +1 — Transport politician, but not an independent expert

D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent with SP programme

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Mix of wish and argument

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary (political opinion)

TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) **SUBJECT COMPETENCE:** Ebischer is correctly identified as an SP politician, but without a countervoice from the right-wing spectrum.

Expert 3: Florence Brenzikhofer, Green transport politician

Timestamp: 18:48–19:19

Statement: "So what is important is that the offers available primarily concern young people, that they concern young families."

Assessment: Greens party representative; position corresponds to the Greens programme.

Source in-depth check:

(a) **FUNDING:** Politician, publicly funded.

(b) **MANDATE:** Party-political; not neutral.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Party-political interest

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Standard position

D3 Subject competence: +1 — Transport politician

D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent with Greens programme

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Factual

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary

TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

Missing expert groups:

- Criminologist/violence researcher (Uvalde segment)
- Market-liberal economist (Stiglitz countervoice)
- SVP/FDP transport politician (9-euro ticket segment)

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel Prize-winning economist	+1	+1	+2	+2	+1	+1	+8	GREEN
Matthias Ebischer, SP National Councillor	-1	0	+1	+2	0	0	+2	YELLOW
Florence Brenzikhofer, Green transport politician	-1	0	+1	+2	0	0	+2	YELLOW

Summary:



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

Expert	Source indicator	Identification	Countervoice present
Stiglitz	GREEN	Incomplete (political positioning not mentioned)	No
Ebischer (SP)	YELLOW	Correct (party named)	No
Brenzikhofer (Greens)	YELLOW	Correct (party named)	No



2. SOURCE SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

Source 1: Correspondent Vivian Manz (SRF, Texas)

Timestamp: 04:24–07:02

Statement: "That would be a miracle. The Democrats have been trying for years to push stricter gun laws through Congress, so far without success."

(a) Funding: SRF, public broadcaster, Swiss licence fee payers.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: No direct conflict of interest, but the correspondent reports the Republican position without a representative and with an implicitly sceptical tone ("the prevailing view is").

(c) Missing counter-source: A Republican senator or NRA representative would have directly articulated the opposing position.

Source 2: Cody Wilson, weapons manufacturer

Timestamp: 09:44–11:28

Statement: "I don't worry about it. The safety of society, that's not what it's about. In America it's about how to achieve the greatest possible freedom."

(a) Funding: Private entrepreneur, commercial interest in weapons sales.

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Direct financial interest in liberal gun laws; is presented as a representative of the gun lobby position, but his statements are extreme and not representative of the majority of gun rights advocates.

(c) Missing counter-source: A moderate gun rights advocate (e.g. a sport shooter, constitutional lawyer) would have contributed a more nuanced pro-gun position.

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 02:36

Claim: "Apparently he had prepared himself."

Word marker: "apparently"

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

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 04:52

Claim: "The attacker was apparently an outsider, a school dropout"

Word marker: "apparently"

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

Summary: The source selection is structurally one-sided: for the gun law debate, exclusively advocates of stricter laws (Biden, Democratic senator, survivors) and an extreme gun lobbyist (Wilson) are presented — a moderate gun rights advocate is completely absent. Two rumours without a primary source increase the score.



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Biden/Democratic senator (pro-gun control): approx. 1:30 min. (approx. 6%)
- Vivian Manz (correspondent, implicitly pro-regulation): approx. 2:30 min. (approx. 10%)
- Republican position (only reported, no representative): 0 min. direct speaking time
- Cody Wilson (extreme gun lobbyist): approx. 0:45 min. (approx. 3%)
- Deborah Fine (survivor, pro-regulation): approx. 0:45 min. (approx. 3%)
- Joseph Stiglitz (left-progressive economist): approx. 4:30 min. (approx. 17%)
- Market-liberal countervoice: 0 min.
- Matthias Ebischer (SP): approx. 0:45 min. (approx. 3%)
- Florence Brenzikhofer (Greens): approx. 0:45 min. (approx. 3%)
- SwissPass representative (critical of 9-euro ticket): approx. 1:00 min. (approx. 4%)
- SVP/FDP position (only reported): 0 min. direct speaking time
- BirdLife/nature conservation: approx. 4:00 min. (approx. 15%)
- Presenter/reporter: approx. 5:00 min. (approx. 19%)
- Other (intro, transitions): approx. 4:00 min. (approx. 15%)

Summary: The time distribution is structurally asymmetric: pro-regulation voices (gun laws) and left-wing politicians (SP, Greens) receive direct speaking time, while right-wing/Republican positions are exclusively reported by third parties. Stiglitz dominates with 17% of broadcast time as the sole economic voice.



