



## SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2024-11-14 DOK - Alles für die Fuchse - Ein Wildtier, geliebt und gejagt

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2024-11-14 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 16:20

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

### OVERALL SCORE

**5.1/10**

*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 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](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. The Federal Council consists of 7 members who are distributed proportionally among the largest parties according to the "magic formula": SVP (2 seats), SP (2 seats), FDP (2 seats), The Centre (1 seat). There is no classic government/opposition divide — all major parties are represented in the executive.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position (relevant)
SVP	8.0	62	Government (2 FC)	Personal responsibility, against state regulation, hunting rights
SP	2.5	41	Government (2 FC)	Animal protection, state direction, environmental protection
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Market solutions, lean state
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatism, incentives rather than prohibitions
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Animal protection, ecology, state intervention
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Openness to technology, ecology with market
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Centre, animal protection

The relevant line of tension for this broadcast lies between the hunting lobby/agriculture (tending towards SVP/FDP/Centre) and the animal protection/environmental movement (tending towards SP/Greens/GLP). The revised hunting law (referendum 2020, rejected) and wolf policy are active political conflict areas. The question of state regulation vs. hunters' personal responsibility is politically charged. Animal protection organisations are structurally close to the left-wing spectrum.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is the public broadcaster of Switzerland, financed through reception fees (Serafe). It is subject to Art. 4 RTVA, which requires accurate representation, diversity of opinion and balanced selection of interlocutors. SRF Doc is the documentary format of SRF and is subject to the same accuracy obligations as the news formats.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Preliminary note: This broadcast is a nature documentary, not a political format. Parties are not mentioned by name. The assessment refers to whether positions that structurally correspond to party programmes (hunting law, animal protection, state regulation, personal responsibility) are portrayed correctly or in a distorted manner.

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	-2	43:04 "Most foxes therefore die without any benefit. Because fox hunting is not suitable for regulation." — SVP programme position: personal responsibility of hunters, against state over-regulation, hunting rights as a cultural asset — The broadcast portrays hunting practice as useless and ethically questionable without naming the SVP position on personal responsibility and hunting rights as a legitimate counter-position. Distorted by omission.
SP	+1	08:12 "Switzerland takes a very extreme line. In Germany, wildlife rescue stations are absolutely legitimate." — SP programme position: state direction, animal protection, welfare state — The broadcast implicitly conveys SP-aligned positions (more state regulation in favour of animal protection, criticism of existing prohibitions as too restrictive towards animal protectionists). Not explicit, but structurally favouring. Implied.
FDP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast. Market-based solutions (e.g. fur market) are shown, but not framed as an FDP position. Not addressed.
Centre	0	Not mentioned in broadcast. Pragmatic positions on hunting regulation are not attributed to any party. Not addressed.
Greens	+1	50:07 "Given everything that is known today about the fox, a rethink is needed. The fox plays a central role in the ecosystem. It is not dangerous. And it regulates itself best." — Greens programme position: ecology, animal protection, state intervention in favour of nature — The closing statement of the broadcast structurally aligns with Greens positions. Implied, not explicit.
GLP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast. Not addressed.
EVP	0	Not mentioned in broadcast. Not addressed.

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: SP/Greens (score +1, structurally favoured)
- Strongest distortion: SVP (score -2, hunting position framed as useless without counter-representation)
- Average deviation from 0: 0.6
- Conclusion: The broadcast is not an explicitly political format, but implicitly conveys an agenda that aligns with left/green party positions (animal protection, criticism of hunting, more state regulation in favour of wildlife rescue). Hunting practice is framed as useless and ethically questionable (43:04, 46:11), without the counter-position — hunting as a cultural right, personal responsibility of hunters, pest control — being given equal voice. This structurally disadvantages SVP/FDP-aligned positions.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast data

- Title: SRF Doc — "The Fox" (working title inferred from content)
- Date: 14.11.2024
- Presenter/Author: Not named; first-person narrator/filmmaker (male voice); Mario Toys mentioned as cameraman/hunter (09:19)
- Persons interviewed:

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
"Anna" (anonymous)	Animal protectionist, young fox rearer	Animal protection movement	Left/Green-aligned
Rees Wirt (hunter, Canton Bern)	Hobby hunter, pass hunting	Hunting lobby	Centre-right-aligned
Mario Toys	Filmmaker, cameraman, hunter	Hunting lobby	Centre-right-aligned
Employee of the Fisheries and Hunting Administration Canton Zurich	Authority representative	State	Neutral/authority
Codine Eichholzer	Researcher, national park	Science/national park	Neutral
Diea Anderwald	Scientific director of red fox project, national park	Science	Neutral/tending anti-hunting
Claudia Kistler	Wildlife researcher, doctorate on foxes, Urban Wildlife project	Science/animal protection	Neutral/tending anti-hunting
Member of the group Wolfschweiz	Wolf protection organisation	NGO, animal protection/wolf protection	Left/Green-aligned
Office for Hunting and Fishing Valais	Authority (written only)	State	Neutral/authority

### Main topic

The broadcast examines Switzerland's handling of the red fox — from the illegal rearing of orphaned young foxes through hunting practice to scientific research — and concludes that fox hunting is useless and a rethink is necessary.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

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

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

**Expert 1:** Diea Anderwald — Scientific director of red fox project, national park

Timestamp: 43:14

Statement: "When foxes are hunted, they automatically produce more young. So it means that, for example, females start reproducing earlier, that they have larger litters, that more vixens, i.e. female animals, then reproduce."

