



## SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2024-04-07 Tagesschau vom 07.04.2024 Hauptausgabe

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2024-04-07 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 12:37

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**4.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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 favouring left, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly favouring right). The calculation is based on the difference in the average favouring of left vs. right parties (grouping according to CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**3.8 / 10**

*Favouring left*

0 1 2 **3** 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — [chesdata.eu](https://chesdata.eu) | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | 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 with a seven-member Federal Council composed according to the magic formula: SVP (2 seats), SP (2 seats), FDP (2 seats), Centre (1 seat). There is no classic government/opposition divide — all major parties are represented in the executive. The Greens, GLP and EVP are not represented in the Federal Council, but form relevant parliamentary forces.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NR	Government/Opposition	Core position
SVP	8.0	62	Government (2 FC)	Limit migration, sovereignty, against EU rapprochement
SP	2.5	41	Government (2 FC)	Expand welfare state, open migration, single health insurer
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Economic freedom, bilateral path, lean state
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatism, family relief, EU stabilisation
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Net zero 2030, redistribution, disarmament
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Green investments, liberal migration, cleantech
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Christian-social, centre values

The main lines of conflict in Switzerland are: (1) migration and asylum policy (SVP vs. SP/Greens), (2) EU bilateral agreements and institutional ties (FDP/Centre/SP vs. SVP), (3) climate policy and energy transition (Greens/SP vs. SVP/FDP), (4) healthcare costs and premium relief (SP single insurer vs. FDP/SVP competition model).

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of German-speaking Switzerland and is subject to the RTVA (Radio and Television Act). Art. 4 RTVA obliges SRF to present facts accurately, ensure diversity of opinion on controversial topics and make a balanced selection of interlocutors. As Switzerland's largest media organisation funded by licence fees, SRF bears particular democratic responsibility.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	0	Not directly addressed. Thurgau election result (SVP strongest force, seat retention) reported factually — omitted
SP	+2	11:03 "Mustafa Atiqi of the SP" — election framed positively, migration background acknowledged as a historic step; 14:22 SP as "big winner" in Thurgau — correct, slightly positively connoted
FDP	0	11:03 "Luca Urgeese of the FDP" — factual mention as the losing candidate, no programme position presented — omitted
Centre	0	13:46 "Dominik Diezzi, Centre" — name mention only, no programme position — omitted
Greens	-1	14:54 "Sandra Reinhardt of the Greens" — defeat mentioned, complaint about lack of SP support quoted; 16:26 "Greens lose two seats" — factual, but losses without contextualisation
GLP	0	16:29 "GLP three [seats lost]" — mention only, no programme position — omitted
EVP	0	16:35 "EVP can hold its six seats" — mention only — omitted

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: SP (Score +2) — Atiqi's election correctly reported, slightly positively framed
- Strongest distortion: Greens (Score -1) — defeat and internal criticism without contextualisation of programme position
- Average deviation from 0: 0.4
- Conclusion: The broadcast addresses Swiss party politics primarily in the context of election results, not programme positions. The SP election of Atiqi receives significantly more airtime and emotional framing than the SVP results in Thurgau. The party bias deviation is overall minor, as Swiss domestic politics makes up only a small part of the broadcast.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMING

### Broadcast data

- Title: SRF Tagesschau
- Date: 07.04.2024
- Presenter: Not named (voice-over / studio presenter)
- Reporters: Carina Reiola (Gaza/Israel), Jonas Bischof (Jerusalem, correspondent), Anita Bünter (hostage reportage), Tobias Bossat (Basel election), Philippe Naun (Thurgau election), Mauro Flüller (Slovakia), Claudia Pfister (solar eclipse)

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Jonas Bischof	SRF correspondent Jerusalem	SRF (public broadcaster)	Neutral (journalistic)
Sharon Sharabi	Hostage relative	Civil society Israel	No party
Battalion commander (anonymous)	IDF reservist	Israeli army	No party
Mustafa Atiqi	New Basel cantonal councillor	SP	Left (2.5)
Beat Jans	Federal Councillor, cited indirectly	SP	Left (2.5)
Sandra Reinhardt	Greens candidate Thurgau	Greens	Left (2.0)
Denise Neuweiler	New Thurgau cantonal councillor	SVP	Right (8.0)
Sonja Wiesmann	New Thurgau cantonal councillor	SP	Left (2.5)
Peter Pellegrini	New Slovak president	Smer (left-populist)	Left-populist
Ivan Korczok	Defeated candidate Slovakia	Independent/pro-Western	Centre-right

