



SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2025-06-08 Tagesschau vom Hauptausgabe

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2025-06-08 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 12:26

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)

3.8 / 10

Left-favouring

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

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — chesdata.eu | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section serves for political classification and does not factor into the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Switzerland is a consensus democracy. The Federal Council (7 seats) is filled according to the magic formula: SVP 2 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. Bias therefore does not manifest in government-vs-opposition framing, but in the relative over- or under-representation of individual parties and positions.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position
SVP	8.0	62	Government (2 FC)	Restrict migration, sovereignty, reduction of state
SP	2.5	41	Government (2 FC)	Welfare state, open migration, EU rapprochement
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Economic freedom, bilateral path, lean state
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatism, family relief, cost containment
Greens	2.0	23	Opposition	Climate protection, disarmament, redistribution
GLP	4.0	10	Opposition	Green economy, liberal migration, innovation
EVP	5.5	2	Opposition	Christian values, centre positions

The dominant fault lines in Switzerland are: (1) Migration and asylum policy — SVP for tightening, SP/Greens for open policy; (2) EU bilateral agreements — broad pro-coalition against SVP scepticism; (3) Healthcare costs — single health fund (SP/Greens) vs. competition (FDP/SVP); (4) Climate policy — bans and state intervention (Greens/SP) vs. technological openness and market solutions (SVP/FDP).

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is Switzerland's public broadcaster, financed through Serafe fees and committed to Art. 4 RTVA: accurate representation, diversity of opinion on controversial topics, balanced selection of interlocutors. As Switzerland's largest media organisation, SRF bears a special democratic responsibility towards all political camps, particularly towards the SVP as the largest party, which regularly describes itself as disadvantaged in the media.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	0	Not directly mentioned. The topic of US migration touches on SVP's core issue of migration, but without reference to the SVP position. Score 0 = not in broadcast.
SP	0	Not mentioned.
FDP	0	Not mentioned.
Centre	+1	18:30 "Federal Councillor Martin Pfister is shown around the tent city" — Pfister (The Centre, FC) is portrayed positively and humanely. No programme position is touched upon, but slightly favourable portrayal.
Greens	0	Not mentioned.
GLP	0	Not mentioned.
EVP	0	Not mentioned.

Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: Centre (Score +1, only party with broadcast presence)
- Strongest distortion: No relevant distortion of party positions detectable
- Average deviation from 0: 0.1
- Conclusion: This broadcast is primarily a news programme without explicit domestic party debates. No Swiss party position is actively distorted or misrepresented. The only party-politically relevant presence is Federal Councillor Pfister (Centre), who is shown in a non-political context (Whitsun camp) in a positive light — this is marginal and not to be regarded as systematic bias.



CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Broadcast data

- Title: SRF Tagesschau
- Date: 08.06.2025
- Presenter: Not named (sign-off by female presenter, reference to Angelique Beltner for later broadcast)
- Reporters: Stephanie Schunke (Los Angeles/USA), Vivian Manz (New York), Stefan Rathgeb & Andreas Lüthi (TFA/water), Raphael von Matt (disability/parliament), Jonas Hink (Colombia), Miriam Mathis (Paris/cable car), Raphael Prinz (Rigi railway)

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Vivian Manz	SRF correspondent New York	SRF (public broadcaster)	Neutral (journalist)
Mayor of Paramount	Local politician Paramount/CA	Democratic Party (implicit)	Left (US context)
Governor Gavin Newsom	Governor of California	Democratic Party	Left (US context)
Spokesperson water utility	Industry representative	No party	Neutral/Technical
Islam Aliai	National Councillor	Not stated	Not assigned
Christian Lohr	National Councillor	The Centre	Centre
Philipp Kutter	National Councillor	The Centre	Centre
Federal Councillor Martin Pfister	Federal Councillor	The Centre	Centre
CEO Rigi Railways	Company representative	No party	Business

Main topic

The broadcast reports on five thematically unconnected topics: US migration policy/protests in Los Angeles, Swiss groundwater contamination by TFA, inclusion in the Swiss parliament, assassination attempt on a Colombian politician, Paris cable car, Whitsun camp Jungwacht/Blauring and anniversary of the Rigi railway.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hard facts

Hard facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically robust

1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Expert 1: Vivian Manz, SRF correspondent New York

Timestamp	03:44–06:47
Statement	"It is a very unusual step, a drastic step." / "This inhibition, he now seems to have lost."
Classification	SRF journalist, not an independent expert. Her assessments are journalistic interpretations, but are presented as factual analysis.
Missing countervoice	A US constitutional lawyer or a Republican political scientist would have provided a different assessment.