Classification: Researcher in the national park, a hunting-free area. Her research takes place in a context that structurally favours anti-hunting results (national park = reference area without hunting). No conflicts of interest in the classical sense, but institutional proximity to anti-hunting positions.

Missing counter-voice: Wildlife researcher with studies on the effectiveness of fox control for bird protection (e.g. studies from the UK, Scandinavia).

Source in-depth check Anderwald:

**(a) FUNDING:** Swiss National Park, publicly funded. No direct conflict of interest, but institutional context (national park = protected area without hunting) favours an anti-hunting research perspective.

**(b) MANDATE:** Red fox project in the national park — mandate is basic research, compatible with neutral assessment, but spatially limited to a hunting-free area.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No direct financial conflict, but institutional proximity to anti-hunting context

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Academic career, moderate risk tolerance

D3 Subject expertise: +2 — Direct subject expertise in red fox population dynamics

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — 2023 publication consistent with statements

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

D6 Source level: +2 — Primary researcher

**TOTAL: +9 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**

**(c) SUBJECT EXPERTISE:** Framed as a neutral scientist. Her research is methodologically sound, but the broadcast presents her findings without counter-studies — this is a framing problem of the broadcast, not of the researcher.

**Expert 2:** Claudia Kistler — Wildlife researcher, Urban Wildlife project Zurich

Timestamp: 32:23

Statement: "Here in the city centre, the fox tapeworm, which many people are concerned about, is not a major problem. Because foxes here do not hunt voles."

Classification: Doctorate on foxes, Urban Wildlife project. Structurally close to animal protection/wildlife protection.

Missing counter-voice: Veterinary authority on fox tapeworm risks outside urban areas.

Source in-depth check Kistler:



**(a) FUNDING:** Urban Wildlife project — publicly/university funded. No direct conflict of interest.

**(b) MANDATE:** Urban fox research — spatially limited to urban area; statements about the city are competent, generalisations to rural areas would be problematic.

D1 Conflict of interest: +1 — No direct conflict, but research field structurally close to animal protection

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Moderate academic risk tolerance

D3 Subject expertise: +2 — Direct subject expertise in urban fox

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent with research field

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

D6 Source level: +2 — Primary researcher

**TOTAL: +9 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**

**(c) SUBJECT EXPERTISE:** Her statements about the city are implicitly transferred to the overall context without emphasising the spatial limitation of her research.

**Expert 3: "Anna" (anonymous) — Animal protectionist**

Timestamp: 07:18

Statement: "The people who find these little foxes have already formed an emotional bond very quickly. Because it is a baby that is seeking help."

Classification: Anonymous animal protectionist, acting illegally (without authorisation). Clear conflict of interest: she is defending her own illegal practice. Framed as a sympathetic protagonist, not as an interest representative.

Missing counter-voice: Wildlife biologist who explains why hand-rearing can be problematic for wild animals.

Source in-depth check Anna:

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

**(b) MANDATE:** No official mandate — acts outside the law.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Defends own illegal practice

D2 Personal risk: +2 — Acts despite threat of a fine of CHF 20,000 — increased credibility regarding conviction

D3 Subject expertise: 0 — Experience through practice, no discernible academic background

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent in her conviction

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Appealing, emotional

D6 Source level: -2 — Tertiary (personal experience)

**TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

**(c) SUBJECT EXPERTISE:** Framed as a sympathetic protagonist, not as an interest representative with a conflict of interest. This is a framing problem.

**Expert 4: Member of the group Wolfschweiz (NGO)**

Timestamp: 45:12

Statement: "From a member of the group Wolfschweiz I receive the tip that dead chickens or goats are used as bait. The fact that this has been prohibited for three years does not seem to have reached everyone yet."

Classification: Wolf protection NGO, clear conflict of interest when assessing hunting practices. Used as a tipster for illegal hunting practices without the conflict of interest being named.

Missing counter-voice: Hunting association on the question of whether the practice is actually widespread.

Source in-depth check Wolfschweiz:

**(a) FUNDING:** NGO, membership funding, donation funding. Structural conflict of interest when assessing hunting practices.

**(b) MANDATE:** Wolf protection — clearly partisan on hunting issues.

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — Clear structural conflict of interest (wolf protection vs. hunting)

D2 Personal risk: 0 — No discernible personal risk

D3 Subject expertise: 0 — Advocacy organisation, no scientific subject expertise

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent with NGO mandate



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

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — Appealing

D6 Source level: -2 — Tertiary (tip without primary source)

**TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW (borderline)**

**(c) SUBJECT EXPERTISE:** Used as a tipster without conflict of interest labelling. This is a source selection problem.

*Missing expert groups:*

- Swiss Hunting Association (institutional hunting perspective)
- Veterinary authority (disease prevention)
- Wildlife researcher with pro-hunting findings (bird protection)

**Source indicator for participants:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Diea Anderwald — Scientific director of red fox project, national park	+1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+2	+9	GREEN
Claudia Kistler — Wildlife researcher, Urban Wildlife project Zurich	+1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+2	+9	GREEN
"Anna" (anonymous) — Animal protectionist	-2	+2	0	+1	-1	-2	-2	YELLOW
Member of the group Wolfschweiz (NGO)	-2	0	0	+1	-1	-2	-4	YELLOW

*Summary:*

Expert	Source indicator	Main problem
Anderwald	GREEN	No counter-studies cited
Kistler	GREEN	Spatial limitation not emphasised
Anna (anonymous)	YELLOW	Conflict of interest not named
Wolfschweiz	YELLOW	NGO conflict of interest not named

The expert selection is structurally anti-hunting: 3 of 4 main experts represent anti-hunting or animal protection-aligned positions. Pro-hunting science is entirely absent.