### Main topic

The broadcast of 7 April 2024 reports, on the six-month anniversary of the Hamas attack, on the Gaza war, Swiss cantonal elections (Basel, Thurgau), the Slovak presidential election, Paris-Roubaix and the upcoming solar eclipse.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Expert 1: Jonas Bischof, SRF correspondent Jerusalem

Timestamp	04:21–07:05
Statement	"This war has massively lost momentum [...] it is questionable whether Israel can really still carry out this major announced Rafah offensive."
Classification	SRF foreign correspondent, journalistic generalist, not a recognised military or Middle East expert in the academic sense. No discernible conflicts of interest, but also no specialist expertise beyond journalistic observation.
Missing countervoice	An Israeli military analyst or Palestinian political scientist would have provided a technically grounded assessment of the Rafah offensive.

Source deep-check Jonas Bischof:

**(a) FUNDING:** SRF, public broadcaster, licence fee funding. No direct conflict of interest on the Gaza topic.

**(b) MANDATE:** Journalistic observer on the ground — compatible with situational assessment, not with military-strategic analysis.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No direct conflict of interest discernible

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Correspondent on the ground, some personal risk

D3 Professional competence: 0 — Journalist, not a military or Middle East expert

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — No contradictions discernible

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly factual, occasionally emotional ("seen weeping people")

D6 Source level: +1 — Primary observer on the ground

**TOTAL: +5 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN**

**(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Bischof's assessments are presented as journalistic analysis, not as expert judgement — this is correctly framed.

#### Expert 2: Sharon Sharabi, hostage relative

Timestamp	08:04–10:26
Statement	"I implore the Israeli government to do everything in its power in the negotiations with Hamas so that the hostages are released."
Classification	Affected person, not an expert. Legitimate emotional voice, but one-sided — no Palestinian affected person as counterweight.
Missing countervoice	A Palestinian civilian from Gaza with comparable personal loss.



Source deep-check Sharon Sharabi:

(a) **FUNDING:** Private individual, no institutional funding.

(b) **MANDATE:** Affected person — no mandate for neutral assessment, but legitimate voice as a witness.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Directly personally affected, clear interest in a particular outcome

D2 Personal risk: +2 — Loss of family members, high personal risk

D3 Professional competence: -2 — Not a specialist in the Middle East conflict or negotiation

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent position

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Strongly emotional, no data

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

**TOTAL: +1 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Sharabi is correctly framed as an affected person, not as an expert — this is appropriate.

Missing expert groups:

- Military analyst (Israeli or international) for assessment of the Rafah offensive
- Palestinian political scientist or civil society representative
- Humanitarian international law specialist

### Source traffic light for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Traffic light
Jonas Bischof, SRF correspondent Jerusalem	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+5	GREEN
Sharon Sharabi, hostage relative	-1	+2	-2	+1	-1	+2	+1	YELLOW

*Summary: Jonas Bischof (GREEN) is as a correspondent on the ground a legitimate but not specialist-expert source; Sharon Sharabi (YELLOW) is an important emotional voice that appears one-sided without a Palestinian counterweight.*



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: Israeli media (general)

#### Timestamp

01:58 — Statement: "Israeli media, here the television with a special logo for the day, interpret the withdrawal predominantly as the end of the major ground offensive"

- (a) **Funding:** Israeli media, partly state-owned, partly private — structurally Israeli perspective.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Israeli media have a vested interest in a particular portrayal of the course of the war; no Palestinian media cited as a counter-source.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Al Jazeera, Arab media or independent international sources for assessment of the withdrawal.

### Source 2: Netanyahu quote (direct)

#### Timestamp

02:21 — Statement: "Giving in to Hamas's demands would allow it to repeat the acts of 7 October."

- (a) **Funding:** Israeli government.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Netanyahu has a direct interest in portraying the necessity of the war; no Hamas counter-statement cited.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Hamas statement on negotiations or Palestinian Authority.

### Source 3: Israeli Defence Minister Galland

#### Timestamp

04:06 — Statement: "the armed forces are thereby preparing for new missions also in the Rafah region"

- (a) **Funding:** Israeli government/military.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Military source with interest in portraying strength.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Independent military analysis or UN assessment.