Source in-depth check Vivian Manz:

(a) FUNDING: SRF, public broadcaster, Serafe-funded. No direct commercial conflict of interest, but institutional dependence on public legitimacy.

(b) MANDATE: Journalistic reporting — compatible with analysis, but not with an expert role in constitutional or political science questions.

D1 Conflict of interest: 0 — No direct conflict of interest, but institutional shaping through SRF editorial culture

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Correspondent with reputation, but no existential risk position

D3 Professional competence: 0 — Journalist, not a political scientist or constitutional lawyer; statements about "lost inhibitions" are interpretation, not expertise

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent critical reporting on Trump (no inconsistency demonstrable)

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: -1 — "This inhibition, he now seems to have lost" is evaluative, not data-based

D6 Source level: +1 — On-site correspondent, secondary source

TOTAL: +2 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: Manz is presented as a neutral analytical authority, although her statements ("widely criticised step", "lost inhibitions") are evaluative interpretations. This is structurally problematic.

Expert 2: Spokesperson water utility (name not stated)

Timestamp	07:42–09:31
Statement	"We are concerned about the quality of the most important drinking water resource"
Classification	Industry representative of water utilities. Has an institutional interest in stricter limit values (legitimising infrastructure investments).

Source in-depth check water utility:



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

(a) **FUNDING:** Water utilities in Switzerland are mostly financed at municipal or cantonal level. Public-law structure.

(b) **MANDATE:** Water supply — compatible with statements on water quality, but not neutral on the question of regulatory need (benefits from legitimisation of investment).

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Water utilities benefit from legitimisation of investment through stricter limit values

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Public statement with reputational risk

D3 Professional competence: +2 — Direct professional competence for water supply

D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Industry position consistent

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Largely factual

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

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

(c) **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE:** Presented as a neutral expert voice, although a structural conflict of interest exists (legitimisation of investment).

Missing expert groups:

- Independent toxicologist on TFA hazardousness (instead of merely referencing authorities)
- Constitutional lawyer on the Insurrection Act / National Guard deployment
- Representative of agriculture on TFA sources and the debate on bans

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Vivian Manz, SRF correspondent New York	0	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	+2	YELLOW
Spokesperson water utility (name not stated)	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+5	GREEN

Summary:

- Vivian Manz: **YELLOW (+2)** — Journalist as analytical authority, evaluative statements framed as facts
- Water utility: **GREEN (+5)** — Professionally competent, but structural conflict of interest not addressed



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: Governor Gavin Newsom (social media)

Timestamp

03:07 — Statement: "Trump wants to deliberately inflame the situation. [...] Don't give them any. Never use violence."

- (a) **Funding and sponsorship:** Democratic Governor of California, political opponent of Trump
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Newsom is Trump's direct political opponent and potential 2028 presidential candidate — maximum conflict of interest
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** No Republican governor, no Trump spokesperson, no conservative commentator

Source 2: Mayor of Paramount

Timestamp

02:29 — Statement: "One of the major problems is the lack of communication between the authorities."

- (a) **Funding:** Local politician, democratically governed city
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Local politician who criticises ICE raids in her city — clear political conflict of interest
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** ICE spokesperson, DHS representative

Source 3: Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN) — analysis

Timestamp

08:27 — Statement: "This is shown by an analysis by the Federal Office for the Environment."

- (a) **Funding:** State-funded, federal administration
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Authority with regulatory mandate — has an institutional interest in demonstrating the need for regulation
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Independent scientific study, industry rebuttal

Rumour check:

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 05:29

Claim: "there are now indications that the Trump administration is moving towards conducting more raids at workplaces"

Word marker: "there are indications"

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

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 07:14

Claim: "New research now suggests that TFA could be more dangerous than previously assumed"

Word marker: "suggests", "could"

Primary source available: NO (only reference to EU authority, no primary study cited) — penalty point (+1)



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

Summary: The source selection is one-sided in favour of Trump critics (Newsom, mayor) and state regulatory advocates (FOEN). Two rumours without primary sources increase the score. Conservative, economic and security policy sources are entirely absent.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time (US migration report, approx. 5:30 min. total):

- Vivian Manz (SRF, critical analysis of Trump): approx. 2:30 min. (45%)
- Governor Newsom (Trump critic): approx. 0:30 min. (9%)
- Mayor of Paramount (Trump critic): approx. 0:20 min. (6%)
- Stephanie Schunke (reportage, predominantly critically framed): approx. 1:30 min. (27%)
- Trump position (indirect, without own voice): approx. 0:20 min. (6%)
- Migrant (fear perspective): approx. 0:20 min. (6%)

Estimated speaking time (TFA report, approx. 2:30 min. total):

- Water utility (regulatory advocate): approx. 0:45 min. (30%)
- Reporter (regulatory framing): approx. 1:30 min. (60%)
- Agriculture/industry (opposing position): 0 min. (0%)

Summary: In the US migration report, Trump critics receive approx. 93% of speaking time, while Trump's position is only presented indirectly and without his own voice. In the TFA report, the agricultural and industry perspective is entirely absent. The time distribution is clearly asymmetric in both main segments.