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

Omission 1:

Context

Empirical evidence on the effectiveness of gun laws is completely absent.

Relevant at: Timestamp 06:01 ("Will anything change in the USA now?")

Effect

The broadcast suggests that stricter gun laws would prevent massacres, without empirically substantiating this causal claim. Studies show a mixed picture (e.g. Lott 2000 vs. Webster 2014).

Omission 2:

Context

The Republican/conservative position on the gun issue is not explained by a representative.

Relevant at: Timestamp 06:29 ("Among Republicans, the prevailing view is...")

Effect

The opposing position appears as a mere opinion without justification, while the Democratic position is supported by emotional testimonies and presidential statements.

Omission 3:

Context

The costs of a Swiss 9-euro ticket for the taxpayer are not quantified.

Relevant at: Timestamp 17:06–20:44 (entire public transport segment)

Effect

The proposal appears as a cost-free solution; the question of financing (who pays?) is not raised.

Summary: Three systematic omissions characterise the broadcast: missing empirical evidence on the gun law debate, missing Republican voice and missing cost analysis for the public transport proposal. All three omissions structurally favour left-wing interpretive frameworks.

Missing voices

- Republican politician/constitutional lawyer: Would have explained the Second Amendment and the constitutional dimension of the gun debate.
- Criminologist/violence researcher: Would have contributed empirical data on the effectiveness of gun laws.
- Market-liberal economist (e.g. representative of the Cato Institute, Heritage Foundation): Would have contrasted Stiglitz's positions on globalisation and growth.
- SVP transport politician: Would have substantively justified the right-wing position on petrol price relief.
- FDP representative: Would have contributed market-based solutions to the mobility question.
- Taxpayer/financing perspective: Would have quantified the costs of a Swiss 9-euro ticket for the taxpayer.
- Farmer: Would have contributed the agricultural perspective on BirdLife demands (described in the report itself as a "political obstacle").
- Gun law expert/historian: Would have explained the cultural and historical context of US gun culture.



5. NUMBERS MANIPULATION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:02

Figure: "It's not even June and we already have the 39th school shooting this year."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — (b) Share missing — (c) Trend missing

Missing context

What counts as a "school shooting"? (Definition varies greatly depending on the source — from deadly massacres to shots fired on school grounds with no injuries.) How does the figure develop compared to previous years? How does the figure relate to the total number of schools (approx. 130,000 in the USA)?

Effect

The figure 39 sounds extremely high without it being clear what it measures; it produces maximum shock effect without contextualisation.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 09:01

Figure: "Last year, 23 million pistols and rifles were sold in the USA. 60 percent more than the previous year."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — (b) Share shown (60% increase) — (c) Trend indicated, but not contextualised

Missing context

Why the increase? (COVID-19 pandemic, unrest in 2020 — self-protection motive.) How does this relate to the total number of weapons in the USA (approx. 400 million)? Does the increase correlate with more violence?

Effect

The increase appears as a threatening development without explanation of the causes.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 05:39

Figure: "Last year, 1,500 children were killed by firearms in the USA."

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — (b) Share missing — (c) Trend missing

Missing context

How many children die in the USA in total per year (approx. 20,000)? How does the figure compare to other causes of death in children (car accidents, drowning)? How has the figure developed?

Effect

The figure appears in isolation and maximises emotional impact without contextualisation.