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 01:51

Claim: "Whether it thereby heralds the end of the ground offensive or is rather gathering for the next major operation"

Word marker: "apparently" (00:14 in the headline teaser)

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

*Summary: The source selection is one-sidedly Israeli-governmental; Palestinian, Arab or independent international sources are completely absent from the Gaza block.*



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Gaza/Israel block (total): 30 sec. (41%)
- Netanyahu quote: approx. 20 sec.
- Jonas Bischof (correspondent): 30 sec.
- Sharon Sharabi (hostage relative, Israeli):
- Battalion commander (Israeli): approx. 20 sec.
- Reportage commentary (SRF):
- Palestinian voices: 0 sec.
- Basel election: (13%)
- Mustafa Atiqi (SP): approx. 45 sec.
- Beat Jans (SP, cited): approx. 15 sec.
- FDP candidate Urgeese: 0 sec.
- Thurgau election: 30 sec. (11%)
- Denise Neuweiler (SVP): approx. 30 sec.
- Sonja Wiesmann (SP): approx. 10 sec.
- Sandra Reinhardt (Greens): approx. 20 sec.
- Slovakia: 30 sec. (11%)
- Pellegrini (winner): approx. 15 sec.
- Korczok (loser): 0 sec. own voice
- Sport/solar eclipse: (17%)
- Presenter: (9%)

*Summary: In the Gaza block, Israeli voices (governmental + civil society) receive airtime, Palestinian voices 0 sec. — a structural asymmetry that distorts the overall picture.*



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

Palestinian civilian voices from Gaza are completely absent.

Relevant at: Timestamp 02:56 — "It suffers from the many deaths, from the destruction of homes"

###### Effect

The humanitarian catastrophe is presented as an abstract number ("over 30,000 dead"), without a human face on the Palestinian side — while the Israeli side receives a concrete, emotional voice in Sharon Sharabi.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

FDP reaction to defeat in Basel is missing.

Relevant at: Timestamp 11:03 — Atiqi election reported, Urgeese mentioned only as a number.

###### Effect

The election is told as an SP success story; the defeated bourgeois side has no voice, even though Urgeese received 44.5% of the votes.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

The democratic legitimacy of the Slovak election is not addressed.

Relevant at: Timestamp 18:52 — "democracy in Slovakia in great danger"

###### Effect

Pellegrini won with 53% in a democratic election; the assessment "democracy in danger" is stated without evidence, without the democratic legitimacy of the result being acknowledged.

*Summary: The most systematic omission is the complete absence of Palestinian voices in the Gaza block; this creates a structurally one-sided picture despite factually correct figures.*

#### Missing voices

- Palestinian civilian from Gaza: Would have conveyed the suffering of the civilian population first-hand and given concrete form to the humanitarian perspective.
- International law specialist: Would have contextualised the question of proportionality and international humanitarian law.
- FDP representative Basel: Would have commented on Urgeese's defeat and brought in the bourgeois perspective on the election.
- SVP representative Thurgau: Would have brought in the perspective of the strongest party despite seat losses.
- Ivan Korczok (Slovakia): Would have represented the pro-Western perspective with his own voice as the defeated candidate.
- UNRWA or ICRC: Would have contextualised the humanitarian situation in Gaza with institutional authority.
- Israeli security expert: Would have professionally contextualised the military logic of the withdrawal and the Rafah plans.



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

- Slovak democracy researcher: Would have substantiated or relativised the assessment "democracy in great danger" with facts.



## 5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 07:08

Figure: "Probably over 30,000 dead and two million internally displaced in Gaza"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: ✓ stated ("over 30,000")
- (b) Share: X not stated (ratio to total population of Gaza ~2.3 million, i.e. ~1.3% death rate)
- (c) Trend: X not stated (development over 6 months, comparison with other conflicts)

**Missing context**

Source reference missing ( Hamas Ministry of Health as source is disputed); distinction between combatants/civilians missing.

**Effect**

The figure appears absolute and indisputable, even though the source and composition are disputed.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 07:27

Figure: "they kill 1,200 people [...] abduct over 250 hostages, of whom 130 are still in the Gaza Strip"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: ✓ stated
- (b) Share: not relevant
- (c) Trend: ✓ implicit (250 → 130 = 120 released/deceased)

**Missing context**

How many of the 120 were released vs. deceased? This distinction is missing.

**Effect**

Slight imprecision, but no serious error.

*Summary: The Gaza casualty figure is presented without source reference and without contextualisation; this is a methodological shortcoming, but not active manipulation.*



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

<b>Association 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	17:02
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"And with him a confidant of the left-populist Prime Minister Robert Fizzo."</i>
Technique: Pellegrini is discredited by association with Fico ("left-populist") and his policies (anti-corruption, media control) before his own policies are presented.	
<b>Effect</b>	The democratically elected president is burdened with negative attributes through association before any statement of his own.