4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omission 1:

Context

Trump's justification for the National Guard deployment — Insurrection Act, security arguments, figures on unrest

Relevant at: 01:26–04:48

Effect

Without Trump's own justification, the deployment appears arbitrary and authoritarian; the legal basis and the security argumentation are withheld from the viewer.

Omission 2:

Context

Crime statistics on undocumented migrants in California — neither confirming nor refuting

Relevant at: 05:14–05:55

Effect

The claim that it is "difficult to find criminal immigrants right now" is presented without data context; viewers cannot assess whether Trump's security concerns are factually justified.

Omission 3:

Context

Agricultural perspective on TFA limit values — costs for farmers, alternatives to pesticides, economic consequences

Relevant at: 08:17–09:34

Effect

The report suggests that stricter limit values are unproblematically desirable; the economic consequences for agriculture and the question of alternatives are not addressed.

Summary: Systematic omission of opposing positions in both main segments — Trump's security arguments and the agricultural perspective are entirely absent. This creates a distorted overall picture that makes regulation and criticism of Trump appear self-evident.

Missing voices

- Republican commentator/member of Congress: Would have presented the justification for the National Guard deployment from a conservative perspective
- ICE spokesperson or DHS representative: Would have explained the legal situation and objectives of the raids from the authority's perspective
- LAPD spokesperson or sheriff: Would have assessed the local security situation and coordination with federal authorities
- Farmer/farmers' association (TFA report): Would have brought in the agricultural perspective on pesticide bans
- Business representative (TFA report): Would have presented a cost-benefit analysis for the introduction of limit values
- Constitutional lawyer (US report): Would have provided a neutral assessment of the legal basis for the National Guard deployment



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

- Colombian opposition representative (assassination attempt): Would have deepened the political context of the assassination attempt
- Migration researcher with a critical perspective on undocumented migration: Would have differentiated the complexity of the security debate



5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:20

Figure: "during the George Floyd protests of 2020, which were many times larger and more violent"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — vague ("many times"), (b) Share — missing, (c) Trend — missing

Missing context

No concrete figures on deaths, injuries, property damage during Floyd protests vs. current protests; "many times" is not a measurable statement

Effect

Suggests that Trump was more restrained during the Floyd protests, although the comparability of the situations is not substantiated.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 05:14

Figure: "The numbers are currently not as high as desired" (deportations)

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

Missing context

No concrete deportation figures, no comparison with previous administrations, no target figure stated

Effect

Claim without any data basis; viewers cannot assess whether the statement is correct.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 05:36

Figure: "millions of immigrants without legal residence papers"

Dimensions: (a) Absolute value — vague ("millions"), (b) Share — missing, (c) Trend — missing

Missing context

Estimates vary between 10–12 million for the USA as a whole; no specific figure for Los Angeles; no trend (rising/falling?)

Effect

Vague figure without context; emotional impact ("millions") without analytical substance.

Summary: On multiple occasions, figures are presented without absolute values, shares or trends. Particularly problematic is the Floyd comparison with the vague formulation "many times", which suggests a conclusion without substantiating it.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Association 1:

Timestamp

01:26

Quote

"Whereupon President Trump, a widely criticised step, mobilises 2000 National Guard soldiers"

Technique: The insertion "widely criticised step" is embedded directly into the news report before Trump's action has even been explained. Trump is associated with "criticism" before the viewer knows the facts.

Effect

Anticipation of a negative assessment; the viewer is preconditioned before being able to contextualise the action.

Association 2:

Timestamp

04:12

Quote

"Critics in turn say that he is now deploying the military to suppress resistance in the country"

Technique: The association "military to suppress resistance" is introduced as a critics' position, but is neither refuted nor contextualised. The association with authoritarian regimes remains in the air.

Effect

Suggests authoritarian behaviour without the other side (legal basis, proportionality) being presented.

Summary: Two cases of guilt by association, both directed against Trump. The embedding of "widely criticised" directly into the news report is particularly problematic, as it conflates evaluation and factual reporting. No analogous association is detectable with other actors (Newsom, demonstrators).