Summary: All three figures are used as emotional arguments without providing the dimensions (share, trend, definition) necessary for factual contextualisation. This corresponds to a systematic selection of figures in favour of the regulation narrative.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

09:44–11:28

Quote

"Cody Wilson manufactures gun parts and sells them on the internet." / "Cody doesn't care." / "And so he continues to fight for his idea of freedom. A society in which anyone who wants to can have their finger on the trigger."

Technique: Cody Wilson is presented as a representative of the entire gun rights movement. His extreme statements ("The safety of society, that's not what it's about") are not identified as a fringe position, but are implicitly framed as representative of gun rights advocates.

Effect

Those who advocate gun rights are associated through Wilson with indifference to the death of children.

Association 2:

Timestamp

13:17

Quote

"From the right, demands are being made to make driving cheaper now."

Technique: The right-wing position (tax cuts on fuels) is introduced without a representative and without justification — immediately before the left-wing counter-proposal (public transport subsidies). The association: right = making driving cheaper (implicitly: harmful to the climate, short-sighted).

Effect

Right-wing positions appear reactive and harmful to the climate, without a representative being able to justify them.

Summary: Cody Wilson is used as a stand-in for the entire gun rights movement — a classic guilt-by-association technique. The right-wing public transport position is introduced without a representative as a negative foil. Both techniques structurally favour left-wing interpretive frameworks.



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

Finding 1:

Position: 00:11 (start of broadcast, first words)

Content: "How many children have to die?"

Timing effect

The broadcast begins with a rhetorical question that is not a neutral news question, but implies a normative demand (fewer must die = laws must change). This framing shapes the entire reception of the Uvalde segment.

Finding 2:

Position: 11:08–11:28 (end of the ghost gun segment)

Content: "With a similar rifle, the gunman from Santa Monica shot six people. Cody doesn't care."

Timing effect

The segment ends with the moral condemnation of Wilson ("Cody doesn't care") — a value-laden closing statement that is not journalistic contextualisation, but an emotional judgement. Placement at the end maximises the effect.

Finding 3:

Position: 13:17 (transition to the public transport segment)

Content: "From the right, demands are being made to make driving cheaper now. [...] From the left, a different proposal is now coming."

Timing effect

The structure "the right wants X — the left has a better idea" is implicitly framed as progress through the sequence (right first, left as response).

Summary: The broadcast deploys normative framings strategically at the beginning (rhetorical question) and at the end (moral judgement on Wilson); the public transport segment is structurally framed as a "left-wing response to right-wing demands".



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 00:11

Triggering event: School massacre in Uvalde with 19 children killed.

Reaction: "How many children have to die?" — Rhetorical question as the broadcast's opening; emotional framing by the presenter.

Comparison

Analogous event — knife attacks on schools in other countries, terrorist attacks with many fatalities — no comparable rhetorical outrage question as a broadcast opening is demonstrable in comparable broadcasts from this transcript.

Asymmetry: The outrage is directed specifically against US gun laws; the question implies that the solution lies in legislative changes. An analogous outrage question for other causes of child death (e.g. traffic accidents, poverty) is not present.

Degree of outrage: 3/5 — Multiple and clear (rhetorical question, "torn from life", "shot in cold blood")

Selectivity: 3/5 — Outrage is directed exclusively against gun laws/gun lobby; no analogous outrage at other causes of death or other political positions

Finding 2:

Timestamp 11:08

Triggering event: Cody Wilson expresses indifference towards victims.

Reaction: "Cody doesn't care." — Value-laden statement by the reporter.

Comparison

No comparable value-laden comment for other interviewees (Stiglitz, Ebischer, Brenzikhofer).

Asymmetry: Only with Wilson is an explicitly value-laden statement by the reporter used; no analogous judgement for left-wing interlocutors.

Degree of outrage: 2/5 — Isolated, but explicit

Selectivity: 3/5 — Exclusively at the right-libertarian position

Summary: The broadcast shows selective outrage: the rhetorical opening question and the value-laden comment about Wilson are directed exclusively against gun rights positions. Comparable outrage at other political positions or other causes of death is not present.



