



## SVFAB DETAILED ANALYSIS

2026-03-04 Tagesschau vom 04.03.2026 Hauptausgabe

Broadcast: SRF Tagesschau broadcast | 2026-03-04 | Analysed on: 2026-05-19 12:21

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

**OVERALL  
SCORE**

**4.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly one-sided/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	Greens	SP	GLP	Centre	EVP	FDP	SVP
CHES	1.13	1.67	3.60	5.47	5.64	7.67	9.00
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Centre</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

The overall tendency is displayed on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly favouring left, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly favouring right). The calculation is based on the difference in average favourability of left vs. right parties (grouping according to CHES 2024).

**TENDENCY (L – R)**

**4.2 / 10**

*Balanced*

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: SVP (2 seats), SP (2 seats), FDP (2 seats), The Centre (1 seat). There is no classic opposition role — all major parties are represented in government. Smaller parties (Greens, GLP, EVP) are not represented in the Federal Council but are active in the National Council.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats NC	Government/Opposition	Core position
SVP	8.0	62	Government (2 FC)	Limit migration, sovereignty, reduction of state
SP	2.5	41	Government (2 FC)	Welfare state, redistribution, open migration
FDP	6.5	28	Government (2 FC)	Economic freedom, lean state, bilateral agreements
Centre	5.0	29	Government (1 FC)	Pragmatism, family relief, EU stabilisation
Greens	2.0	23	No FC representation	Climate protection, disarmament, redistribution
GLP	4.0	10	No FC representation	Green economy, liberal migration, EU alignment
EVP	5.5	2	No FC representation	Christian values, centre positions

Swiss domestic politics is characterised by the tension between budget consolidation and social spending, with SVP and FDP demanding cuts while SP and Greens prefer revenue increases. The Bilateral Agreements III with the EU are another major conflict between EU-friendly parties (SP, FDP, Centre, GLP) and the EU-sceptical SVP. Migration policy remains permanently contested, with SVP on the restrictive side and SP/Greens on the open side.

SRF (Swiss Radio and Television) is Switzerland's public broadcaster, financed through Serafe fees and committed to Art. 4 RTVA (accurate, balanced reporting). As Switzerland's largest media organisation, SRF bears special responsibility for democratic opinion formation. Critics — particularly from the SVP camp — accuse SRF of structural left-wing bias, which increases the relevance of systematic analysis.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast portrayal vs. programme position
SVP	-1	21:08 "Among those who switched to No is the SVP" — SVP representative receives a brief explanation but is placed in the context of the failure of a savings package. Programme position (reduce government spending) is correctly conveyed, but the context (SVP rejected the PLB quick fix, not saving in general) is only briefly presented — slightly distorted by framing
SP	+1	20:34 "In the committee, for example, the SP was not yet against it" / 20:40 "because consumers would have ended up paying" — SP position (purchasing power protection) is explained and presented with reasoning; programme position (welfare state, purchasing power) correctly conveyed
FDP	0	Not directly mentioned in the broadcast — no portrayal, no distortion
Centre	+1	20:03 "The idea from the ranks of the Centre seemed financially attractive" / 20:11 "I am disappointed, because everyone said we should not only cut spending but also do something on the revenue side" — Centre position is portrayed sympathetically, disappointment is directly quoted; programme position (balanced budget, targeted revenues) correct
Greens	-1	07:06 "Bente Scheller, of the Heinrich Böll Foundation, which is close to the German Greens" — the expert's proximity to the Greens is made transparent, which is correct; however, no Swiss Greens position is presented in the broadcast — omitted
GLP	0	Not mentioned — no portrayal
EVP	0	Not mentioned — no portrayal

### Party bias summary

- Most accurate portrayal: SP (Score +1) — position is presented with reasoning
- Strongest distortion: SVP (Score -1) — rejection of the PLB is framed in the context of failure, without fully explaining the SVP's substantive logic
- Average deviation from 0: 0.3
- Conclusion: The domestic political reporting is overall moderately balanced. The SVP position is slightly framed in a negative context (failure of the savings package), while the SP position is provided with explanatory reasoning. The deviations are minor and not systematic enough for a clear party bias finding.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast data

- Title: SRF Tagesschau
- Date: 04.03.2026
- Presenter: Cornelia (surname not given)
- Reporters: Simon Roth (Iran succession), Petra Frey (US military), Benedikt Hofer (Revolutionary Guards), Georg Halter (federal finances), Andreas Reich (EU industry), Markus Schnurrenberger (banknotes)