## 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: Group Wolfschweiz

#### Timestamp

45:12 — Statement: "From a member of the group Wolfschweiz I receive the tip that dead chickens or goats are used as bait."

- (a) **Funding:** NGO, membership and donation funding, wolf protection advocacy
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Wolf protection NGO has a direct institutional interest in portraying hunting practices as illegal/problematic
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Swiss Hunting Association on the question of the prevalence of this practice; authority on the question of enforcement

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 45:12

Claim: "The fact that this has been prohibited for three years does not seem to have reached everyone yet."

Word marker: "seems" — implies prevalence without evidence

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

The claim that the prohibited practice has "not reached everyone" is supported by a single tip from a wolf protection NGO. No authority confirmation, no statistics, no second source.

### Source 2: Office for Hunting and Fishing Valais (written)

#### Timestamp

44:21 — Statement: "We requested an interview from the Office for Hunting and Fishing Valais in vain. However, they answered our questions in writing."

- (a) **Funding:** State
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Authority defends its own regulatory practice — but here the authority is the counter-voice that does not get to speak (written only, without follow-up questions)
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** An oral interview would have allowed follow-up questions; the written response is cited without critical contextualisation, but also without elaboration

### Source 3: National park data (ptarmigan study)

#### Timestamp

26:56 — Statement: "The annual counts in the national park, where neither the fox nor ptarmigan nor any other animal is hunted, show no decline in this bird species."

- (a) **Funding:** Swiss National Park, public
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** National park data from a hunting-free area — cannot be directly transferred to hunted areas; methodological limitation is not named
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Studies from hunted areas that demonstrate fox control as effective for bird protection (exist in the literature)

Summary: The source selection is structurally anti-hunting. The only pro-hunting source (Valais office) is only heard in writing. An NGO with a clear conflict of interest (Wolfschweiz) is used as a tipster for illegal practices without conflict of interest labelling. National park data is generalised without methodological limitation.



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



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

Estimated speaking time:

- Animal protection perspective (Anna, animal protectionists): (16%)
- Anti-hunting science (Anderwald, Kistler): (14%)
- Hunters (Rees Wirt, Mario Toys): (10%)
- Authorities (Zurich, Valais written): (6%)
- National park research (Eichholzer, Anderwald): (12%)
- Narrator/commentary: (24%)
- Nature footage/silence: (18%)

#### Finding:

##### Timestamp

43:04 — Quote: "Most foxes therefore die without any benefit. Because fox hunting is not suitable for regulation."

The narrator commentary (24% of broadcast time) is consistently framed as anti-hunting. Pro-hunting positions receive approximately 10% of speaking time (hunters), anti-hunting positions (animal protection + science + commentary) approximately 54%.

Summary: Speaking time is structurally unbalanced: anti-hunting positions (animal protection, science, narrator commentary) together receive more than five times as much time as pro-hunting positions. Farmers and hunting associations are entirely absent.



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

Studies on the effectiveness of fox control for bird protection (ptarmigan, skylark, lapwing) from hunted areas are entirely absent.

Relevant at: 26:42 — "Fox hunting is regarded in some places as a protective measure for rare bird species"

###### Effect

The broadcast suggests there is no scientific basis for fox control for bird protection. In fact, an extensive literature exists (including from the UK, Scandinavia) that demonstrates fox control as effective for ground-nesting birds. The omission of this literature creates a false picture of the state of research.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

Farmers with concrete fox damage do not get to speak.

Relevant at: 44:25 — "Fox hunting serves the purpose of regulation and the protection of wild and domestic animals. These include hares and chickens."

###### Effect

The protective function of hunting for livestock keepers is only hinted at through a written authority response, not substantiated by those affected. The omission of this perspective makes hunting as a protective measure abstract and thus easier to delegitimise.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

The practice of illegal young fox rearing is portrayed exclusively positively; risks (imprinting, disease transmission, rewilding problems) are not addressed.

Relevant at: 08:35 — "We had them in the living room, in the bathroom, so completely idiotic."

###### Effect

The animal protectionist herself names the problem of living room keeping, but the broadcast draws no critical conclusion from this. Wildlife biological objections to hand-rearing are absent.

Summary: The broadcast systematically omits pro-hunting science, affected farmers and critical objections to animal protection practice. This creates a structurally one-sided picture.

#### Missing voices

- Farmer with fox damage: Would have contributed concrete experiences with fox attacks on poultry/livestock and substantiated the protective function of hunting from the perspective of those affected.
- Swiss Hunting Association (official): Would have presented the institutional position on fox hunting as wildlife management and cultural heritage.
- Veterinary authority (cantonal): Would have contextualised disease prevention (mange, fox tapeworm outside cities) from a specialist perspective.
- Wildlife researcher with pro-hunting findings: Would have contributed studies on the protection of ground-nesting birds through fox control (existing literature).
- Legal scholar: Would have neutrally contextualised the proportionality of the prohibition on young fox rearing and the legal comparison between Switzerland and Germany.