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 06:01–07:02

Missing perspective/fact: Empirical research on the effectiveness of gun laws.

Relevance: The central question of the broadcast ("Will anything change now?") implicitly presupposes that stricter laws would help. This causal claim is empirically contested.

Impact: Viewers receive the impression that stricter gun laws are the obvious solution; the scientific debate about this is completely blanked out.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 12:27–17:04

Missing perspective/fact: Market-liberal countervoice to Stiglitz.

Relevance: Stiglitz's positions (market failure, growth criticism, state direction) are contested in economics; a countervoice would be essential for a balanced portrayal.

Impact: Stiglitz's normative conclusions appear as expert consensus, even though they represent a minority opinion in the mainstream of economics.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 17:06–20:44

Missing perspective/fact: Costs of the 9-euro ticket for taxpayers; SVP/FDP position on petrol price relief without a representative.

Relevance: Every subsidy solution has costs; the financing question is central to a factual debate. The right-wing position is used without a representative as a negative foil.

Impact: The public transport proposal appears as a cost-neutral, obviously better alternative to the right-wing demand.

Summary: The broadcast exhibits systematic omissions in all three main segments that structurally favour left-wing interpretive frameworks: missing empirical evidence (weapons), missing market-liberal countervoice (Stiglitz) and missing right-wing representatives (public transport).

The Uvalde massacre of 24 May 2022 (19 children, 2 adults killed) triggered a renewed debate about gun control in the USA and worldwide. In the USA, the gun issue is deeply politically divided: Democrats demand stricter laws, Republicans refer to the Second Amendment and individual rights to freedom. The debate is complex — empirical studies on the effectiveness of gun laws are contested, and the USA has a historically grown gun culture that is not contextualised in the broadcast. The WEF 2022 took place in the shadow of the Ukraine war and the energy price crisis.

Share of perspectives covered

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

[A] Advocates of stricter gun laws (Democrats, victims' associations)



- [B] Opponents of stricter gun laws (Republicans, NRA, constitutional lawyers)
- [C] Empirical research on the effectiveness of gun laws (pro and contra)
- [D] Historical-cultural context of the Second Amendment
- [E] Psychological/social causes of mass shootings (perpetrator profiles, prevention)
- [F] Comparison with other countries (gun laws and violence statistics)
- [G] Market-liberal counter-positions to Stiglitz (globalisation advocates, market economists)
- [H] Right-wing/civic positions on petrol price relief (SVP, FDP)
- [I] Public transport industry and financing questions (costs for taxpayers)
- [J] Critical perspective on BirdLife (conflicts of interest, agriculture)

[A] COVERED

Timestamp: 02:57 — Quote: "He calls once again in an initial reaction for stricter gun laws." / 03:03 Biden: "I am sick and tired of it. We have to finally do something." — Assessment: The Democratic position is portrayed extensively and emotionally.

[B] INDICATED

Timestamp: 06:29 — Quote: "Among Republicans, the prevailing view is that gun laws do nothing against such violence, that the problem lies in the psychology of the attackers." — Assessment: The Republican position is reported by the correspondent, but no Republican speaks for themselves; the position is not developed argumentatively.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Not a single empirical study on the effectiveness of gun laws is cited; the question of whether stricter laws would actually prevent massacres remains unanswered.

[D] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The Second Amendment, its historical origins and its constitutional significance are not explained.

[E] INDICATED

Timestamp: 06:29 — Quote: "the problem lies in the psychology of the attackers" — Assessment: Only reported as a Republican argument, not examined as an independent perspective.

[F] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No international comparison of gun laws and violence statistics; would considerably differentiate the debate.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Stiglitz's positions on redistribution, growth criticism and state direction are not contrasted by a countervoice from the market-liberal camp.

[H] INDICATED

Timestamp: 13:17 — Quote: "From the right, demands are being made to make driving cheaper now." — Assessment: The right-wing position is introduced without a representative and without substantive justification as a negative foil.

[I] COVERED

Timestamp: 19:32 — Quote: "I don't think much of this solution..." (SwissPass representative) — Assessment: Industry representative is given airtime, but the financing question (costs for taxpayers) is not explicitly addressed.