<b>Association 2:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	17:08
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"Slovakia Russia-friendly government leaders"</i>
Technique: "Russia-friendly" as a label without differentiation — Pellegrini's position is neutrality/peace, not active support for Russia.	
<b>Effect</b>	Association with Russia in times of war is a strong negative connotation that is stated without evidence.

<b>Association 3:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	18:38–18:48
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"such as weakening the anti-corruption prosecutor's office so that corrupt politicians can more easily escape punishment. Or dismantling the public broadcaster so that the media can more easily be brought under state control."</i>
Technique: Pellegrini is discredited by association with corruption and media censorship — these measures concern the Fico government, not Pellegrini personally.	
<b>Effect</b>	Collective guilt through political proximity, without evidence of Pellegrini's personal responsibility.

Source check Pellegrini:

- Does the broadcast work with verifiable primary sources? NO — no concrete evidence for Pellegrini's personal role in corruption/media censorship
- Are the core statements falsifiable? PARTIALLY — "Russia-friendly" is an interpretation, not a fact

Result category: B — Borderline case (partly substantiated by Fico government policy, partly speculative regarding Pellegrini's personal responsibility)

*Summary: Pellegrini is discredited by triple association (Fico, Russia, corruption/media censorship) without his own position being presented in a differentiated manner; this is a clear guilt-by-association technique.*



## 7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:59 (start of broadcast, after headlines)

Content: "Today, exactly half a year ago, an act of unheard-of barbarism horrified Israel and the world."

#### Timing effect

The emotional framing of the Hamas attack as "unheard-of barbarism" appears at the beginning of the broadcast and sets the emotional tone for all subsequent Gaza reports. This shapes the reception of the humanitarian criticism of Israel that follows.

### Finding 2:

Position: 18:52 (end of the Slovakia block)

Content: "The will of the people is sacred, but from today democracy in Slovakia is in great danger."

#### Timing effect

This normative concluding statement appears at the end of the Slovakia block and remains as the last impression — without a countervoice or qualification.

### Finding 3:

Position: 10:33 (transition Gaza → Switzerland)

Content: "And now to Switzerland."

#### Timing effect

The abrupt transition from the emotional hostage reportage (Sharon Sharabi, weeping people) to the factual Swiss election coverage creates a contrast that amplifies the emotional charge of the Gaza block.

*Summary: The emotional framing at the start of the broadcast and the normative concluding statement in the Slovakia block are the strongest timing findings; both set interpretive frameworks without a countervoice.*



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 18:38–18:52

Triggering event: Democratic election of Pellegrini as Slovak president with 53% of the votes.

Reaction: "so that corrupt politicians can more easily escape punishment [...] so that the media can more easily be brought under state control [...] from today democracy in Slovakia is in great danger."

### Comparison

Analogous event — election of governments with similar tendencies in other countries (e.g. Hungary, Poland previously, Israel itself with Netanyahu's judicial reform) — no comparable language of outrage in this broadcast.

Asymmetry: The outrage over the Slovak election is markedly stronger than any outrage over Israeli government policy (judicial reform, settlement policy), which is not commented on in the broadcast with comparable normative language.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 01:09

Triggering event: Hamas attack of 7 October 2023.

Reaction: "The terrorist bloodlust of 7 October 2023"

### Comparison

Israeli military actions in Gaza (30,000+ dead) — no comparably emotional language ("bloodlust", "barbarism") for Israeli actions.

Asymmetry: Demonstrably present — Hamas violence is described with maximum outrage language, Israeli military violence with factual distance ("The civilian population pays the price").

Degree of outrage: 3/5

Selectivity: 2/5

*Summary: The language of outrage is asymmetrically distributed — Hamas violence and the Slovak election receive strong normative commentary, while Israeli military violence and other comparable political developments are treated more factually.*



## 9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 02:56–03:07

Missing perspective/fact: Palestinian casualty figures are mentioned, but without a Palestinian voice — neither a civilian nor political representation (Palestinian Authority).

Relevance: In a report about 30,000 dead and 2 million displaced, the absence of any Palestinian voice is a serious completeness deficiency.

Impact: The overall picture shows Israel as the acting party and the Palestinians as a passive mass of victims — without their own voice, perspective or political agency.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 18:32–18:52

Missing perspective/fact: The assessment "democracy in great danger" is stated without evidence, without a countervoice and without contextualisation by democracy researchers.

Relevance: Such a far-reaching normative statement about a democratically elected result requires justification.

Impact: Viewers receive a normative judgement presented as fact.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 13:16–13:32

Missing perspective/fact: Criticism of Atiqi (language skills, missing statements) is mentioned but immediately relativised ("His migration background is also unlikely to have helped much in the end").