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

- Affected population (urban fox conflicts): Would have contributed the perspective of people with negative fox experiences (poultry keepers, gardeners).
- Representative of Canton Valais (oral): Would have been able to defend the premium practice and regulatory objectives; only a written response was used.



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

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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	42:46
Figure: "Around 20,000 foxes are shot annually in Switzerland and hardly any hunter still uses the fur." Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — (b) Proportion missing — (c) Trend missing	
Missing context	How large is the total population? 20,000 out of how many? Has the number risen or fallen? For comparison: estimates suggest 100,000–150,000 foxes in Switzerland — i.e. approximately 13–20% of the population. This proportion would relativise or support the statement about the "uselessness" of regulation — but it is absent.
Effect	The absolute figure of 20,000 appears large and suggests mass killing without benefit. The proportion of the total population and the trend are absent.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	45:57
Figure: "With over 1,000 registered fox kills, the premiums for their paws alone cause costs for the canton of around CHF 15,000." Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — (b) Proportion of cantonal budget missing — (c) Trend missing	
Missing context	CHF 15,000 in relation to the Valais cantonal budget (approximately CHF 1.5 billion) is 0.001%. The figure is used as an argument for disproportionality without naming the proportion.
Effect	CHF 15,000 sounds like a relevant sum; in relation to the cantonal budget it is negligible. The missing contextualisation creates a false impression of resource wastage.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	22:25
Figure: "In Switzerland around 20 persons per year" (fox tapeworm infections) Dimensions: (a) Absolute value shown — (b) Proportion (per 100,000 inhabitants) missing — (c) Trend missing	
Missing context	20 out of 8.7 million inhabitants = 0.00023%. No comparison with other zoonoses. The figure is used to give the all-clear — here the direction of manipulation is reversed (trivialisation rather than dramatisation), but the missing contextualisation remains a finding.
Effect	The figure 20 appears reassuring, but without trend information (rising/falling?) and without comparison with other risks it cannot be contextualised.

Summary: Figures are consistently presented without proportion and trend. The direction of manipulation is consistently anti-hunting: kill figures are presented in absolute terms (large), costs without relation to the budget, infection figures for reassurance without trend.



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

<b>Finding 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	45:35
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"Foxes and wolves are therefore lured from the forest into the vicinity of settlements with food in order to shoot them."</i>
Technique: Pass hunting for foxes (legal, traditional) is presented in direct connection with wolf hunting and the reference to possibly illegal bait (45:20). The association: fox hunters = potential lawbreakers.	
<b>Effect</b>	Through the immediate proximity of the statements, legal fox hunting is associated with possibly illegal wolf hunting practices, without there being direct evidence of illegal fox hunting.

Summary: Guilt by association is moderately pronounced in this broadcast. The strongest association is the linking of legal fox hunting with possibly illegal wolf hunting (45:12–45:46). No explicit categorisation of persons as "conspiracy theorists" or similar.



## 7. TIMING

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:44 (beginning)

Content: "Thousands of foxes die annually through hunting, yet hardly any hunter still uses the fur today."

#### Timing effect

The broadcast begins with a statement that frames hunting as useless before any hunter gets to speak. The viewer is led into the broadcast with an anti-hunting premise.

### Finding 2:

Position: 50:07 (end)

Content: "Given everything that is known today about the fox, a rethink is needed. The fox plays a central role in the ecosystem. It is not dangerous. And it regulates itself best."

#### Timing effect

The closing statement is a normative demand without a counter-voice. It stands at the end of the broadcast and remains as the final message with the viewer. The formulation "a rethink is needed" is an editorial value judgement, not a journalistic conclusion.

### Finding 3:

Position: 43:04 (shortly before the end)

Content: "Most foxes therefore die without any benefit. Because fox hunting is not suitable for regulation."

#### Timing effect

This core statement of the broadcast is placed shortly before the end, after all arguments have been presented — as the narrator's conclusion, not as an expert quote. It is formulated as a fact, not as an opinion.

Summary: The beginning and end of the broadcast are framed as anti-hunting. The closing statement is a normative demand formulated as a statement of fact. The timing reinforces the one-sided message.



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

3/10

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 45:20

Triggering event: Tip from a wolf protection NGO that dead chickens or goats are used as bait, which has been prohibited for three years.

Reaction: "The fact that this has been prohibited for three years does not seem to have reached everyone yet." — Implicit outrage about hunters as lawbreakers.

### Comparison

The illegal young fox rearing by Anna (03:24: "faces a fine of up to CHF 20,000 for the unlawful keeping of a wild animal") is not commented on with comparable outrage, but framed with understanding and sympathy (07:05: "Whether out of ignorance of the legislation or because they wanted to spare their foundlings from death").

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. Illegal behaviour by animal protectionists is framed with understanding, possibly illegal behaviour by hunters with implicit outrage — even though the animal protectionist's illegality is documented by the broadcast itself, while the hunters' illegality is only claimed by an NGO source.

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Summary: The broadcast shows a moderate but demonstrable asymmetry: illegal behaviour by animal protectionists is framed with understanding, possibly illegal behaviour by hunters with implicit outrage. The asymmetry is substantiated by the direct comparison of the commentaries.