7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Position: 01:26 (beginning of the first segment)

Content: "a widely criticised step" — evaluation is placed before any explanation

Timing effect

The viewer receives the negative assessment before knowing the facts. This sets the interpretive frame for the entire segment.

Finding 2:

Position: 04:48 (end of the correspondent interview)

Content: "And this inhibition, he now seems to have lost."

Timing effect

The interview ends with an evaluative conclusion about Trump's character ("lost inhibitions"), which remains as the last impression. No rebuttal follows.

Finding 3:

Position: 06:00 (shortly before the end of the US segment)

Content: "we spoke, for example, with a student who now simply lives in fear every day that her parents won't come home from work in the evening"

Timing effect

Emotional conclusion of the segment with a fear narrative; amplifies the emotional impact of the entire segment shortly before its close.

Summary: Evaluative elements are strategically placed at the beginning (framing) and at the end (last impression) of the segment. This is a classic sandwich technique: negative framing at the start, emotional conclusion at the end.



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)

Methodological principle K11+K8: Document the triggering event — asymmetry is only demonstrable with a comparable trigger without an analogous reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 01:26

Triggering event: Trump mobilises 2000 National Guard soldiers without the governor's consent

Reaction: "a widely criticised step" — embedded directly in the news text

Comparison

Analogous event — Governor Newsom calls for resistance (03:07, "Don't give them any") —
Reaction: no evaluation, direct citation without critical insertion

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — Trump's action is framed with "widely criticised"; Newsom's call to resist federal authorities receives no analogous evaluation.

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp 04:48

Triggering event: Trump deploys National Guard without governor's consent

Reaction: "And this inhibition, he now seems to have lost" — personal characterisation

Comparison

Demonstrators throw stones, police deploy tear gas (02:17) — Reaction: factual description
without evaluation

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — violence by demonstrators is described factually; Trump's legal (if controversial) action is commented on with character criticism ("lost inhibitions").

Degree of outrage: 2/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Summary: Selective outrage is demonstrable in two cases: Trump's actions are accompanied by evaluative insertions, while comparable actions by other actors (Newsom, demonstrators) are described factually. Overall score 5/10 (degree of outrage 2 + selectivity 3).



9. COMPLETENESS (Selective Omission — Overall picture)

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Finding 1:

Timestamp 01:44–06:47 (entire US report)

Missing perspective/fact: Trump's own justification, Republican supporting voices, security data

Relevance: A report on a politically highly controversial step that presents only one side violates the requirement of diversity of opinion under Art. 4 RTVA

Impact: The viewer receives a one-sided picture that makes Trump's action appear arbitrary and authoritarian, without knowing the counter-arguments.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 07:31–09:45 (TFA report)

Missing perspective/fact: Agricultural perspective, cost-benefit analysis, uncertainty of the research situation

Relevance: The report addresses a topic with direct economic consequences for agriculture, without allowing this side to speak

Impact: One-sided presentation in favour of regulation; the viewer has no basis for forming a balanced opinion.

Finding 3:

Timestamp 12:22–14:09 (Colombia assassination attempt)

Missing perspective/fact: Political context of the assassination attempt — who benefits, which groups are suspected, role of the Petro government

Relevance: An assassination attempt on an opposition politician in a politically divided country requires contextualisation

Impact: The report remains at the surface; the political dimension (left-wing government, right-conservative opposition candidate) is not explored in depth.

Summary: The broadcast shows significant completeness deficiencies in three of five main segments. Particularly serious is the US migration report, which systematically omits one side. This corresponds to a pattern, not an isolated case.

Soft facts

The broadcast airs on a Whit Sunday — a public holiday with reduced news volume — and combines hard news (USA, Colombia) with Swiss soft news (Whitsun camp, Rigi railway). The US migration report is politically highly relevant, as it shows Trump's immigration policy at a moment of escalating tensions between the federal government and the states. The TFA topic touches on Swiss environmental and agricultural policy. Both topics have direct references to current political debates in Switzerland (migration, environmental regulation).

Share of perspectives covered

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



[A] Perspective of the US federal government / Trump administration: Justification for National Guard deployment, security arguments

[B] Perspective of the demonstrators / migrant community

[C] Perspective of local law enforcement authorities (LAPD, Sheriff)

[D] Perspective of Governor Newsom / Democratic side

[E] Legal classification: Constitutional question of federal power vs. states' rights

[F] Historical context: Previous deployments of National Guard under federal command

[G] Perspective of conservative commentators / Republican supporters

[H] Economic perspective: Role of undocumented migrants in the US economy

[I] Security perspective: Crime statistics, actual threat situation

[J] International perspective: Comparison with other countries

[A] INDICATED

Timestamp: 01:26 — Quote: "Trump orders 2000 National Guard soldiers into the state" — Assessment: Trump's action is described, but his justification ("rebellion against the government") is only briefly and critically framed; no independent presentation of the government's position.