Actors	Function	Party/affiliation	Political spectrum
Anita Bünter	SRF correspondent Middle East (Amman)	SRF	Neutral (journalist)
Pascal Weber	SRF correspondent USA (Washington)	SRF	Neutral (journalist)
Franziska Ramser	Rundschau presenter	SRF	Neutral (journalist)
Bente Scheller	Expert, Heinrich Böll Foundation	Foundation close to the Greens (Germany)	Left-green
Pete Hegseth (quoted)	US Secretary of Defense	Republican Party USA	Right
Israeli military spokesperson (quoted)	IDF spokesperson	Israeli government	Right-conservative
Israel's Defence Minister Katz (quoted)	Defence Minister Israel	Likud	Right
Centre representative (unnamed)	National Council	The Centre	Centre
SP representative (unnamed)	National Council	SP	Left
SVP representative (unnamed)	National Council	SVP	Right
FDFA spokesperson	Federal Department of Foreign Affairs	Federal administration	Neutral
Swiss spokesperson	Airline Swiss	Private sector	Neutral
SNB spokesperson	Swiss National Bank	State	Neutral
Federal Councillor Jans	Minister of Justice	SP	Left
Federal President Parmelin	Federal President	SVP	Right
Ursula von der Leyen (quoted)	President of the European Commission	EVP (Germany)	Centre-right
Swissmem representative	Association of Swiss tech industry	Industry association	Economic liberal



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

## Main topic

---

The broadcast reports on the ongoing US-Israeli military war against Iran (day 5), the question of succession following the killing of Ayatollah Khamenei, and domestic Swiss topics (federal finances, evacuation flights, EU industrial policy, new banknotes).



## 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: Bente Scheller, Heinrich Böll Foundation

Timestamp	07:04–08:28
Statement	"It can be assumed based on their powerful role [...] that they are a truly driving force here [...] I fear that, at least in larger numbers, this does not yet exist."
Classification	Political scientist/Middle East expert at the Heinrich Böll Foundation, which is close to the German Greens. Structurally partisan on topics touching on green foreign policy (human rights, regime change, democratisation).
Missing countervoice	Realist security expert (e.g. IISS, RAND Corporation), Iranian political scientist, Russian or Chinese analyst.

#### Source in-depth check:

**(a) FUNDING:** The Heinrich Böll Foundation is primarily funded through the German federal budget (party foundation financing), and is close to the party Alliance 90/The Greens. Conflict of interest: On topics such as regime change, democratisation and human rights in Iran, there is structural alignment with green foreign policy.

**(b) MANDATE:** The foundation has an explicit political mandate (green values, promotion of democracy). This is not compatible with a fully neutral assessment on questions of regime change in Iran.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Foundation close to the Greens on regime change topic; structural conflict of interest present

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Expert with institutional affiliation; moderate personal risk

D3 Subject expertise: +2 — Middle East expert with many years of experience; area of statement (Revolutionary Guards, regime stability) is her field

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — No contrary previous statements known; consistent line

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly analytical, with qualifications ("I fear"); not purely appellative

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary analysis; no primary sources cited

**TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

**(c) SUBJECT EXPERTISE:** Partisan-affiliated source is framed as an expert authority.

##### Expert 2: Anita Bünter (SRF correspondent Middle East)

Timestamp	03:15–06:13, 13:07–14:27
Statement	"One must therefore not underestimate the military capabilities of the Iranian regime at present."
Classification	SRF's own correspondent; journalistic, not academic. No demonstrated expertise in military strategy or Iranian domestic politics.



**Missing  
countervoice**

Military analyst specialising in Iran.

**Source in-depth check:**

**(a) FUNDING:** SRF, public broadcaster, Serafe-financed. No direct conflict of interest in Iran reporting.

**(b) MANDATE:** Journalistic mandate; compatible with assessments, but no academic expertise.

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

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Correspondent in crisis region; elevated personal risk

D3 Subject expertise: 0 — Journalist, not a military expert; statements on military capabilities are assessments, not expert analyses

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — No contradictions discernible

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly factual, with source references ("according to US sources")

D6 Source level: -1 — Secondary; refers to "US sources" without specification

**TOTAL: +3 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

*Missing expert groups:*

- International law expert (legality of the attack)
- Independent military analyst (not SRF-internal)
- Iranian political scientist or diaspora intellectual

**Source indicator for participants:**

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Indicator
Bente Scheller, Heinrich Böll Foundation	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	0	+4	<b>YELLOW</b>
Anita Bünter (SRF correspondent Middle East)	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	+3	<b>YELLOW</b>

*Summary:*

- Bente Scheller (Heinrich Böll/close to the Greens): **YELLOW (+4)** — Subject expertise present, but structural conflict of interest on regime change topic; framed as a neutral expert
- Anita Bünter (SRF correspondent): **YELLOW (+3)** — Journalistic assessment, no military expertise; source references unspecific



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: US Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth (direct quote)

**Timestamp** 10:09–10:30

**Statement** "Only the USA is also capable [...] means pure destruction for our radical Islamist Iranian adversaries. They are finished and they know it."

- (a) **Funding:** US government; state. Conflict of interest: Hegseth is a party to the war and has a direct interest in portraying American strength.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** As Secretary of Defense of a party to the war, Hegseth is not a neutral source for assessments of the war situation.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Critical US voice (Democratic senator, independent military analyst), Iranian government source, UN spokesperson.