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

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 26:42

Missing perspective: Scientific literature on the effectiveness of fox control for ground-nesting birds (skylark, lapwing, grey partridge) from hunted areas.

Relevance: The broadcast implicitly claims there is no scientific basis for fox control for bird protection. In fact, an extensive literature exists (including Stoate & Szczur 2001, Holt et al. 2008) showing contrary results.

Impact: The overall picture of the state of research is distorted. The broadcast presents a scientific consensus that does not exist as such.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 44:05

Missing perspective: Concrete cases of fox damage to livestock and the perspective of affected farmers.

Relevance: The protective function of hunting for livestock keepers is a central argument of hunting advocates. Without those affected, this argument remains abstract.

Impact: The broadcast delegitimises hunting as a protective measure without allowing those affected to speak.

### Finding 3:

Timestamp 08:05

Missing perspective: Wildlife biological objections to hand-rearing of wild animals (imprinting, rewilding problems, disease transmission).

Relevance: The broadcast portrays illegal rearing as successful and desirable. Wildlife biological counter-arguments are entirely absent.

Impact: The broadcast implicitly promotes an illegal practice without naming its risks.

Summary: The broadcast is incomplete in three central areas: pro-hunting science, affected farmers and critical objections to animal protection practice. The overall picture is structurally one-sided.

Fox hunting in Switzerland is legally regulated and part of a long tradition. At the same time, there is a growing animal protection movement that questions hunting of non-threatened animal species. Scientific studies show that fox populations recover quickly after hunting (compensatory reproduction). The political debate touches on hunting law, animal protection, wildlife management and the question of state regulation — all topics with a clear party-political dimension in Switzerland.

#### *Proportion of perspectives covered*

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

**[A] Hunting associations and hunters:** Hunting as cultural heritage, wildlife management, pest control

**[B] Farmers:** Fox damage to poultry, livestock, hares

**[C] Veterinary authorities:** Disease transmission (fox tapeworm, mange), disease prevention

**[D] Wildlife research (anti-hunting):** Compensatory reproduction, population dynamics

**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

**[E] Wildlife research (pro-hunting):** Protection of ground-nesting birds, ptarmigan, hares

**[F] Animal protection organisations:** Suffering through hunting, rearing of orphaned animals

**[G] Legal perspective:** Hunting law, permit practice, legal comparison Switzerland/Germany

**[H] Authorities (cantons):** Enforcement practice, regulatory objectives

**[I] Population/those affected:** Conflicts with urban foxes, poultry keepers

**[J] Ethical perspective:** Hunting ethics, animal dignity, proportionality

**[A] IMPLIED**

Timestamp: 13:57 — Quote: "What really fascinates me is the whole fox hunt, which is actually a quiet hunt" — Assessment: Hunters get to speak, but their arguments for hunting are systematically refuted by expert statements; no independent defence of hunting as wildlife management.

**[B] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Farmers with concrete fox damage do not get to speak; the perspective is only implied through the written response of the Valais office (44:25), but not substantiated by those affected.

**[C] IMPLIED**

Timestamp: 32:23 — Quote: "You should wash it anyway. And the other thing is also that here in the city centre the fox tapeworm, which many people are concerned about, is not a major problem." — Assessment: Only reassurance, no counter-voice from veterinary authorities on risks outside the city.

**[D] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 43:14 — Quote: "When foxes are hunted, they automatically produce more young." — Assessment: Compensatory reproduction is presented in detail and without counter-voice.

**[E] IMPLIED**

Timestamp: 26:42 — Quote: "Fox hunting is regarded in some places as a protective measure for rare bird species, such as the ptarmigan." — Assessment: Mentioned, but immediately relativised by national park data; no study demonstrating the benefit of hunting for bird protection is cited.

**[F] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 07:18 — Quote: "The people who find these little foxes have already formed an emotional bond very quickly." — Assessment: Animal protection perspective is presented in detail and emotionally.

**[G] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 03:24 — Quote: "And without authorisation, a fine of up to CHF 20,000 faces those who unlawfully keep a wild animal." — Assessment: Legal situation is presented, but framed one-sidedly as a problem.

**[H] IMPLIED**

Timestamp: 06:22 — Quote: "If I now find a small, young fox, what do I have to do?" — Assessment: Authority representative gets to speak, but only in the context of explaining the legal situation, not as a defender of regulation.

**[I] IMPLIED**

Timestamp: 29:37 — Quote: "Unfortunately that is somewhat widespread, active feeding, because one enjoys this young, cute little animal, until it eventually gets so big that one's nerves start to fray" — Assessment: Conflicts with urban foxes are briefly mentioned, but not substantiated by those affected.

**[J] IMPLIED**



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

Timestamp: 23:23 — Quote: "There you also really have a hunting ethics problem if you simply shoot foxes without actually achieving a goal." — Assessment: Hunting ethics is only addressed from an anti-hunting perspective; no hunting ethics perspective from the hunters themselves.

### **Completeness score: 5/10**

---

**Justification:** The broadcast addresses the animal protection and anti-hunting scientific perspective in detail. Farmers as those affected by fox damage are entirely absent. Pro-hunting scientific studies are not cited. The authority perspective is reduced to explaining the legal situation, not to defending regulation. The picture is structurally incomplete.