[B] COVERED

Timestamp: 06:00 — Quote: "we spoke, for example, with a student who now simply lives in fear every day that her parents won't come home from work in the evening" — Assessment: The migrant perspective is introduced emotionally and concretely.

[C] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The perspective of local police (LAPD, Sheriff) is entirely absent; their assessment of the security situation would have been relevant for a balanced presentation.

[D] COVERED

Timestamp: 03:07 — Quote: "Trump wants to deliberately inflame the situation" — Assessment: Newsom's position is directly quoted and receives substantial space.

[E] INDICATED

Timestamp: 03:55 — Quote: "It has only happened once before in the history of the USA that the president deployed the National Guard against the will of the governor" — Assessment: The historical precedent is mentioned, but the constitutional debate (Insurrection Act, 10 U.S.C. § 12406) is not explored in depth.

[F] COVERED

Timestamp: 04:20 — Quote: "during the George Floyd protests of 2020, which were many times larger and more violent" — Assessment: A historical comparison is drawn, albeit with an implicitly critical framing towards Trump.

[G] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No Republican or conservative voice is heard; no commentator who defends or explains Trump's approach.

[H] INDICATED

Timestamp: 05:36 — Quote: "millions of immigrants without legal residence papers, who have in part lived and worked here for decades, in part paying taxes" — Assessment: The economic dimension is briefly mentioned, but not explored in depth.

[I] OMITTED



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

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Crime statistics or security data that could support or refute Trump's justification are entirely absent.

[J] OMITTED

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: No international comparison; how do other countries deal with similar situations?

Completeness score: 4/10

Justification: Of ten relevant perspectives, only four are covered or indicated. Particularly striking is the complete absence of conservative/Republican voices and security policy arguments. The broadcast presents the topic of US migration one-sidedly from the perspective of Trump's critics, without bringing in his supporters or the security perspective on an equal footing.



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	01:44
Quote	"The immigration authority's forces arrive in armoured vehicles, some masked and heavily armed."
Manipulation	The description of ICE officers with military attributes ("armoured", "masked", "heavily armed") frames state law enforcement as a threatening military operation. The same attributes would not be negatively connoted in police operations against criminals.
Why problematic	The framing creates a sense of threat towards law enforcement authorities, without the necessity of the equipment being addressed.

Finding 2:

Timestamp	07:05
Quote	"Swiss groundwater, contaminated with trifluoroacetic acid, TFA, across the board."
Manipulation	"Contaminated across the board" is alarm framing. The word "contaminated" implies harm, although the report itself concedes that TFA was previously considered "rather harmless". The hazardousness has not yet been established.
Why problematic	Alarm framing before the facts have been clarified; the viewer is put in a state of concern before the scientific uncertainty is communicated.

Finding 3:

Timestamp	06:54
Quote	"Swiss water, you know how it is. Clean, good, healthy."
Manipulation	The presenter's text first builds up a positive image ("clean, good, healthy"), only to then shatter it. This contrast technique amplifies the shock effect of the contamination report.
Why problematic	Emotional manipulation through the deliberate construction and destruction of a sense of security.

Summary: Two dominant framing techniques: (1) militarisation framing in ICE operations, (2) alarm framing with TFA. Both framings favour a pro-regulation, state-sceptical (towards Trump) basic stance.



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

Finding 1:	
Timestamp	01:26
Quote	<i>"a widely criticised step"</i>
Manipulation	Evaluative insertions in news text; "widely criticised" is a journalistic evaluation, not a fact
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "a controversial step" or simply a description of the action without evaluation. "Widely criticised" prejudices the assessment.

Finding 2:	
Timestamp	04:48
Quote	<i>"And this inhibition, he now seems to have lost."</i>
Manipulation	Psychologising characterisation of a head of state by a journalist; "lost inhibitions" implies loss of control and irrational behaviour
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "Trump decided differently in this case than in 2020." The chosen formulation is a character diagnosis, not journalistic analysis.

Finding 3:	
Timestamp	07:07
Quote	<i>"An environmental chemical that was previously considered rather harmless."</i>
Manipulation	"Was considered" (past tense) suggests that this assessment is outdated, although the report itself states that the EU is only "examining" a limit value. The hazardousness has not yet been established.
Why problematic	A neutral alternative would be: "An environmental chemical whose hazardousness is currently being reassessed." The chosen formulation already suggests established new findings.