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

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: BirdLife is presented uncritically as an anniversary report; no critical perspective on conflicts of interest or effectiveness of the measures.

Completeness score: 3/10

Justification: Of ten relevant perspectives, only three are fully covered (A, I, and conditionally H). Four perspectives are completely absent (C, D, F, J), three are only indicated (B, E, G). Particularly serious is the absence of empirical evidence on the gun law debate and the complete absence of a market-liberal countervoice to Stiglitz.



Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:11
Quote	<i>"How many children have to die?"</i>
Manipulation	The broadcast opens with a rhetorical question that frames the topic of gun violence not as a complex political problem, but as a moral failure. The implicit answer: laws must change.
Why problematic	A neutral framing would read: "After the Uvalde massacre: How is America responding?" The chosen formulation prejudices the solution (legislative change) and excludes other explanatory frameworks (mental health, school architecture, security personnel).

Finding 2:

Timestamp	07:15–07:36
Quote	<i>"It has long been particularly easy to buy a firearm in the USA. In recent years, however, it became absurdly easy."</i>
Manipulation	The word "absurd" is a value judgement, not a description. The presenter frames the accessibility of weapons as obviously irrational.
Why problematic	From the perspective of the Second Amendment and US gun culture, the accessibility of weapons is not "absurd", but a constitutionally protected right. The value judgement excludes this perspective.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	13:17–13:22
Quote	<i>"From the right, demands are being made to make driving cheaper now. [...] From the left, a different proposal is now coming."</i>
Manipulation	The structure "the right wants X — the left has a different proposal" implicitly frames the left-wing position as a response and alternative, not as an equally valid option.
Why problematic	A neutral framing would present both positions as equally valid: "Two proposals for relieving the population in the face of rising energy prices."

Summary: The framing of the broadcast is consistently normative: gun laws must change (Uvalde), the market does not solve distribution problems (Stiglitz), public transport subsidies are the better response to petrol prices (public transport segment). All three framings correspond to left-wing interpretive patterns.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	00:11
Quote	"How many children have to die?"
Manipulation	Rhetorical question with implicit attribution of blame (someone is letting children die).
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "The Uvalde massacre: What does it mean for the gun debate in the USA?"

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	07:21–07:25
Quote	"In recent years, however, it became absurdly easy."
Manipulation	"Absurd" is a value judgement, not a description; it delegitimises the opposing position without naming it.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "In recent years, access to weapons was further simplified."

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	11:08
Quote	"Cody doesn't care."
Manipulation	Value-laden statement by the reporter about an interviewee; abandons the journalistic observer role.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Cody Wilson does not comment on the victims." The chosen formulation is a moral judgement, not a journalistic finding.

Summary: The word choice of the broadcast contains several normative value judgements ("absurd", "Cody doesn't care", "How many children have to die?") that abandon the journalistic observer role and convey a clear political stance.



12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 12:27

Triggering event: Interview with Stiglitz begins; presenter asks first question.

Quote (moderator) *"You have been a committed critic of globalisation for decades. Now there is talk here in Davos of de-globalisation. Is that a positive development?"*

Comparison No comparable interview with a market-liberal economist in this broadcast.

Asymmetry: The question is open and inviting; Stiglitz can freely develop his position. A critical follow-up question ("But globalisation has lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty — does that contradict your thesis?") is completely absent.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 15:50

Triggering event: Stiglitz says economic growth must change.

Quote (moderator) *"Is economic growth actually the wrong priority?"*

Comparison The question is suggestive — it implies that growth may be wrong, and invites Stiglitz to confirm this thesis.

Asymmetry: A balanced question would be: "Critics say growth is the best way to combat poverty — how do you respond to that?"

Finding 3:

Timestamp 18:03

Triggering event: Interview with SP politician Ebischer.

Quote (moderator) *[No critical follow-up question discernible in the transcript]*

Comparison Ebischer can present his proposal without comment; no question about costs or financing.