### Source 2: Heinrich Böll Foundation (Bente Scheller)

**Timestamp** 07:04

**Statement** "It can be assumed based on their powerful role [...] that they are a truly driving force here"

- (a) **Funding:** German federal budget, party foundation close to the Greens.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** On the subject of regime change, there is alignment with green foreign policy.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Realist security expert who assesses regime stability differently.

### Source 3: "Iranian opposition medium" (unnamed)

**Timestamp** 04:09

**Statement** "an Iranian opposition medium reports, has already been elected"

- (a) **Funding:** Unknown — source not identified.
- (b) **Structural conflict of interest:** Opposition media have a structural interest in certain narratives about the Iranian regime.
- (c) **Missing counter-source:** Official Iranian source, neutral international news agency.

Rumour check (penalty points):

Rumour 1:

Timestamp: 04:09

Claim: "an Iranian opposition medium reports, has already been elected"

Word marker: "reports" (without primary source, opposition medium not identified)

Primary source available: NO — +1 penalty point

Rumour 2:

Timestamp: 11:48

Claim: "Ammunition is running low, it is said from the region."



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

Word marker: "it is said from the region" — no identifiable primary source

Primary source available: NO — +1 penalty point

Rumour 3:

Timestamp: 23:02

Claim: "is however according to sources from the EU Commission also included"

Word marker: "according to sources from the EU Commission" — anonymous source

Primary source available: NO — +1 penalty point

*Summary: The source selection is one-sidedly dominated by Western-Israeli perspectives; Iranian, Russian and Chinese perspectives are absent. Three rumours without identifiable primary sources increase the score. The only external expert (Scheller) is not politically neutral.*



### 3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Estimated speaking time:

- Iran war (main topic): (54%)
- Swiss domestic politics (federal finances, evacuation, EU, banknotes, sport): (38%)
- Presenter/transitions: (8%)

Within the Iran topic:

- US/Israeli perspective (Hegseth quote, IDF spokesperson, Katz): (21% of the Iran block)
- SRF correspondents (Bünter, Weber): (50% of the Iran block)
- Green-affiliated expert (Scheller): (14% of the Iran block)
- Iranian perspective (regime or population): (0%)

*Summary: The time distribution within the Iran topic is structurally unbalanced: Iranian voices (regime or civilian population) receive no direct speaking time. The Western-Israeli perspective dominates, supplemented by SRF-internal assessments. A balanced broadcast would have included at least one Iranian or neutral international voice.*



#### 4. OMISSION (Selective Omission)

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

##### Omission 1:

###### Context

Civilian casualties and humanitarian situation in Iran

Relevant at: Entire Iran block (00:07–14:27)

###### Effect

The bombing of Iran is presented exclusively as a military-strategic event. Civilian casualties, destroyed infrastructure, and the humanitarian emergency of the Iranian population are not mentioned. This creates an image of the war as a technical military problem rather than a humanitarian catastrophe.

##### Omission 2:

###### Context

International law classification of the US-Israeli attack

Relevant at: 09:15 "For five days the USA and Israel [...] have been attacking Iran almost continuously from the air"

###### Effect

The attack is treated as a given fact without raising the question of its legality under international law. This normalises the attack and prevents critical contextualisation.

##### Omission 3:

###### Context

Swiss neutrality policy in the context of the expression of solidarity

Relevant at: 14:40 "Federal President Guy Parmelin has [...] expressed his solidarity"

###### Effect

The question of whether an expression of solidarity with a party to the war (USA/Israel) is compatible with Switzerland's neutrality obligation is not raised. This leaves Parmelin's statement uncritically standing.

*Summary: The systematic omission of humanitarian, international law and neutrality policy perspectives creates a one-sided image of the conflict as a military-strategic event. This is the strongest individual finding of the broadcast.*

#### Missing voices

- International law expert: Would have contextualised the legality of the US-Israeli attack under the UN Charter and shed light on the question of declaration of war vs. self-defence
- Humanitarian organisation (ICRC, UNHCR): Would have presented the situation of the civilian population in Iran and the humanitarian consequences of the bombings
- Iranian opposition politician in exile (nuanced): Would have brought a more nuanced perspective on regime change scenarios and the wishes of the Iranian population
- Russian or Chinese diplomat/analyst: Would have shed light on the geopolitical reaction of the other major powers to the conflict
- American critic of the military strategy (e.g. Democratic senator, military historian): Would have presented the US-internal debate on the strategy



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

- Swiss neutrality expert/international law expert: Would have examined the compatibility of Swiss expressions of solidarity with the neutrality obligation
- Energy economist: Would have contextualised the economic consequences of the conflict for Switzerland and Europe
- Iranian journalist or citizen in Iran: Would have directly brought in the perspective of the affected population



## 5. MANIPULATION OF FIGURES

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 09:52

Figure: "over 2000 sorties flown"

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

**Missing context**

No contextualisation of how many sorties per day, how many targets hit, how many civilian vs. military targets, comparison with other conflicts

**Effect**

The figure "2000 sorties" appears impressive and suggests overwhelming military power, without the viewer being able to contextualise what it means.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 08:38

Figure: "estimated 30 to 50 percent of economic output"

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

**Missing context**

The range of 30–50% is very wide; no source reference for the estimate; no comparison with other countries

**Effect**

Suggests economic dominance of the Revolutionary Guards without problematising the uncertainty of the estimate.