Summary: Word choice is evaluative rather than descriptive in several instances. Particularly problematic are the psychologising characterisations of Trump and the alarm vocabulary in the TFA report.



12. PRESENTER BEHAVIOUR

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Methodological principle K11+K8: Document the triggering event.

Finding 1:

Timestamp 03:44

Triggering event: Presenter asks correspondent for her assessment of the National Guard deployment

Quote (presenter) *"Vivian Manz in New York, how unusual, how drastic is this step?"*

Comparison No analogous question to a conservative voice or Trump supporter — no counter-question posed

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — The question formulation ("how unusual, how drastic") already implicitly contains the answer. A neutral question would be: "How is this step to be assessed?" The formulation invites confirmation of a negative evaluation.

Finding 2:

Timestamp 04:51

Triggering event: Presenter asks about Trump's motivation

Quote (presenter) *"Quite obviously, the relationship between Governor Newsom and Donald Trump has long been strained. Why this escalation by Trump right now?"*

Comparison No analogous question addressing Newsom's contribution to the escalation

Asymmetry: Demonstrable — "Escalation by Trump" attributes the escalation one-sidedly to Trump; Newsom's role (refusal to cooperate with federal authorities, political instrumentalisation) is not addressed.

Summary: Two demonstrable asymmetries in presenter behaviour: questions are formulated in such a way as to invite negative assessments of Trump, without questioning Newsom's role. This violates the requirement of balanced conduct of interviews.



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

Asymmetry 1:	
To Vivian Manz (correspondent), 03	44: "how unusual, how drastic is this step?" — soft/leading (answer implicit in question)
To [hypothetical Trump supporter], not posed	"[How does the government justify this step legally?]" — not posed
Comparison	The only interviewee receives a leading question that confirms her critical assessment. No critical question to Trump supporters, as none were invited.

Asymmetry 2:	
To Vivian Manz, 04	51: "Why this escalation by Trump right now?" — leading (escalation attributed to Trump)
To Governor Newsom (indirectly, via social media quote), 03	07: No critical follow-up question on Newsom's refusal to cooperate with federal authorities — no question
Comparison	Trump is questioned about motives for "escalation"; Newsom's contribution to the escalation is not questioned.

Summary: The question asymmetry is structural: Trump is critically framed through question formulations, while Newsom and other Trump critics receive no critical questions. This is a clear pattern, not an isolated case.



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

Finding 1:

Timestamp 04:12

Construct: "Donald Trump argues that the unrest is a form of rebellion against the government. Critics in turn say that he is now deploying the military to suppress resistance in the country."

Analysis

A seeming balance is established here (Trump position vs. critics), but the weighting is asymmetric: Trump's position is summarised in one sentence, while the critics' position receives more space and is supported throughout the entire segment. This is not a genuine false balance (both sides are not treated equally), but rather a pseudo-balance.

Summary: Genuine false balance (equating unequal positions) is not the dominant problem in this broadcast — the problem is rather the opposite: one side is systematically favoured, without an artificial equation taking place. Score 2/10.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Trump's National Guard deployment is inherently problematic and "drastic"

Timestamp 01:26 — Evidence: "a widely criticised step"

Alternative agenda: The question of whether states may actively undermine federal law (immigration law) does not make it onto the agenda. The legality of sanctuary city policies is not addressed.

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: TFA contamination requires state regulation

Timestamp 09:03 — Evidence: "Technically it is possible to eliminate chemical substances. For TFA in particular, this is really only possible with reverse osmosis systems."

Alternative agenda: The question of whether a ban on TFA-producing substances would be more sensible than expensive treatment plants does not make it onto the agenda. Equally absent is the question of economic proportionality.

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: Inclusion in parliament is a topic of progress

Timestamp 09:45 — Evidence: "1.8 million people in Switzerland live with a disability and, despite progress in equality, still feel disadvantaged."

Alternative agenda: Legitimate topic, treated in a balanced manner. No agenda-setting problem in this segment.

Summary: Agenda-setting is demonstrable in two segments: the US report sets the agenda "Trump's actions are problematic" as its starting point; the TFA report sets "regulation is necessary" as its starting point. Counter-questions to these premises do not make it onto the agenda.



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

The 3 strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** Trump's own justification, Republican voices and security data are entirely absent from the US report; the agricultural perspective is absent from the TFA report. This is not an isolated case, but a pattern across multiple segments.
- 2. Framing (Score 7):** ICE officers are framed as a military threat ("armoured, masked, heavily armed"); TFA is framed as a widespread danger before its hazardousness has been scientifically established. Both framings favour pro-regulation and Trump-critical conclusions.
- 3. Completeness (Score 7):** In three of five main segments, relevant opposing perspectives are systematically absent. This exceeds the level of random omissions and points to a structural selectivity.