Asymmetry: The SwissPass representative (critical voice) also receives airtime, but the presenter asks him no in-depth questions.

Summary: The moderation is inviting and uncritical with Stiglitz and Ebischer; critical follow-up questions about costs, empirical evidence or counter-arguments are absent. The SwissPass representative as the only critical voice receives no in-depth questions.



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

Asymmetry 1:	
To Stiglitz, 12	27: "You have been a committed critic of globalisation for decades. Now there is talk here in Davos of de-globalisation. Is that a positive development?" — soft/inviting
To [missing market-liberal economist]	no interview available
Comparison	Stiglitz receives exclusively open, inviting questions; a countervoice is not interviewed, let alone critically questioned.

Asymmetry 2:	
To Ebischer (SP), 18	03: [Inviting presentation of his proposal, no critical follow-up question about costs]
To [missing SVP/FDP politician]	no interview available
Comparison	The left-wing position is presented without critical follow-up questions; the right-wing position is reported without a representative.

Summary: The question asymmetry is structural: left-wing and progressive interlocutors receive open, inviting questions without critical follow-ups; right-wing and market-liberal positions are either not interviewed at all or only reported through third parties.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	19:32–20:10

Construct: SwissPass representative as "opposing position" to the 9-euro ticket proposal.

Analysis	The SwissPass representative criticises the 9-euro ticket on operational grounds (uncertainties, sustainability), not political ones. He is not a representative of the right-wing/civic position, but an industry representative with his own interests. The actual political opposing position (SVP/FDP: tax cuts instead of subsidies) is absent. The broadcast suggests through the SwissPass representative a balance that is factually not present.
Effect	Viewers receive the impression that both sides are represented, even though the political opposing position is absent.

Summary: The broadcast uses the SwissPass representative as a pseudo-counterweight to the left-wing public transport position, without representing the actual political opposing position (right-wing/civic). This is a case of false balance through substitution.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Stricter gun laws are the obvious solution for school massacres.

Timestamp

00:11 — Evidence: "How many children have to die?" / 02:57 "He calls once again for stricter gun laws."

Alternative agenda: Mental health care, school architecture and security concepts, social isolation as a perpetrator risk factor, effectiveness of existing laws.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Economic growth is problematic; state direction and redistribution are necessary.

Timestamp

15:50 — Evidence: "Is economic growth actually the wrong priority?" / Stiglitz: "the nature of economic growth must change."

Alternative agenda: Growth as poverty reduction; successes of globalisation for developing countries; limits of state direction.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Public transport subsidies are the right, climate-friendly response to rising petrol prices.

Timestamp

13:17 — Evidence: "From the right, demands are being made to make driving cheaper now. From the left, a different proposal is now coming."

Alternative agenda: Tax cuts on fuels; purchasing power relief through tax policy; cost-benefit analysis of public transport subsidies.

Summary: The broadcast sets agendas in all three main segments that correspond to left-wing interpretive patterns: gun control, growth criticism and public transport subsidies. Alternative agendas (prevention, market solutions, tax policy) are not placed on the agenda.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 5.7 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 5.5 / 10

Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** The broadcast systematically omits opposing positions, empirical evidence and cost analyses in all three main segments. The absence of a Republican voice, a market-liberal countervoice to Stiglitz and a right-wing transport politician voice is not coincidental, but structurally consistent. This is the most impactful technique of the broadcast, because it remains invisible.
- 2. Framing (Score 7):** The broadcast frames all three main topics normatively: gun control as the obvious solution, growth as problematic, public transport subsidies as the better alternative. These framings are not identified as opinions, but presented as self-evident starting points. The rhetorical opening question ("How many children have to die?") sets the tone for the entire broadcast.
- 3. Agenda-Setting (Score 7):** The broadcast sets agendas in all three segments that correspond to the left-wing political spectrum, without placing alternative agendas (prevention, market solutions, tax policy) on the agenda. This is particularly relevant because agenda-setting influences long-term opinion formation more strongly than individual statements.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "The USA urgently needs stricter gun laws — those who prevent this bear co-responsibility for the death of children."