*Summary: Figures are used selectively to illustrate military strength (USA) and economic power (Revolutionary Guards), without complete contextualisation. The manipulation is moderate — no active misleading, but missing contextualisation.*



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

<b>Association 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	01:55
<b>Quote</b>	"Mojdabah Khamenei is considered a hardliner. In the past he is said to have played a key role in the suppression of protests."
Technique: Use of "is said to" (unconfirmed claim) + association with violence against protesters + archive footage from 2009 protests	
<b>Effect</b>	Khamenei junior is prejudged by association with violence and repression, without the claim being substantiated.

<b>Association 2:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	10:22
<b>Quote</b>	"radical Islamist Iranian adversaries" (Hegseth quote, adopted without commentary)
Technique: The designation "radical Islamist" is displayed as a Hegseth quote but is not contextualised or questioned.	
<b>Effect</b>	The framing of Iran as "radical Islamist" is normalised through the uncommented adoption of the quote.

Source check for Mojtabah Khamenei (as implicitly negatively framed actors):

- Does the broadcast work with verifiable primary sources? NO — "is said to have [...] played" without source reference
- Are the core statements falsifiable? PARTIALLY — the role in the 2009 protests is historically documented, but the specific claim about Khamenei junior is unsubstantiated
- Risk matrix: Khamenei junior has nothing to gain and everything to lose through his position — increased caution warranted for unverified claims
- RESULT CATEGORY: B (borderline case — partly substantiated, partly speculative)

*Summary: The broadcast uses "is said to" constructions for serious allegations against Khamenei junior without citing primary sources. The uncommented adoption of Hegseth's "radical Islamist" designation is problematic. Score moderate, as no systematic guilt-by-association campaign is discernible.*



## 7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Position: 00:07–00:56 (teaser/opening)

Content: "Possible Khamenei successor, his son Mojtabah, hitherto a hardliner in the background, could become the new supreme leader of Iran."

#### Timing effect

The term "hardliner" is introduced in the teaser before any context or classification is provided. This shapes the viewer's perception for the entire subsequent report.

### Finding 2:

Position: 17:54–18:07 (transition to Rundschau)

Content: "Great joy at the death of the Iranian ruler. This idiot is finally gone."

#### Timing effect

The emotional quote ("This idiot is finally gone") is placed as a teaser for the Rundschau — at the end of the main block, as an emotional conclusion. This reinforces the anti-regime sentiment and leaves an emotional impression on the viewer.

*Summary: The placement of "hardliner" in the teaser and the emotional diaspora quote at the end of the Iran block are strategically effective and influence the viewer's perception without this being journalistically necessary.*



## 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

12:04–13:03

Triggering event: Pascal Weber comments on the statements of US Secretary of Defense Hegseth about American military power and war objectives.

Reaction: "Pete Hegseth tries at each of his appearances first of all to prevent any comparisons with the Iraq War from arising. At the same time, he does this partly because his argumentation seems to lack any thinking about what comes after."

#### Comparison

Israeli Defence Minister Katz, 05:36 — Reaction: No critical contextualisation by the correspondent; Katz's statement ("any successor [...] would be on the hit list") is reported without critical commentary.

Asymmetry: Weber comments critically on Hegseth (lack of post-war planning, Iraq War comparison), while Katz's threat against any future Iranian leader remains without analogous critical contextualisation. The asymmetry is demonstrable but moderate.

Degree of outrage: 2/5 — Criticism of Hegseth is factual-analytical, not emotional

Selectivity: 2/5 — Katz receives no analogous critical contextualisation, but the asymmetry is not extreme

*Summary: A moderate asymmetry is demonstrable: Hegseth's statements are critically contextualised (Iraq War comparison, lack of post-war planning), while Katz's threat against any future Iranian leader remains without analogous criticism. The finding is real but not serious.*



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

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** Entire Iran block

Missing perspective/fact: Iranian civilian population, humanitarian situation, civilian casualties

Relevance: A war encompassing "over 2000 sorties" in four days necessarily has humanitarian consequences for the civilian population.

Impact: The absence of this perspective creates an image of the war as a clean military operation without human suffering.

### Finding 2:

**Timestamp** 09:15 "For five days the USA and Israel [...] have been attacking Iran almost continuously from the air"

Missing perspective/fact: International law classification of the attack

Relevance: An attack on a sovereign state without a UN mandate is fundamentally problematic under international law and should have been contextualised.

Impact: The attack is treated as self-evident, which constitutes an implicit legitimisation.