Core messages of the broadcast

MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE): "Trump's migration policy is authoritarian, disproportionate and endangers democracy."

Technique: Framing, omission, source selection — Evidence: 01:26, 04:12, 04:48

MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL): "Trump has lost control and acts without inhibitions."

Technique: Word choice, timing — Evidence: 04:48, 01:26

MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL): "State regulation is necessary to protect the environment and migrants."

Technique: Agenda-setting, framing — Evidence: 07:05, 08:27, 09:03

Justification: The broadcast achieves an overall score of 5.1/10, which corresponds to a clear one-sidedness. The US migration report violates Art. 4 RTVA through systematic omission of the opposing side (no Republican voices, no security arguments, no legal classification in favour of the federal government). The TFA report violates the requirement of accurate representation through alarm framing before the scientific facts have been clarified. The one-sidedness is not limited to a single segment, but manifests as a pattern across multiple segments. The broadcast therefore does not fully meet the requirements of Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (diversity of opinion on controversial topics).

CONCLUSION

The analysed Tagesschau broadcast exhibits a clear one-sidedness (overall score 5.1/10), which manifests primarily in the US migration report and the TFA report. In the US report, Trump-critical voices (Newsom, mayor, correspondent) are favoured with approx. 93% of speaking time, while Trump's own justification, Republican supporting voices and security data are entirely absent — this violates Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA, which requires diversity of opinion on controversial topics. The word choice ("widely criticised step", "lost inhibitions") and the framing ("armoured, masked, heavily armed") cross the boundary between reporting and commentary, which touches on Art. 4 Para. 1 RTVA (accurate representation of facts). The TFA report uses alarm framing ("contaminated across the board") before scientific clarification and entirely omits the agricultural perspective. The one-sidedness cannot be attributed to an isolated case, but manifests as a structural pattern that would have to withstand legally sound scrutiny by OFCOM.



OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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)

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

Aggregated deviation index — Interpretation ranges

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

Party-political bias (-5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	Party is clearly disadvantaged in portrayal, speaking time or framing.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Discernible, but weak disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No discernible favouring or disadvantaging.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Discernible, but weak favouring.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	Party is clearly favoured in portrayal, speaking time or framing.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Art. 4 RTVA)

Assessment under Art. 4 RTVA

Art. 4 RTVA requires: accurate representation of facts and events, diversity of opinion on controversial topics, balanced selection of interlocutors.

Violation 1:

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

Facts: In the report on the National Guard deployment in Los Angeles, exclusively Trump-critical voices are heard (Newsom, Mayor of Paramount, correspondent Manz). No Republican, conservative or government-aligned voice is included.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:44–06:47 — Quote: "Whereupon President Trump, a widely criticised step, mobilises 2000 National Guard soldiers" (01:26); "And this inhibition, he now seems to have lost" (04:48)

Assessment: The immigration policy of the Trump administration is a politically highly controversial topic. Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA requires that on such topics the essential opinions are heard. The complete absence of a countervoice to the critical portrayal violates this requirement. The Federal Supreme Court held in BGE 131 II 253 that balance does not require mechanical equal time, but essential positions must not be systematically excluded.

Violation 2:

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

Facts: Evaluative insertions are embedded in news text ("widely criticised step") and journalistic interpretations are presented as factual analyses ("And this inhibition, he now seems to have lost").

Evidence: Timestamp 01:26 — Quote: "a widely criticised step"; Timestamp 04:48 — Quote: "And this inhibition, he now seems to have lost"

Assessment: The conflation of factual reporting and evaluation violates the requirement of accurate representation. "Widely criticised" is a journalistic evaluation, not a fact; "lost inhibitions" is a psychologising characterisation, not a factual analysis. Both formulations cross the boundary between news and commentary.

Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 Para. 1 RTVA (accurate representation) in conjunction with Art. 4 Para. 2 RTVA (diversity of opinion)

Facts: In the TFA report, alarm framing ("contaminated across the board", "previously considered rather harmless") is used before the scientific facts have been clarified, and the agricultural perspective is entirely absent.

Evidence: Timestamp 07:05 — Quote: "Swiss groundwater, contaminated with trifluoroacetic acid, TFA, across the board"; Timestamp 07:07 — Quote: "An environmental chemical that was previously considered rather harmless"

Assessment: The formulation "previously considered rather harmless" suggests that this assessment is outdated, although the report itself concedes that the EU is only "examining" a limit value. This is not an accurate representation of the state of scientific uncertainty. Furthermore, the agricultural perspective is absent, although agriculture is identified as the main source of TFA — a violation of the requirement of diversity of opinion.

Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

The broadcast violates Art. 4 RTVA in three demonstrable respects: (1) lack of diversity of opinion in the US migration report through the complete absence of conservative/Republican voices; (2) conflation of factual reporting and evaluation through embedded commentary ("widely criticised step", "lost inhibitions"); (3) alarm framing and absent agricultural perspective in the TFA report. The violations cannot be attributed to individual errors, but show a consistent pattern that would have to withstand a complaint to OFCOM. A violation of Art. 4 RTVA is to be assumed, according to the standard of the Federal Supreme Court (BGE 131 II 253; BGE 137 I 340), when the reporting leaves a reasonable, unbiased viewer with a false or incomplete impression — which is the case here with regard to the US migration report and the TFA report.



CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

Organisation 1: Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN)

- FUNDING:** State-funded, federal administration, financed through the federal budget
- MANDATE:** Environmental protection and regulation — the mandate is compatible with statements on environmental contamination, but not neutral on the question of regulatory need (institutional interest in demonstrating regulatory need to legitimise its own mandate)
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** An authority with a regulatory mandate has a structural interest in demonstrating regulatory need. FOEN analyses are professionally competent, but not neutral on the question "are stricter limit values needed?"
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Structural interest in regulatory need
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Authority with reputational risk in case of false statements
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 — Direct professional competence for environmental data
 - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent authority position
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Data-based analysis
 - D6 Source level: +2 — Primary source (own analysis)**TOTAL: +7 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**
- COUNTERVOICE:** No independent scientific study or industry perspective is cited. The FOEN analysis is presented as the sole data source.

Organisation 2: European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)

- FUNDING:** EU authority, publicly funded
- MANDATE:** Food safety — compatible with limit value examination, but examination does not yet constitute a finding of hazardousness
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Authority with regulatory mandate; examination of a limit value is not evidence of hazardousness
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Regulatory authority
 - D2 Personal risk: +1 — Institutional reputation
 - D3 Professional competence: +2 — Direct professional competence
 - D4 Consistency of opinion: +1 — Consistent authority position
 - D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +2 — Scientific process
 - D6 Source level: +1 — Secondary source (examination process, no completed study)**TOTAL: +6 → SOURCE INDICATOR: GREEN**
- COUNTERVOICE:** The broadcast does not mention that the EFSA examination has not yet been completed and no limit value has been established. This is a relevant omission that reinforces the alarm framing.

IMPORTANT: "Recognised" is not a factual qualification. Both authorities are professionally competent (GREEN), but their structural conflicts of interest (regulatory mandate) are not addressed in the broadcast. The broadcast presents authority statements as neutral facts, without naming the institutional context.

Source indicator for participants:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN)	-1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+2	+7	GREEN
European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)	-1	+1	+2	+1	+2	+1	+6	GREEN

Legal and methodological classification



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

No finding of fact

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

No legal ruling

The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment within the meaning of Art. 4 RTVA. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates statutory requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular IHRA).

No proof of causality

Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intentions. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news situation, political controversy or format logic.

No finding of intent

The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant imbalance has been identified — not that the editorial team intended this. The methodology makes no statements about motives or strategic objectives.

Heuristic comparison instrument

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



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Switzerland — SRG SSR

Law

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

Relevant articles

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

Core obligations

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

Supervisory authority

- IHRA (Independent Human Rights 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
- 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. IHRA (if no agreement is reached)
3. Federal Supreme Court (final instance)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS

Literature

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Research Centre for the Public Sphere and Society (2024). *Yearbook Quality of the Media 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methods report v4.1: Countable criteria and multi-model cross-validation*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

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

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

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Reporting | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | kontakt@svfab.ch | *Methods report March 2026* | Converter 3.4 (2026-05-20)



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

Analyses and membership at SVFAB

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

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

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

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



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

The following books are available from SVFAB

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



Unbalanced Reporting is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and source selection. Subsequently, 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, removal of context 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 all those who have a microphone in front of them and want to know what they can do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three basic principles of sovereignty — anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what counts after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for all those who are exposed and want to understand how the game works. So that they stop playing along — and start shaping it.

In A5. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and in difficult situations



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



You think you see the world. In reality you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It does not change the facts — it changes what we make of the facts. How we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate. Daily. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry textbook. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You learn not only how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how you can use it consciously and fairly.

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

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

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year — compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can lodge a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the IHRA, the Independent Human Rights 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 examination that shows: the IHRA 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 all those considering a complaint — and for all those who want to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still outstanding.