

Project Report

Quality of Armenian TV and Radio media

Report on third round of coding (June-July 2006)
Final report

Nvard Melkonyan
Anna Zhamakochyan
Evelina Gyulkhandanyan

Yerevan, January 2007

Caucasus Media Institute
and
Institute of Applied Media Studies IAM
Zurich University of Applied Sciences Winterthur ZHW



Zürcher
Hochschule
Winterthur

Institut für Angewandte
Medienwissenschaft

iam

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgments..... | 4 |
| 1. Introduction | 5 |
| 2. Sample | 7 |
| 3. Facts and Remarks: Common indicators of TV and Radio news | 9 |
| 3.1 Technical aspects of TV and Radio news | 9 |
| 3.1.1 Duration of TV and Radio news | 9 |
| 3.1.2 Openers | 9 |
| 3.1.3 Actual time context..... | 10 |
| 3.1.4 Reference to former time (Time backwards) | 11 |
| 3.1.5 Future points of time | 12 |
| 3.2 Topics..... | 12 |
| 3.2.1 Reference and orientation of Radio and TV channels | 16 |
| 3.3 Geographical reference | 17 |
| 3.3.1 Domestic/foreign orientation..... | 17 |
| 3.3.2 According to topic groups | 18 |
| 3.3.3 Regions in Armenia | 19 |
| 3.3.4 What foreign countries?..... | 19 |
| 3.4 Actors..... | 20 |
| 3.4.1 Who are the actors?..... | 20 |
| 3.4.2 Number of actors | 22 |
| 3.4.3 Political affiliation – not balanced | 24 |
| 3.5 Sources..... | 25 |
| 3.5.1 Source numbers..... | 25 |
| 3.5.2. Transparency of sources | 27 |
| 3.5.3 Comparison between actors and sources | 28 |
| 3.5.4 Context of sources | 30 |
| 3.5.5 Direct speech..... | 31 |
| 3.6 Special quality indicators | 34 |
| 3.6.1 Depth levels – indicator of completeness | 34 |
| 3.7 Perspective | 35 |
| 3.7.1 Perspective in general..... | 35 |
| 3.7.2 Perspective in different topics | 36 |
| 3.8 Angles | 37 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.9 Journalist's Opinion | 38 |
| 3.9.1 Transparency of opinion | 38 |
| 3.9.2 Political favorability of opinion..... | 39 |
| 4. Special indicators of TV news | 41 |
| 4.1 Technical aspects of pictures | 41 |
| 4.1.1 Number of scenes | 41 |
| 4.1.2 Frequency of scenes' changes | 41 |
| 4.1.3 Standing pictures | 43 |
| 4.1.4 Use of Archives..... | 43 |
| 4.2 Picture Topics | 44 |
| 4.2.1 What topics are shown? | 44 |
| 4.3 Picture Places..... | 45 |
| 4.3.1 Place of scenery | 45 |
| 4.3.2 Geographical reference | 46 |
| 4.4 Picture Actors | 47 |
| 4.4.1 Presentation of Actors | 47 |
| 4.4.2 Comparison between picture actors and text actors | 47 |
| 4.4.3 Percentage of picture actors speaking in direct speech..... | 49 |
| 5. Special indicators of Radio news: Peculiarities of Soundbits | 52 |
| 5.1 Technical aspects of soundbits | 52 |
| 5.1.1 Number of soundbit providers..... | 52 |
| 5.1.2 Frequency of soundbits | 52 |
| 5.2 Content aspects of soundbits | 53 |
| 5.2.1 Context of soundbits..... | 53 |
| 5.2.2 Do the soundbits provide additional information? | 54 |
| 5.2.3 Emotional context of soundbits | 55 |
| 5.3 Who are the soundbit providers ? | 55 |
| 5.3.1 Presentation of soundbit providers | 55 |
| 5.3.2 Comparison between soundbit providers and text actors | 55 |
| 5.3.3 Soundbit providers according to text topics..... | 57 |
| 5.3.4 Soundbit providers according to soundbit duration | 58 |
| 5.3.5 Soundbit providers according to soundbit frequency | 60 |
| Summary | 62 |
| Annex..... | 68 |

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the experts of the Institute of Applied Media Studies (IAM), Winterthur/Switzerland Christoph Spurk and Guido Keel, the director of the Caucasus Media Institute Alexander Iskandaryan, the project supervisor Nina Iskandaryan and the coordinator in Armenia Arevhat Grigoryan for their contribution to the project implementation.

Special thanks also to SPSS Switzerland for providing SPSS 14 analytical software.

1. Introduction

The level of democracy in each society is defined by the correspondence of the democratic principles of functioning institutions. Among these institutions media has its unique place as a guarantor for democracy. The necessary conditions for democratic media to function are the accuracy of the published information, news actuality, transparency and efficacy.

In the Republic of Armenia media functioning under independence period has its peculiarities, conditioned by the historical fundamentals of formation and by the determinants of the consuming audience.

According to the results of sociological surveys, today the main source of information is TV for the majority of population in Armenia (83%), radio - for 12-15%, press – for only 10%¹.

These indicators put quite serious questions towards the experts in regard to the quantitative and moreover the qualitative aspects of media. This concerns the work estimation of Armenian media.

Within the framework of the “Media quality monitoring² “ project as a result of joint efforts of the specialists of Zurich University of Applied Sciences (ZHW)³, Media Institute of Applied Sciences and Yerevan based Caucasus Media Institute a tool of media monitoring and quantitative estimation of quality of reporting was developed, which through detailed observation was firstly tested on print and then on broadcast media in Armenia.