### Finding 3:

**Timestamp** 14:40 "Federal President Guy Parmelin has [...] expressed his solidarity"

Missing perspective/fact: Swiss neutrality policy and its limits

Relevance: Switzerland has a constitutional neutrality obligation; expressions of solidarity with parties to a war are politically and legally relevant.

Impact: Parmelin's statement is presented uncritically as a normal diplomatic act.

*Summary: The broadcast exhibits systematic gaps in humanitarian, international law and neutrality policy perspectives. This is the most serious finding of the broadcast and directly touches on the obligation of balance under Art. 4 RTVA.*

## Soft facts

The Iran conflict is a highly complex geopolitical topic with diverging narratives: Western security interests vs. Iranian sovereignty, regime change debate vs. stability interests, military escalation vs. diplomatic solution. The broadcast deals with a fictional (or hypothetical) war scenario in which the USA and Israel are actively engaged militarily against Iran — a scenario that had not occurred in the real world at the time of analysis, but is treated as a journalistic thought experiment or future scenario. The societal significance is enormous: war in the Middle East affects energy prices, refugee movements, international security architecture and Swiss neutrality policy.

### Share of perspectives covered

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



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

- [A] Iranian civilian population and their situation under bombardment
- [B] International law classification of the US-Israeli attack
- [C] Russian and Chinese reaction to the conflict
- [D] Arab states and their security interests (Gulf states)
- [E] Swiss neutrality policy and its limits in the context of the conflict
- [F] Humanitarian situation in Iran (civilian casualties, infrastructure)
- [G] Critical voices on US military strategy from within the USA itself (Democrats, military experts)
- [H] Iranian opposition voices in exile (nuanced, not only jubilation)
- [I] Economic consequences for Switzerland (energy prices, trade)
- [J] Diplomatic alternatives and peace initiatives

**[A] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The situation of the Iranian civilian population under the bombardments is not addressed at any point; civilian casualties, humanitarian consequences and the suffering of the population are entirely absent.

**[B] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: An international law classification of the attack (self-defence? aggression? UN Charter?) is entirely absent; no jurist, no international law expert is consulted.

**[C] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Russia and China as veto powers in the UN Security Council and as strategic partners of Iran are not mentioned.

**[D] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 11:34 — Quote: "an Iranian projectile struck near the US embassy in Dubai" / 14:09 "especially among the Gulf states" — Assessment: Gulf states are mentioned as those affected, but their political position and security interests are not explored in depth.

**[E] OMITTED**

Timestamp: 14:40 — Quote: "Federal President Guy Parmelin has [...] expressed his solidarity" — Assessment: Swiss neutrality policy is not discussed; the question of whether expressions of solidarity with parties to a war are compatible with neutrality is not raised.

**[F] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: The humanitarian situation in Iran (civilian casualties, hospitals, infrastructure) is not addressed.

**[G] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 12:04 — Quote: "Pete Hegseth tries at each of his appearances first of all to prevent any comparisons with the Iraq War from arising" — Assessment: Criticism of the US strategy is indicated by the SRF correspondent, but no American counter-voices (Democrats, military experts) are directly quoted.

**[H] INDICATED**

Timestamp: 17:34 — Quote: "Great joy at the death of the Iranian ruler. This idiot is finally gone." — Assessment: Iranian diaspora voices are indicated in the Rundschau announcement but are not analysed in depth.

**[I] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Economic consequences for Switzerland (energy prices, trade relations, financial market) are not addressed.



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

**[J] OMITTED**

Timestamp: — — Quote: — — Assessment: Diplomatic alternatives, peace initiatives or negotiation options are not discussed; the war is treated as a given reality without illuminating alternatives.

**Completeness score: 3/10**

---

**Reasoning:** Of ten relevant perspectives, only two are indicated (D, G) and one marginally mentioned (H); seven perspectives are entirely absent. The broadcast focuses on military developments and questions of power, but systematically neglects humanitarian, international law, diplomatic and economic dimensions. For a main news broadcast of a public broadcaster with an obligation of balance, this is a significant finding.



## Soft facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING (Setting the frame)

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1:

Timestamp	00:10 / 01:06
Quote	<i>"In Iran the question of the future arises." / "Who will fill the power vacuum?"</i>
Manipulation	The war is framed as a question of shaping Iran's future — not as an attack on a sovereign state. The framing "power vacuum" implies that the previous regime has already been overcome and it is only a matter of succession.
Why problematic	This framing implicitly adopts the perspective of the attackers (regime change as the goal) and normalises the war as a means of democratisation.

#### Finding 2:

Timestamp	09:30
Quote	<i>"The USA, on the other hand, appear extremely confident of victory today."</i>
Manipulation	"Confident of victory" is a value-laden formulation that uncritically adopts American self-presentation. The word implies that victory is likely.
Why problematic	A neutral formulation would be "The USA emphasise their military superiority" — "confident of victory" adopts the American self-perception as a journalistic assessment.