Relevance: The criticism of Atiqi is treated as a marginal note in the election campaign, not as a substantive discussion.

Impact: Legitimate political criticism of a candidate is implicitly framed as potentially discriminatory through the context of migration background.

*Summary: The greatest completeness deficiencies lie in the Gaza block (no Palestinian voices) and in the Slovakia block (normative statement without evidence); both structurally distort the overall picture.*

7 October 2023 marks the largest terrorist attack on Israel since the founding of the state; the Israeli military response in Gaza has triggered a global humanitarian and political debate. The question of proportionality, war aims and hostages is highly contested. In Switzerland, cantonal elections are taking place against the backdrop of the migration debate and party proportionality. The Slovak election reflects the European divide between pro-Western and Russia-friendly orientation.

### Share of perspectives covered

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

**[A] Israeli government perspective:** Security objectives, right to self-defence, Hamas responsibility



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

- [B] **Palestinian civilian population:** Suffering, displacement, humanitarian situation in Gaza
- [C]  **Hamas perspective / political goals of Hamas** (even if reprehensible, relevant for completeness)
- [D] **International legal perspective:** Laws of war, ICJ proceedings, proportionality
- [E] **Hostage relatives in Israel:** Personal suffering, demands on government
- [F] **Critical Israeli voices:** Demonstrators, opposition, war cabinet dissent
- [G] **Humanitarian organisations:** UNRWA, ICRC, World Central Kitchen
- [H] **Geopolitical embedding:** Iran, Hezbollah, US pressure, Arab mediators
- [I] **Slovakia:** Pro-Western perspective of the defeated candidate Korczok
- [J] **Swiss elections:** SVP perspective on Thurgau results, FDP reaction to Basel defeat

**[A] COVERED**

Timestamp: 02:21 — Quote: "Giving in to Hamas's demands would allow it to repeat the acts of 7 October." — Assessment: Netanyahu quote present, but without critical contextualisation or counter-question.

**[B] COVERED**

Timestamp: 02:56 — Quote: "It suffers from the many deaths, from the destruction of homes, infrastructure, also from hunger." — Assessment: Humanitarian situation of the civilian population is named, but without a Palestinian voice.

**[C] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Hamas perspective or political goals are not presented; Hamas appears exclusively as a terrorist actor without a political dimension.

**[D] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 03:03 — Quote: "For this price Israel is being increasingly harshly criticised and isolated internationally." — Assessment: International criticism mentioned, but international law perspective not explicitly elaborated.

**[E] COVERED**

Timestamp: 08:04–10:26 — Quote: "We wake up every morning with the hope that we can bring the hostages back home." — Assessment: Extensive, emotional portrayal of the hostage relatives.

**[F] COVERED**

Timestamp: 03:12 — Quote: "At this moment there are demonstrations in Jerusalem." — Assessment: Demonstrations mentioned, but little depth of content.

**[G] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 04:42 — Quote: "especially also after this killing of his staff members of the US-Angio World Central Kitchen" — Assessment: WCK incident mentioned, but UNRWA/ICRC perspective missing.

**[H] COVERED**

Timestamp: 05:44 — Quote: "with the Shia militia Hezbollah in Lebanon, but also the tensions with Iran" — Assessment: Geopolitical embedding present, but brief.

**[I] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 17:38 — Quote: "Ivan Korczok [...] advocated during the election campaign for an expansion of weapons deliveries to the neighbouring country Ukraine." — Assessment: Korczok's position mentioned, but no own voice, no quote.

**[J] OMITTED**

**Präsident:** Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: SVP reaction to Thurgau results and FDP reaction to Basel defeat are completely absent.

### **Completeness score: 6/10**

---

Justification: The broadcast covers the most important perspectives in the Gaza conflict superficially, but omits Palestinian voices and the international law perspective. In the Swiss elections, reactions from the defeated parties (FDP Basel, SVP comment Thurgau) are missing. The Slovakia coverage gives the defeated candidate no voice of his own.



## Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:59–01:09
Quote	<i>"Today, exactly half a year ago, an act of unheard-of barbarism horrified Israel and the world. [...] The terrorist bloodlust of 7 October 2023"</i>
Manipulation	The entire Gaza conflict is embedded in the frame "reaction to barbarism". This frame pre-legitimises Israeli action and makes a neutral assessment of proportionality more difficult.
Why problematic	Viewers who internalise this frame will classify the subsequent humanitarian criticism of Israel as a reaction to "barbarism" — which structurally weakens the criticism.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	17:02–18:52
Quote	<i>"populist social democrat Peter Pellegrini [...] Russia-friendly government leaders [...] democracy in Slovakia in great danger"</i>
Manipulation	The Slovak election is embedded in the frame "threat to democracy through proximity to Russia". The democratic act of voting itself is not framed as an expression of the will of the people, but as a threat.
Why problematic	A democratic election result is delegitimised through the framing, without the arguments of the voters being presented.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	11:14–12:18
Quote	<i>"The Kurd Atiqi will be the first cantonal councillor in Switzerland who grew up in Turkey [...] my election is a success for this diversity"</i>
Manipulation	Atiqi's election is embedded primarily in the frame "diversity success" and "historic step", not in the frame "political competition between SP and FDP".
Why problematic	The political-substantive dimension (SP vs. FDP, programme positions) recedes behind identity politics; this is a framing that favours SP positions.

*Summary: The three dominant frames ( Hamas barbarism, Slovak democracy threat, Atiqi diversity success) set normative interpretive frameworks that make neutral classification of events more difficult.*



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



## 11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp

01:09

Quote

*"The terrorist bloodlust of 7 October 2023"*

Manipulation

"Bloodlust" is a strongly emotionalising term with animalistic connotations; it goes beyond factual reporting.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "The Hamas terrorist attack of 7 October 2023" — factually correct without emotional exaggeration.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp

17:02

Quote

*"populist social democrat Peter Pellegrini"*

Manipulation

"Populist" is a negatively connoted term used without definition or evidence. Pellegrini is a social democrat — "populist" is a value judgement, not a description.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "Social democrat Peter Pellegrini, a confidant of Prime Minister Fico" — without normative pre-judgement.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp

18:42–18:48

Quote

*"so that corrupt politicians can more easily escape punishment [...] so that the media can more easily be brought under state control"*

Manipulation

The formulation "so that [...] can more easily escape punishment" is an attribution of intent without evidence — it imputes to Pellegrini/Fico a deliberate intention to promote corruption.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "which critics regard as a weakening of the anti-corruption authorities" — with source reference and without direct attribution of intent.

*Summary: The choice of words in the Gaza block and in the Slovakia block is consistently normatively charged; "bloodlust", "populist" and direct attributions of intent exceed the boundary of factual reporting.*



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:21

Triggering event: Presenter asks question about the troop withdrawal.

Quote (presenter) *"So there can be no talk of an end to the ground offensive."*

Comparison This statement is an assertion, not a question — Bischof immediately corrects it ("I would not put it that way in such absolute terms"). No comparable prior assertion on other topics.

Asymmetry: Demonstrably present — the presenter presupposes an interpretation that the correspondent has to qualify. This is an unusual reversal of roles.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 05:10

Triggering event: Question about Israel's international standing.

Quote (presenter) *"Given this six-month anniversary, how does Israel stand in the world six months after 7 October?"*

Comparison The question is open and factual — no finding.

Asymmetry: Not demonstrable.

*Summary: Moderation behaviour is predominantly factual; the only finding is the prior assertion at 04:21 that the correspondent had to correct — a minor finding.*



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1:

To Jonas  
Bischof (SRF  
correspondent),  
04

21: "So there can be no talk of an end to the ground offensive." — [suggestive, not neutral]

To Sharon  
Sharabi  
(hostage  
relative), 08

17 (implicit through reportage structure): No critical questions about Israeli government policy or conduct of war — [soft/none]

Comparison

Bischof receives a suggestive prior assertion, Sharabi receives exclusively empathetic framing. Pellegrini receives no voice of his own, nor does Korczok — both are characterised through reportage commentary.

#### Asymmetry 2:

To Mustafa  
Atiqi (SP), 11

33: "Is it a satisfaction?" — [soft, inviting]

To Luca  
Urgeese (FDP)

No question, no voice — [not present]

Comparison

The SP candidate receives an inviting question, the FDP candidate receives no voice despite 44.5% of the votes.

*Summary: The question asymmetry is moderate; the strongest asymmetry lies in the complete absence of any question/voice for the defeated FDP candidate in Basel.*



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

#### Finding 1:

##### Timestamp

15:38–15:47

Construct: "the governing parties, i.e. SVP, FDP, Centre and also the SP, traditionally support each other in cantonal council elections"

##### Analysis

This is a correct portrayal of the Thurgau consensus system — not false balance, but factual contextualisation. The Greens candidate Reinhardt is correctly positioned as an outsider.