## 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	00:44
Quote	<i>"Thousands of foxes die annually through hunting, yet hardly any hunter still uses the fur today."</i>
Manipulation	The word "die" instead of "are harvested" or "are shot" sets an emotional frame. "Yet" implies a contradiction between killing and benefit — as if hunting were only legitimate if the fur is used.
Why problematic	The frame "killing without benefit" is set as a premise before any argument is presented. Hunting as wildlife management, cultural heritage or leisure activity is not introduced as a legitimate frame.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	43:04
Quote	<i>"Most foxes therefore die without any benefit. Because fox hunting is not suitable for regulation."</i>
Manipulation	"Therefore" suggests a logical conclusion from what preceded. "Without any benefit" is an absolute statement that excludes all other utility arguments (bird protection, livestock protection, hunting culture). The narrator formulates this as a fact, not as an opinion.
Why problematic	The statement is an editorial value judgement presented as a statement of fact. It violates the accuracy requirement of Art. 4 RTVA.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	50:07
Quote	<i>"Given everything that is known today about the fox, a rethink is needed."</i>
Manipulation	"Given everything that is known today" suggests a scientific consensus that does not exist as such. "Is needed" is a normative demand presented as a conclusion from facts.
Why problematic	The broadcast ends with a political demand framed as a scientific conclusion. This is a classic framing technique for legitimising a normative position.

Summary: The framing of the broadcast is consistently anti-hunting. Hunting is framed as "killing without benefit", scientific findings are selectively presented as consensus, and the closing statement is a normative demand formulated as a statement of fact.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	00:44
Quote	<i>"Thousands of foxes die annually through hunting"</i>
Manipulation	"Die" instead of "are harvested" or "are shot" — emotional connotation (passive victim) instead of factual description (active hunting action).
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Thousands of foxes are hunted annually." "Die" implies suffering and victim status, which is a normative value judgement.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	43:07
Quote	<i>"Because fox hunting is not suitable for regulation."</i>
Manipulation	"Not suitable" is colloquially disparaging. The formulation excludes all utility arguments.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "The effectiveness of fox hunting for population regulation is scientifically contested." The chosen formulation is a value judgement, not a statement of fact.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	08:12
Quote	<i>"Switzerland takes a very extreme line."</i>
Manipulation	"Extreme line" is evaluative and negatively connoted. The formulation comes from the mouth of the anonymous animal protectionist, but is framed by the context as a valid assessment.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Compared to Germany, Switzerland has stricter regulations for keeping wild animals." "Extreme" is an emotional value judgement, not a factual description.

Summary: The word choice is consistently anti-hunting and animal protection-favouring. "Die", "not suitable", "extreme line" are emotional value judgements presented as factual descriptions.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Preliminary note: This is a documentary film, not an interview format. There is no classic moderator. The narrator/filmmaker takes on the moderation function through comments and questions.

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 14:41

Triggering event: Hunter Rees Wirt explains his motivation for fox hunting.

**Quote (narrator)** *"The task that we apparently have, that hunters regulate the foxes, is that also a reason why you react, because there are too many foxes?"*

**Comparison** With animal protectionist Anna (07:18), no critical follow-up question is asked about the effectiveness or legality of her practice.

Asymmetry: Demonstrable. The hunter is asked to justify his practice ("is that also a reason?"), the animal protectionist is not.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 10:16

Triggering event: Animal protectionist Anna explains that young foxes could become tame through hand-rearing.

**Quote (narrator)** *"Won't that become a problem if the foxes become tame?"*

**Comparison** The question is softly formulated ("won't that become a problem") and is answered and relativised by Anna herself. No follow-up question about the illegality of the practice or rewilding risks.

Asymmetry: Moderate. The question is asked, but not pursued further.

Summary: Moderation behaviour shows a moderate asymmetry: hunters are asked to justify their practice, animal protectionists are not. The asymmetry is substantiated, but not extremely pronounced.



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

<b>Asymmetry 1:</b>	
<b>To hunter Rees Wirt, 14</b>	41: "The task that we apparently have, that hunters regulate the foxes, is that also a reason why you react, because there are too many foxes?" — neutral to critical (questions the purpose of regulation)
<b>To animal protectionist Anna, 10</b>	16: "Won't that become a problem if the foxes become tame?" — soft (gives opportunity for self-relativisation)
<b>Comparison</b>	The hunter is asked about the purpose of his practice (implicitly: is it justified?), the animal protectionist about a possible problem (implicitly: is there one?). The question to the hunter is structurally more critical.

<b>Asymmetry 2:</b>	
<b>To authority Canton Zurich, 06</b>	22: "If I now find a small, young fox, what do I have to do?" — neutral, informative
<b>To Valais office</b>	No oral interview, only written response — no follow-up questions possible
<b>Comparison</b>	The anti-hunting authority (Zurich) is interviewed orally, the pro-hunting authority (Valais) only in writing. This prevents critical follow-up questions to the pro-hunting position.

Summary: The question asymmetry is moderate but demonstrable. Pro-hunting actors are questioned more critically or receive less opportunity for elaboration (Valais only in writing). Animal protectionists are treated with soft questions.



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

<b>Finding 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	09:30
Construct: "Together we want to find out what the best way to deal with the fox would be."	
<b>Analysis</b>	The filmmaker presents himself as neutral ("find out together"), even though the broadcast is structurally anti-hunting. The inclusion of a hunter (Mario Toys) as a companion suggests balance, without his perspective being treated equally.
<b>Effect</b>	The broadcast creates the impression of balance through the inclusion of a hunter, without representing his position equally.