#### Finding 3:

Timestamp	03:05
Quote	<i>"Possibly a new religious leader in Iran, but one of the old school."</i>
Manipulation	"Old school" is a pejorative formulation that frames continuity with the previous regime as backward.
Why problematic	The formulation sets a normative framework (old = bad, change = good) that contains a political value judgement which should not go unmarked in a news broadcast.

*Summary: The framing of the broadcast largely adopts the perspective of the attackers (regime change as a legitimate goal, power vacuum as the starting point) and normalises the war as a strategic event. This is a clear finding of one-sided framing.*



## 11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp

00:20 / 01:55

Quote

*"hitherto a hardliner in the background" / "Mojdabah Khamenei is considered a hardliner"*

Manipulation

"Hardliner" is a politically connoted term that carries negative connotations from a Western perspective. It is used twice — in the teaser and in the report — without definition or source reference.

Why problematic

A neutral alternative would be: "is considered a representative of an uncompromising line" or "is attributed to the conservative wing of the regime". "Hardliner" is a value judgement, not a description.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp

06:02

Quote

*"every person who stands for the continued existence of the Islamic Republic is potentially on Israel's hit list"*

Manipulation

"Hit list" is a colloquial term for a death list. The formulation normalises the Israeli threat to kill any successor through an everyday term.

Why problematic

The formulation trivialises a threat to kill heads of state. Neutral alternative: "is potentially on Israel's list of military targets".

### Finding 3:

Timestamp

03:46

Quote

*"From the internal logic of the system of the Islamic Republic, his appointment would be somewhat problematic"*

Manipulation

"Somewhat problematic" is an understatement for a fundamental contradiction to the state ideology of the Islamic Republic.

Why problematic

The formulation relativises the political sensitivity of the dynastic succession and has a trivialising effect.

*Summary: The word choice is moderately one-sided: "hardliner" (value-laden, Western perspective), "hit list" (trivialising for a threat to kill) and "somewhat problematic" (understatement) are the most notable findings.*



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Timestamp 11:59

Triggering event: Presenter introduces question about Hegseth's statements.

**Quote (presenter)** *"Martial words from the USA regarding the course of the war. Back to Anita Bünler and Pascal Weber. How do you interpret the words of US Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth?"*

**Comparison** Israeli Defence Minister Katz, 05:36 — Reaction: No analogous critical introduction; Katz's statements are reported without a value-laden introduction.

Asymmetry: The presenter describes Hegseth's statements as "martial" (warlike, exaggerated) — a value-laden introduction that is not used for Katz's statements (threat against all future Iranian leaders). The asymmetry is demonstrable but moderate.

### Finding 2:

Timestamp 16:39

Triggering event: Question to FDFA spokesperson about Swiss evacuation performance.

**Quote (presenter)** *"Question to the FDFA, is Switzerland doing too little?"*

**Comparison** No analogous critical question to other actors (Swiss, Federal President Parmelin).

Asymmetry: The question is direct and critical, which is fundamentally positive. No systematic asymmetry discernible.

*Summary: The moderation behaviour shows a moderate asymmetry: Hegseth's statements are introduced with "martial", while Katz's threats receive no analogous critical introduction. The asymmetry is real but not serious.*



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

3/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

#### Asymmetry 1:

To Pascal Weber (on Hegseth), 11

59: "How do you interpret the words of US Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth?" — after introduction "martial words" — moderately critical

To Anita Bünter (on Katz), 05

27: No direct question about Katz's threat; Bünter reports it on her own initiative — no question asked

Comparison

Hegseth's statements are actively questioned (with critical introduction), Katz's threats are not actively questioned.

#### Asymmetry 2:

To SVP representative, 21

08: "Why did the SVP switch to No?" — direct, slightly confrontational

To SP representative, 20

38: "Why did you end up switching to No?" — direct, neutral

To Centre representative, 20

10: "How disappointed are you?" — empathetic, soft

Comparison

The question to the Centre representative is noticeably softer (empathy question) than the questions to SVP and SP (explanatory questions). Moderate asymmetry.

*Summary: A moderate question asymmetry is discernible: Centre representative receives a more empathetic question than the SVP representative; Hegseth's statements are questioned more actively than Katz's threats. The asymmetries are real but not systematic.*



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

#### Finding 1:

##### Timestamp

10:56–11:22

Construct: "The Israeli side, however, is somewhat more restrained. The Iranian regime still possesses considerable capabilities."

##### Analysis

The "balance" between US optimism and Israeli restraint is presented as evenhandedness — however, both voices are parties to the war. A genuine balance would include a neutral or Iranian perspective.

##### Effect

False balance between two parties to the war suggests evenhandedness where there is none.

*Summary: The broadcast shows a limited false balance problem: the "balance" between the US and Israeli perspective is not genuine balance, as both are parties to the war. The finding is real but not dominant.*



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1:

Agenda element set: The war against Iran is legitimate and the only question is who takes power afterwards.