Technique: Framing (rhetorical opening question), omission (no empirical evidence, no Republican voice), guilt by association (Wilson as stand-in) — evidence: 00:11, 06:29, 11:08

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Economic growth and free markets do not solve the world's problems — state direction and redistribution are necessary."

Technique: Expert selection (Stiglitz as sole economic voice), framing (suggestive questions), omission (no market-liberal countervoice) — evidence: 12:27, 15:50

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "Public transport subsidies are the right, climate-friendly response to rising energy prices — right-wing demands for tax cuts are short-sighted."

Technique: Timing (right as negative foil, left as response), omission (no right-wing voice), false balance (SwissPass as pseudo-counterweight) — evidence: 13:17, 18:03, 19:32

Justification: The broadcast achieves an overall score of 5.6/10, which corresponds to a clear one-sidedness. The one-sidedness is not attributable to individual errors, but to a consistent pattern: in all three main segments, right-wing and market-liberal countervoices are absent, normative framings are presented as self-evident, and figures are used without the necessary contextualisation. This violates Art. 4 RTVA, which requires diversity of opinion on controversial topics and a balanced selection of interlocutors. The one-sidedness is not extreme (no score 7+), because individual critical voices (SwissPass representative, Cody Wilson as opposing position) are present and the broadcast contains no active false statements.

CONCLUSION

The analysed broadcast of SRF 10 vor 10 exhibits a consistent pattern of structural one-sidedness that runs through all three main segments. In the gun debate, Republican voices and empirical evidence on the effectiveness of gun laws are absent; in the WEF interview, a market-liberal countervoice to Stiglitz is absent; in the public transport segment, right-wing and civic representatives are absent. These omissions cannot be explained by time pressure, as the broadcast is extensive and Stiglitz alone receives 4:30 minutes. The normative word choice ("absurd", "Cody doesn't care", "How many children have to die?") abandons the journalistic observer role and conveys political value judgements as editorial statements. According to Art. 4 RTVA, SRF is obliged to ensure diversity of opinion on controversial topics and to select interlocutors in a balanced manner — both requirements are not met in this



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

broadcast. The overall score of 5.6/10 corresponds to a clear one-sidedness in favour of left-wing and progressive interpretive frameworks.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

5.7/10

Significant bias

SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

5.5/10

Significant bias

OVERALL SCORE

5.6/10

Significant bias

Averaged from hard facts and soft facts



KEY — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

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

Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	Unremarkable	No material patterns discernible; broadcast meets the requirement of factual accuracy.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight bias	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible, but still within the tolerance range.
4.1 – 6.0	Significant bias	Multiple significant findings; material impairment of diversity of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the requirement of balance. High degree of deviation	Pronounced, broadcast-wide patterns; high impact relevance.
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 treated worse in portrayal, airtime 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 preferred in portrayal, airtime or framing.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Art. 4 RTVA)

Assessment under Art. 4 RTVA

Violation 1:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (diversity of opinion on controversial topics)

Facts: In the segment on the US gun debate, exclusively advocates of stricter gun laws (Biden, Democratic senator, survivor Deborah Fine) and an extreme gun lobbyist (Cody Wilson) are given airtime. No moderate gun rights advocate, no Republican, no constitutional lawyer is interviewed.

Evidence: Timestamp 02:57 — "He calls once again in an initial reaction for stricter gun laws." / 06:29 — "Among Republicans, the prevailing view is that gun laws do nothing against such violence" (only reported, no representative).

Assessment: The gun debate is a highly controversial political topic in the USA with a constitutional dimension. Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA requires that on such topics the essential positions are given airtime. The Republican/conservative position is exclusively reported by the correspondent, not formulated by a representative themselves. This violates the requirement of diversity of opinion.

Violation 2:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (balanced selection of interlocutors)

Facts: In the domestic policy segment on petrol prices and public transport subsidies, exclusively left-wing and green politicians (SP National Councillor Ebischer, Greens Brenzikhofer) are given airtime. The right-wing position (SVP/FDP: tax cuts on fuels) is introduced without a representative as a negative foil.