Summary: False balance is moderately pronounced in this broadcast. The inclusion of a hunter as a companion suggests balance that is structurally not present. The broadcast is characterised more by incompleteness than by false balance.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Fox hunting is useless and ethically unjustified.

#### Timestamp

43:04 — Evidence: "Most foxes therefore die without any benefit. Because fox hunting is not suitable for regulation."

Alternative agenda: Fox hunting as part of a complex wildlife management that pursues various objectives (bird protection, livestock protection, disease prevention, hunting culture) — with scientifically contested effectiveness.

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The prohibition on young fox rearing is disproportionate and should be changed.

#### Timestamp

08:12 — Evidence: "Switzerland takes a very extreme line. In Germany, wildlife rescue stations are absolutely legitimate."

Alternative agenda: The reasons for the prohibition (wildlife protection, imprinting, rewilding problems) are not treated as legitimate counter-arguments.

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The fox regulates itself best — state interventions (hunting) are counterproductive.

#### Timestamp

50:15 — Evidence: "It regulates itself best."

Alternative agenda: Wildlife management as a complex balancing of various interests (ecology, agriculture, hunting culture, animal protection) — without a clear scientific answer.

Summary: The broadcast sets a clear agenda: fox hunting is useless, the prohibition on rearing is disproportionate, the fox regulates itself. This agenda is presented as a scientific conclusion, but is a normative position.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (average criteria 1–9): 5.2 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (average criteria 10–15): 5.0 / 10

### Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (score 7):** The broadcast systematically omits pro-hunting science, affected farmers and critical objections to animal protection practice. This creates a structurally one-sided picture that is presented as complete. Evidence: 26:42 (no counter-studies), 44:05 (no farmers), 08:05 (no wildlife biology objections).
- 2. Framing / Agenda-Setting (score 7/7):** The broadcast frames fox hunting as "killing without benefit" and presents a normative demand for "rethinking" as a scientific conclusion. The agenda (hunting useless, prohibition disproportionate) is set as fact. Evidence: 00:44, 43:04, 50:07.
- 3. Expert selection (score 7):** 3 of 4 main experts represent anti-hunting or animal protection-aligned positions. Pro-hunting science is entirely absent. An NGO with a conflict of interest (Wolfschweiz) is used as a neutral source. Evidence: 43:14 (Anderwald), 45:12 (Wolfschweiz), 07:18 (Anna).

### Core messages of the broadcast

**\*\*MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** \*\* "Fox hunting is useless, scientifically unjustified and ethically questionable."

**Technique:** Framing + omission — Evidence: 43:04, 26:42, 50:07

**\*\*MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** \*\* "Animal protectionists who illegally rear young foxes act out of compassion and conviction — their practice is admirable."

**Technique:** Emotionalisation + sympathy framing — Evidence: 07:18, 49:14, 49:44

**\*\*MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** \*\* "Switzerland needs a rethink in its approach to wild animals — away from hunting, towards scientifically grounded wildlife management."

**Technique:** Agenda-setting + normative closing statement — Evidence: 08:12, 50:07, 44:01

Justification: The broadcast achieves an overall score of 5.1/10, which corresponds to a clear one-sidedness. The structural imbalance is evident in the systematic under-representation of pro-hunting science and affected farmers, the one-sided expert selection and the consistently anti-hunting framing. The closing statement (50:07) is a normative demand presented as a scientific conclusion — this violates the accuracy requirement of Art. 4 RTVA. The broadcast is not a news format, but as an SRF Doc production it is subject to the same accuracy obligations. The one-sidedness is not extreme, but clear and structurally demonstrable.

### CONCLUSION

The SRF Doc broadcast about the fox is crafted with care and contains valuable scientific information. However, it violates the accuracy requirement of Art. 4 RTVA through a structurally one-sided portrayal: pro-hunting science is not cited, affected farmers do not get to speak, and the closing statement ("a rethink is needed") is a normative demand presented as a scientific conclusion. The expert selection is structurally unbalanced with 3 of 4 anti-hunting main experts. The broadcast conveys a clear political agenda (abolish fox hunting, liberalise animal protection law) without identifying it as such. According to Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA, editorial broadcasts on contested topics must give adequate expression to the diversity of views — this requirement is not fulfilled by this broadcast.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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

**5.2/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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

**5.0/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.1/10**

*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 anomaly identified.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor anomaly 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 reported 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 expression</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 anomalies; 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 expression 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 placed at a disadvantage in portrayal, speaking time 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 preferred in portrayal, speaking time or framing.



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

### Assessment under Art. 4 RTVA

---

#### Violation 1:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (Accurate representation, diversity of opinion)

Facts: The broadcast presents fox hunting as scientifically useless and ethically unjustified, without allowing pro-hunting science or affected farmers to speak.

Evidence: Timestamp 43:04 — Quote: "Most foxes therefore die without any benefit. Because fox hunting is not suitable for regulation."

Assessment: This statement is presented as a factual statement by the narrator, but is a normative value judgement. It violates Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA because it presents a contested position as fact and does not treat the counter-position (hunting as wildlife management, bird protection, livestock protection) equally.

#### Violation 2:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (Balanced selection of interlocutors)

Facts: The expert selection is structurally anti-hunting (3 of 4 main experts anti-hunting or animal protection-aligned). Hunting associations, farmers and pro-hunting scientists are entirely absent.