#### Timestamp

01:06 — Evidence: "Who will fill the power vacuum? Who will steer Iran's destiny in the future?"

Alternative agenda: Is the war legal? What humanitarian consequences does it have? What diplomatic alternatives exist?

### Finding 2:

Agenda element set: The Revolutionary Guards are the central obstacle to regime change.

#### Timestamp

06:19 — Evidence: "Apart from the question of leadership, it is clear that central to the current regime right now are the Revolutionary Guards"

Alternative agenda: What does the Iranian civilian population think? What role do civilian institutions play?

### Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The Switzerland-EU relationship is positive and Switzerland's inclusion in "Made in Europe" is a success.

#### Timestamp

23:43 — Evidence: "Switzerland has already cleared an important hurdle today."

Alternative agenda: What questions of sovereignty arise? What are the costs of EU alignment? What do EU-critical voices say?

*Summary: The agenda-setting of the broadcast normalises the war against Iran as a given reality and places regime change on the agenda as a self-evident goal. Switzerland's EU alignment is framed as an unproblematic success without critical voices.*



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

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

### Dominant techniques

- 1. Omission / Selective Omission (Score 7):** The systematic omission of humanitarian perspectives (civilian casualties, situation of the population), international law classification and the question of Swiss neutrality is the most serious finding. These omissions together create an image of the war as a legitimate, clean military process without human suffering or legal problems.
- 2. Completeness / Selective Omission overall picture (Score 7):** Closely linked to criterion 4: of ten relevant perspectives, only two are indicated. The broadcast treats a war with potentially catastrophic humanitarian consequences as a strategic-military event without giving voice to the affected population.
- 3. Framing (Score 6) and Agenda-Setting (Score 6):** The broadcast adopts the framing of the attackers ("power vacuum", "question of the future") and places regime change on the agenda as a self-evident goal. This normalises the war and prevents a critical contextualisation of its legality and legitimacy.

### Core messages of the broadcast

**MESSAGE 1 (SUBSTANTIVE):** "The US-Israeli attack on Iran is a given reality, and the decisive question is who takes power afterwards."

**Technique:** Framing + Agenda-Setting — Evidence: 01:06 ("Who will fill the power vacuum?"), 06:19 ("central to the current regime right now are the Revolutionary Guards")

**MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** "Mojdabah Khamenei is a dangerous hardliner who would continue the repressive course of his father."

**Technique:** Word choice + Timing + Guilt by Association — Evidence: 00:20 ("hardliner in the background"), 01:55 ("is said to have played a key role in the past"), 02:08 ("is likely to continue his father's uncompromising course")

**MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** "Switzerland and Europe must align more closely with Western structures (EU, USA) to protect their interests."

**Technique:** Agenda-Setting + Framing — Evidence: 22:20 ("What is happening right now, again in Iran, shows us this more clearly every day. We must strengthen our strategic economic sectors in Europe."), 23:43 ("Switzerland has already cleared an important hurdle today.")

**Reasoning:** The overall score of 4.5 falls in the range of "slight tendency" but trends towards the boundary of "clear one-sidedness". The strongest findings (omission of humanitarian perspectives, completeness deficiencies, framing of the war as a regime change process) are significant for a main news broadcast of a public broadcaster. Art. 4 RTVA requires accurate presentation and diversity of opinion on contested topics — both are not fully met in the Iran reporting. The domestic political segments (federal finances, banknotes) are considerably more balanced and lower the overall score.

### CONCLUSION

The Tagesschau broadcast shows in the Iran segment a structural one-sidedness that arises primarily through omission: humanitarian consequences of the war, international law classification and Iranian perspectives are entirely absent, while the attacker perspective (USA, Israel) dominates and is normalised through framing ("power vacuum", "question of the future"). The only external expert (Bente Scheller, Heinrich Böll Foundation) is not politically neutral but is framed as an expert authority. The domestic political segments are considerably more balanced but also show moderate asymmetries (more empathetic treatment of the Centre representative, uncritical presentation of EU alignment). Measured against Art. 4 RTVA, which requires accurate presentation and diversity of opinion on contested topics, the broadcast exhibits relevant deficiencies in the Iran block that go beyond editorial decisions and are structural in character. The overall finding is "slight tendency" with elements of clear one-sidedness in the main topic.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual scores — All 15 criteria

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

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

**4.7/10**

*Significant imbalance*

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

**4.2/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**4.5/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*Averaged from hard facts and soft facts*



## KEY — Meaning of scores

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

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

### Aggregated deviation index — interpretation ranges

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

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

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is clearly disadvantaged in portrayal, 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 favoured 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 presentation of facts and events)

Facts: Missing humanitarian and international law classification of the US-Israeli attack on Iran

Evidence: Timestamp 09:15 — Quote: "For five days the USA and Israel have been attacking Iran almost continuously from the air" — without any contextualisation of legality, civilian casualties or humanitarian consequences

Assessment: A war with "over 2000 sorties" in four days (09:52) without mention of civilian casualties or international law classification does not meet the requirement of accurate presentation. The omission of these dimensions cannot be explained by time pressure, given the time the broadcast devotes to the Iran topic.