*Summary: No relevant false balance identified; the broadcast avoids artificial balance, but tends towards omission rather than false balance.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The Hamas attack as the sole starting point of the Gaza conflict is taken for granted; the prehistory (occupation, blockade, earlier conflicts) does not make it onto the agenda.

#### Timestamp

00:59 — Evidence: "Today, exactly half a year ago, an act of unheard-of barbarism horrified Israel and the world."

Alternative agenda: The conflict could have been embedded in the context of decades of occupation and the Gaza blockade.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Pellegrini's election is taken as a threat to democracy — this is stated as fact, not as interpretation.

#### Timestamp

18:52 — Evidence: "from today democracy in Slovakia is in great danger"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether a democratically elected president per se constitutes a threat to democracy could have been treated as an open question.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Atiqi's migration background is taken as the central feature of his election — political content barely makes it onto the agenda.

#### Timestamp

11:14 — Evidence: "The Kurd Atiqi will be the first cantonal councillor in Switzerland who grew up in Turkey."

Alternative agenda: Atiqi's programme as director of education, his political positions and the substantive confrontation with the FDP candidate should have made it onto the agenda.

*Summary: The agenda-setting findings show a consistent tendency: identity politics and normative interpretive frameworks are taken for granted, while political-substantive dimensions and historical contexts are blanked out.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 4.7 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 4.2 / 10

### Dominant techniques

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 6):** The complete absence of Palestinian voices in the Gaza block, combined with an extensive Israeli civilian voice (Sharon Sharabi), creates a structurally asymmetric picture. The humanitarian catastrophe is presented as an abstract number, while Israeli suffering is conveyed concretely and emotionally.
- 2. Framing (Score 6):** Three normative interpretive frameworks are set without a countervoice: Hamas attack as "barbarism" (pre-legitimises Israeli reaction), Slovak election as "threat to democracy" (delegitimises democratic result), Atiqi election as "diversity success" (displaces the political-substantive dimension). All three frames favour a particular political reading.
- 3. Choice of words and terms (Score 6):** "Terrorist bloodlust", "populist social democrat" and direct attributions of intent ("so that corrupt politicians can more easily escape punishment") exceed the boundary of factual reporting and set normative judgements as facts.

### Core messages of the broadcast

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "Israel is waging a justified but increasingly problematic war in response to an unprecedented act of terrorism."

**Technique:** Framing + Timing — Evidence: 00:59, 02:56, 07:08

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "Mustafa Atiqi's election is a historic success for diversity and migration in Switzerland."

**Technique:** Agenda-Setting + Framing — Evidence: 11:14, 12:01, 12:18

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "Russia-friendly and populist forces are endangering democracy in Europe."

**Technique:** Guilt by Association + Choice of words — Evidence: 17:02, 17:08, 18:52

Justification: With an overall score of 4.5/10, the broadcast sits on the boundary between "slight tendency" and "clear one-sidedness". The strongest findings — complete absence of Palestinian voices, normative concluding statement on Slovakia without evidence, emotionalising choice of words — are not individual lapses, but show a consistent pattern. Pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA, the accurate presentation of facts and diversity of opinion on controversial topics is violated: the Gaza conflict is one of the most contested topics of the present day, and the broadcast presents exclusively Israeli voices. The Slovakia coverage sets normative judgements as facts without acknowledging the democratic legitimacy of the election result.

### CONCLUSION

The SRF Tagesschau of 7 April 2024 shows a consistent, if not extreme, one-sidedness in three subject areas: In the Gaza block, Palestinian voices are completely absent, while Israeli suffering is conveyed emotionally and concretely — this violates Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (diversity of opinion on controversial topics). In the Slovakia block, a democratic election result is delegitimised through normative language ("democracy in great danger") without evidence, which violates the accurate presentation of facts pursuant to Art. 4 para. 1 RTVA. In the Swiss election block, the SP candidate Atiqi receives significantly more airtime and emotional framing than the defeated FDP, creating a slight party-political asymmetry. The broadcast is technically solid and contains no false facts, but the combination of selective omission, normative framing and emotionalising choice of words creates an overall picture that does not fully meet the requirements of balance and accuracy pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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

**4.7/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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

**4.2/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**4.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*Averaged from hard facts and soft facts*



## KEY — Meaning of scores

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

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

### Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

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

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

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is clearly disadvantaged in portrayal, airtime or framing.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Discernible but weak disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No discernible preference or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favoured</b>	Discernible but weak preference.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favoured</b>	Party is clearly favoured in portrayal, airtime or framing.