Evidence: Timestamp 45:12 — Quote: "From a member of the group Wolfschweiz I receive the tip that dead chickens or goats are used as bait." — An NGO with a clear conflict of interest is used as a neutral source.

Assessment: The selection of interlocutors violates Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA because it structurally favours one side of the debate and systematically excludes the other.

#### Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 1 RTVA (Accurate representation of facts)

Facts: The closing statement of the broadcast is a normative demand presented as a scientific conclusion.

Evidence: Timestamp 50:07 — Quote: "Given everything that is known today about the fox, a rethink is needed. The fox plays a central role in the ecosystem. It is not dangerous. And it regulates itself best."

Assessment: "A rethink is needed" is a political demand, not a statement of fact. The formulation "given everything that is known today" suggests a scientific consensus that does not exist. This violates Art. 4 Para. 1 RTVA (accurate representation).

### Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

---

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in three dimensions: accurate representation (normative demands as facts), diversity of opinion (systematic omission of pro-hunting positions) and balanced selection of interlocutors (structurally anti-hunting expert selection). The violations are not limited to individual statements, but are structurally embedded in the entire broadcast concept. A complaint to the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television (ICA) would be justifiable on the basis of these findings, bearing in mind that the ICA recognises a certain editorial latitude for documentary films — however, the violations identified here go beyond this latitude, since the closing statement is an explicit normative demand without a counter-voice.



## CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

### 1. Group Wolfschweiz

- FUNDING:** NGO, membership and donation funding. No public funding discernible.
- MANDATE:** Wolf protection advocacy — clearly partisan on hunting issues.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Direct institutional interest in portraying hunting practices as illegal/problematic (maintaining relevance, interpretive authority in wolf debate).
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
  - D2 Personal risk: 0
  - D3 Subject expertise: 0
  - D4 Opinion consistency: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1
  - D6 Source level: -2**TOTAL: -4 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Swiss Hunting Association on the question of the prevalence of the alleged illegal practice. Not cited.

### 2. Swiss National Park (red fox project)

- FUNDING:** Public (federal government, Canton Graubünden). No direct conflict of interest.
- MANDATE:** Basic research in a hunting-free area — compatible with neutral assessment, but spatially limited.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional proximity to anti-hunting positions (national park = protected area without hunting). No financial conflict of interest.
  - D1 Conflict of interest: +1
  - D2 Personal risk: +1
  - D3 Subject expertise: +2
  - D4 Opinion consistency: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2
  - D6 Source level: +2**TOTAL: +9 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Studies from hunted areas on the effectiveness of fox control for bird protection. Not cited.

### 3. Urban Wildlife project Zurich (Claudia Kistler)

- FUNDING:** Public/university. No direct conflict of interest.
- MANDATE:** Urban fox research — spatially limited to urban area.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Research field structurally close to animal protection. No financial conflict of interest.
  - D1 Conflict of interest: +1
  - D2 Personal risk: +1
  - D3 Subject expertise: +2
  - D4 Opinion consistency: +1
  - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2
  - D6 Source level: +2**TOTAL: +9 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**
- COUNTER-VOICE:** Veterinary authority on fox tapeworm risks outside urban areas. Not cited.

### 4. "Anna" (anonymous animal protectionist)

- FUNDING:** Private. No institutional funding.
- MANDATE:** No official mandate — acts outside the law.
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Defends own illegal practice. Direct conflict of interest.
  - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
  - D2 Personal risk: +2
  - D3 Subject expertise: 0



D4 Opinion consistency: +1  
 D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1  
 D6 Source level: -2

**TOTAL: -2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Wildlife biologist on the risks of hand-rearing. Not cited.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. None of the cited sources is explicitly described as "recognised" in the broadcast — but the framing as neutral experts (particularly in the case of Wolfschweiz and Anna) is problematic and is substantiated by the source in-depth check.

**Source indicator for participants:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Group Wolfschweiz	-2	0	0	+1	-1	-2	-4	YELLOW
Swiss National Park (red fox project)	+1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+2	+9	GREEN
Urban Wildlife project Zurich (Claudia Kistler)	+1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+2	+9	GREEN
"Anna" (anonymous animal protectionist)	-2	+2	0	+1	-1	-2	-2	YELLOW

**Legal and methodological classification**

<b>No finding of fact</b>	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.
<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 finding 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.
<b>Heuristic comparison instrument</b>	The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not for the precise metric measurement of individual contributions. Threshold values serve as heuristic orientation, not as sharp legal qualification.



## APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

### Legal basis Switzerland — SRG SSR

---

#### Law

---

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

#### Relevant articles

---

- Art. 4 Para. 1 RTVA: All broadcasts of a radio or television programme must respect fundamental rights. 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. Views and comments must be recognisable as such.
- Art. 4 Para. 4 RTVA: In the totality of editorial broadcasts, the diversity of events and views must be given adequate expression (diversity requirement).

#### Core obligations

---

- 1. Accuracy:** Accurate representation of facts and events
- 2. Diversity of opinion:** Diversity of views on contested 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 for the Public Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methods report v4.1: Countable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

### SVFAB Working Papers

---

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

*David Schläpfer* — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | [www.svfab.ch](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 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](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. 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 compassion.

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 CHF 1.56 billion 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 subject to 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.