#### Violation 2:

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

Facts: One-sided expert selection — the only external expert is close to the Greens; no Iranian, Russian, Chinese or neutral international voice

Evidence: Timestamp 07:04 — Quote: "That is what Bente Scheller of the Heinrich Böll Foundation, which is close to the German Greens, says" — as the only external expert voice on the situation in Iran

Assessment: On a highly contested geopolitical topic (war against Iran), Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA requires the presentation of various viewpoints. Restricting coverage to a politically non-neutral expert and SRF-internal correspondents does not fulfil this requirement.

#### Violation 3:

Norm: Art. 4 para. 2 RTVA (accurate presentation)

Facts: Use of unidentified sources for factual claims

Evidence: Timestamp 04:09 — Quote: "an Iranian opposition medium reports, has already been elected" (source not identified); 11:48 — "Ammunition is running low, it is said from the region" (source not identified)

Assessment: Factual claims about the course of the war and political decisions without identifiable primary sources do not meet the requirement of accurate presentation. The use of anonymous sources for war-relevant information is particularly problematic.

### Overall assessment Art. 4 RTVA

---

The broadcast largely meets the requirements of Art. 4 RTVA in the domestic political section (federal finances, evacuation, banknotes). In the Iran segment, however, three relevant deficiencies are identifiable: the missing humanitarian and international law classification (Art. 4 para. 2), the one-sided expert selection without Iranian or neutral international voices (Art. 4 para. 4), and the use of unidentified sources for factual claims (Art. 4 para. 2). These deficiencies are not necessarily individually actionable as complaints, but in combination they are capable of creating a one-sided image of the conflict in the viewer's mind that does not fully meet the requirements of the public service mandate. A complaint to the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television (ICA) would be worth examining on the basis of these findings, particularly with regard to the systematic omission of humanitarian perspectives and the lack of diversity of opinion on a highly contested geopolitical topic.



## CHAPTER 6 — SOURCE IN-DEPTH CHECK

Heinrich Böll Foundation (Bente Scheller)

**1. FUNDING:** Primarily through the German federal budget (party foundation financing under the Political Parties Act); close to the Green Party (Alliance 90/The Greens). Additional project funding from the EU, federal ministries and private donors.

**2. MANDATE:** Explicitly political mandate: promotion of green values, democracy, human rights, ecological sustainability. The mandate is not compatible with a fully neutral assessment on topics that directly touch on green foreign policy (regime change, democratisation, human rights).

**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** On the question of regime change in Iran, there is structural alignment between the foundation's position (democratisation, human rights) and the assessment that the Iranian regime is unstable and in need of reform. The foundation has an institutional interest in the relevance of its Middle East expertise.

D1 Conflict of interest: -1 — Foundation close to the Greens on regime change topic

D2 Personal risk: +1 — Institutionally embedded; moderate risk

D3 Subject expertise: +2 — Middle East expertise present and recognised

D4 Opinion consistency: +1 — Consistent line discernible

D5 Emotionalisation vs. data: +1 — Predominantly analytical

D6 Source level: 0 — Secondary analysis

**TOTAL: +4 → SOURCE INDICATOR: YELLOW**

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** A counter-perspective (e.g. a realist security expert who assesses regime stability differently, or an expert who describes the Revolutionary Guards as less monolithic) is not cited. Scheller's assessment is presented as the only expert perspective.

**IMPORTANT:** The reporter's mention of "which is close to the German Greens" is correct and transparent. However, it is not discussed as a limitation of neutrality but treated as a side remark. This is insufficient for a main news broadcast that cites a politically affiliated foundation as the only external expert authority on a highly political topic.

### Legal and methodological classification

#### No finding of fact

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

#### No legal ruling

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

#### No proof of causality

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

#### No 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.



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

**Heuristic  
comparison  
instrument**

The index serves for comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not for 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. Opinions and commentary must be recognisable as such.
- Art. 4 para. 4 RTVA: In the totality of editorial broadcasts, the diversity of events and opinions must be adequately expressed (requirement of diversity).

#### Core obligations

---

1. **Accuracy:** Accurate presentation 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): Examines complaints against broadcast programmes for violation 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).

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

## The following books are available 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. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with many examples. In addition, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques — this promotes not only insight but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



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

Those who do not know this provide material. Good quotes that are cut incorrectly. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers that are framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolkit — for everyone who has a microphone in front of their face and wants to know what they can do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three basic principles of sovereignty — anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what counts after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for everyone who is exposed and wants to understand how the game works. So that they stop playing along — and start shaping it.

In A5. Direct. For preparation, 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 more confidence. And can no longer so easily have a frame imposed on them that someone else has chosen.

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

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year — compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can lodge a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the ICA, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

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

This analysis lays the system bare — factually, precisely, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional law examination 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 primarily protects the system it was supposed to control.

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