Evidence: Timestamp 13:17 — "From the right, demands are being made to make driving cheaper now. From the left, a different proposal is now coming."

Assessment: The selection of interlocutors is structurally one-sided: two left-wing politicians receive direct airtime, while the right-wing position remains without a representative. This violates Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA, which requires a balanced selection of interlocutors.

Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA (accurate representation of facts)

Facts: The presenter uses normative value judgements ("absurdly easy", "Cody doesn't care", "How many children have to die?") as editorial statements, without identifying them as opinions.

Evidence: Timestamp 07:21 — "In recent years, however, it became absurdly easy." / 11:08 — "Cody doesn't care."

Assessment: Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA requires the accurate representation of facts. Presenting normative value judgements as editorial statements without identifying them as opinions violates the requirement of factual accuracy.

Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in three dimensions: (1) diversity of opinion in the US gun debate (Republican position without a representative), (2) balanced selection of interlocutors in the domestic public transport segment (exclusively left-wing politicians), (3) accurate representation through normative value judgements as editorial statements. The violations are not attributable to individual errors, but to a consistent editorial pattern that is discernible in all three main segments. A complaint to the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television (ICA) would be justifiable on the basis of these findings, particularly with regard to the missing diversity of opinion in the gun debate segment and the one-sided selection of interlocutors in the public transport segment.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

BirdLife Switzerland

1. FUNDING: BirdLife Switzerland is a non-profit association, financed through membership fees (68,000 members), donations, public subsidies (federal government, cantons) and project contributions. Partially co-financed by the state.

2. MANDATE: Nature conservation and bird protection; mandate is compatible with the activities portrayed in the segment. No direct conflict of interest in the portrayal of its own projects.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: BirdLife has an institutional interest in the portrayal of its own successes (membership recruitment, fundraising, political influence). The segment is uncritical and corresponds to an anniversary report without journalistic distance.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Institutional interest in positive portrayal

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Employees risk nothing through positive self-portrayal

D3 Subject competence: +2 — Recognised nature conservation organisation with 100-year history

D4 Opinion consistency: +2 — Consistent nature conservation position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: 0 — Mix of data and emotional appeals

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source for own projects

TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN (marginal)

5. COUNTERVOICE: The segment mentions that "political framework conditions" are the obstacle, not the farmers. An agricultural perspective on BirdLife demands is completely absent.

Alliance SwissPass / public transport industry organisation

1. FUNDING: SwissPass is a cooperative of public transport companies (SBB, PostAuto, etc.); partially state-financed (SBB is a federal enterprise).

2. MANDATE: Industry organisation; mandate is oriented towards public transport interests. Not neutral on questions of public transport financing.

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: SwissPass has an institutional interest in stable revenues and against price undercutting through special promotions that could devalue existing subscriptions. The criticism of the 9-euro ticket is therefore not politically neutral, but driven by industry interests.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Industry interest in stable prices

D2 Personal risk: 0 — Standard position of the industry

D3 Subject competence: +2 — Subject competence for public transport operations

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent industry position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Factual-operational

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary source for industry assessment

TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

5. COUNTERVOICE: An independent transport economist or a taxpayers' association would have illuminated the financing question from a different perspective.

Analysis prepared in accordance with Methodological Principle K11+K8 (Version 3.0-detail). All findings are based exclusively on the transcript at hand. Timestamps refer to the time markers indicated in the transcript.

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 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 significant bias 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 the comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not the precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not 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. The 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 accurately represent facts and events so that the public can form its own opinion. Views and comments 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 (requirement of diversity).

Core obligations

1. **Factual accuracy:** Accurate representation of facts and events
2. **Diversity of opinion:** Diversity of views on controversial topics
3. **Balance:** Balanced selection of interlocutors

Supervisory authority

- ICA (Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television): Reviews 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. ICA (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 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 an **audiobook**



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

Those who do not know this provide 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 toolbox — 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 more 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. Those who feel unfairly treated can complain. 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 appropriate, not based on 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 everyone considering a complaint — and for everyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still pending.