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Art. 4 RTVA)

### Assessment pursuant to Art. 4 RTVA

#### Violation 1:

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

Facts: In the Gaza block, Israeli voices (Netanyahu, Galland, Sharabi, Israeli media) receive airtime; Palestinian voices receive 0 seconds. The Gaza conflict is one of the most contested topics in international politics.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:34–10:26 — entire Gaza block without a single Palestinian voice; 07:08 "Probably over 30,000 dead" without a Palestinian source or voice.

Assessment: The complete absence of Palestinian perspectives on a topic that by definition has two conflicting parties violates the requirement of diversity of opinion. This is not an isolated case, but structural: not a single Palestinian actor is given a voice in the entire Gaza coverage.

#### Violation 2:

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

Facts: The statement "from today democracy in Slovakia is in great danger" (18:52) is presented as a statement of fact, but is a normative judgement without evidence. Pellegrini was democratically elected with 53%; the claim of a threat to democracy requires justification.

Evidence: Timestamp 18:52 — Quote: "The will of the people is sacred, but from today democracy in Slovakia is in great danger."

Assessment: The formulation "from today democracy [...] is in great danger" is a statement of fact (not an expression of opinion that would be identified as such) without source reference, without evidence and without a countervoice — this violates the requirement of accurate presentation of facts.

#### Violation 3:

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

Facts: In the Basel election block, the SP candidate Atiqi receives an extensive reportage with original sound (), while the FDP candidate Urgeese, who received 44.5% of the votes, receives no voice of his own.

Evidence: Timestamp 11:03–13:32 — Atiqi with multiple quotes; Urgeese only as a figure ("44.5 percent").

Assessment: In an election with two main candidates, the complete absence of the defeated candidate is a violation of the balanced selection of interlocutors, particularly since the defeated candidate received almost half of the votes.

### Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast of 7 April 2024 exhibits three demonstrable areas of tension with Art. 4 RTVA: the complete absence of Palestinian voices in the Gaza block (diversity of opinion), the unsubstantiated factual claim about the Slovak threat to democracy (accuracy) and the one-sided selection of interlocutors in the Basel election block (balance). None of these findings alone constitutes a clear violation that would provide a high probability of success for a complaint to OFCOM; in their combination and consistency, however, they show a pattern that does not fully meet the requirements of Art. 4 RTVA. A complaint to the Independent Complaints Authority (ICA) would be most promising in the Gaza block, since the complete absence of one party to a conflict on a contested topic touches on the ICA's established practice on diversity of opinion.



## CHAPTER 6 — Source deep-check

Israeli media (general, cited at 01:58)

- 1. FUNDING:** Partly state-owned (public Israeli television KAN), partly private (Channel 12, Channel 13). State co-funded media in a country at war have a structural conflict of interest.
- 2. MANDATE:** Israeli media have no mandate for neutral assessment of the Gaza war — they report from an Israeli perspective for an Israeli audience.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Israeli media have an institutional interest in portrayals that make Israeli war aims appear legitimate; in times of war this is reinforced by the censorship regulations of the Israeli military censor.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — State co-funded, party to the conflict  
D2 Personal risk: +1 — Journalists on the ground with risk  
D3 Professional competence: +1 — Local expertise available  
D4 Consistency: 0 — No verification possible  
D5 Emotion vs. data: -1 — Tends to be emotional in times of war  
D6 Source level: +1 — Primary observer

**TOTAL: 0 → SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW**

- 5. COUNTERVOICE:** Al Jazeera, Arab media, independent international sources are not cited — structural one-sidedness.

**IMPORTANT:** The broadcast cites Israeli media as evidence for the assessment of the troop withdrawal ("Israeli media [...] interpret the withdrawal predominantly as the end of the major ground offensive") without addressing this source problem. This is methodologically insufficient for a public broadcaster with an accuracy mandate.

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

### Legal and methodological classification

<b>No statement of fact</b>	The results presented do not constitute statements 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.
<b>No legal ruling</b>	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 requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular the ICA).
<b>No proof of causality</b>	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.
<b>No judgement of intent</b>	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant imbalance has been identified — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.



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

**Heuristic  
comparison  
instrument**

The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not for the precise metric measurement of individual items. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



## APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

### Legal basis Switzerland — SRG SSR

---

#### Act

---

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 present 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 presentation 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 violation of Art. 4 RTVA
- OFCOM (Federal Office of Communications): Regulatory and supervisory authority
- SRG ombudsman offices: 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)
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](http://www.svfab.ch) | [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch) | *Methods report March 2026* | Converter 3.4 (2026-05-20)



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

## 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](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto: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.

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 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 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 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. Proceedings, 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 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.