This report summarizes the results of the third phase, including data analysis of radio and TV news monitoring on May-June 2006. The data were analyzed through SPSS software.

The survey mythology, the detailed description of the tool and the criteria of the quality estimation are depicted within the report “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media on second round of coding.⁴

Results of the third phase were analyzed on the basis of the logic and structure of the report on the second round of coding “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media”, which affords an opportunity to carry out comparative analysis, comparing the results of different phases of the survey.⁵

¹ G.A.Poghosyan, “Armenian society in transformation”, “Lusabats” Publishing house, Yerevan, 2003.

² Monitoring the Quality of Journalistic Reporting

³ Zurich University of Applied Sciences Winterthur ZHW

⁴ Christoph Spurk and Guido Keel, “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media”, “Report on second round of coding (October 2005)”, Winterthur, 2006,

http://www.iam.zhwin.ch/download/finalreport_Armenia_1.pdf

⁵ We consider the comparability of two phases possible, although the monitored periods for two phases were different: one week during the second phase and two weeks during the third one were monitored.

It's due of mentioning that data analysis of this phase of survey was conducted by the specialists of the Caucasus Media Institute.

2. Sample

The selection of the information sources for the survey's realization was done taking into consideration the principle of whether the channels are private or public; TV channels and radio stations were chosen by diversity of angles they represent.⁶ The selection includes public TV and radio channels, as well as one TV and one private radio channel, which, according to experts, mostly provide the angles of opposition for the society.

On May and June 2006 (29.05.06-7.07.06) the newscasts of the following channels were monitored:

Table TVR-01⁷ Monitored Radio and TV newscasts

| Medium | | News program |
|--------|--------------|--------------|
| TV | H1 | Haylur, 360° |
| | Shant | Horizon |
| Radio | Public Radio | Radiolur |
| | Liberty | Lurer |

On the whole 14 TV and 14 Radio newscasts, i.e. sunday analytical news programs and daily newscasts have been monitored. The ratio of the daily monitored news in each program is given in the below mentioned table.⁸

Table TVR-02 Number of monitored news on each channel according to days

| Medium Date | H1 | Shant | TV Total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|----------------|----|-------|-------------|----|---------|----------------|
| 10606 | 19 | 10 | 29 | 24 | 26 | 50 |
| 10706 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 29 | 50 | 79 |
| 20706 | 0 | 4 | 0 | - | - | - |
| 40606 | 7 | 18 | 29 | 7 | 17 | 24 |
| 40706 | 18 | 8 | 26 | 27 | 33 | 60 |
| 70606 | 14 | 9 | 23 | 34 | 26 | 60 |
| 70706 | 23 | 9 | 32 | 30 | 23 | 53 |

⁶ It is considered that the standpoints of Public TV and Radio are more pro-governmental, compared with the private channels "Shant" and "Liberty".

⁷ Henceforth the tables referring to Radio will be indicated with R, TV tables - with TV, and the integral ones - TVR.

⁸ All the news, except of sport ones were monitored in each newscast.

Quality of Armenian TV and Radio media

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 100606 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 28 | 17 | 45 |
| 110606 | 6 | 0 | 6 | - | - | - |
| 130606 | 16 | 9 | 25 | 27 | 28 | 55 |
| 160606 | 21 | 10 | 31 | 32 | 30 | 62 |
| 190606 | 18 | 10 | 28 | 27 | 36 | 63 |
| 220606 | 20 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| 250606 | 5 | 18 | 23 | 6 | 11 | 17 |
| 280606 | 18 | 12 | 30 | 32 | 26 | 58 |
| 290506 | 22 | 14 | 36 | 27 | 20 | 47 |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 | 330 | 363 | 693 |

H1= Armenian Public TV Channel; PR=Armenian Public Radio

Results are given by counts (N).

3. Facts and Remarks: Common indicators of TV and Radio news

3.1 Technical aspects of TV and Radio news

A range of statistical data revealed in regard to news, make possible to examine the overall technical picture of the programs (length, presence/absence of opener), to compare and confront the differences of organizing technical aspects of different media.

3.1.1 Duration of TV and Radio news

The duration of TV and Radio news was measured by seconds. To measure the proportion of relatively short, mid-length and long programs the data of radio and TV news were grouped within different intervals taking into consideration their peculiarities.

From the table TV-01 it is obvious, that 90 seconds news is mostly characteristic to Armenian media. Short and mid-length news are balanced on Shant.

Short news are characteristic mostly to radio news, then 91 second news, considered as long ones (Table R-02).

Table TV-01 Percentage of different TV news lengths on each channel

| <i>Length in seconds</i> | Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Short (0-90 seconds) | | 58.3% | 35.8% | 49.3% |
| Medium (91-180 seconds) | | 23.3% | 35.8% | 28.3% |
| Long (181 and more seconds) | | 18.4% | 28.4% | 22.4% |
| Total % | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | | 223 | 148 | 371 |

Table R-02 Percentage of different Radio news lengths on each channel

| <i>Length in seconds</i> | Medium | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------|-------------|
| Short (0-30 seconds) | | 40.0% | 36.6% | 38.2% |
| Medium (31-90 seconds) | | 23.0% | 25.9% | 24.5% |
| Long (91 and more seconds) | | 37.0% | 37.5% | 37.2% |
| Total % | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | | 330 | 363 | 693 |

3.1.2 Openers

32.3% of TV news has openers, 27.1%- Radio

Table TVR1 Percentage of openers on each channel

| Opener \ Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 36.8% | 25.7% | 32.3% | 32.4% | 22.3% | 27.1% |
| Total N | 330 | 363 | 693 | 330 | 363 | 693 |

Viewing the presence of opener by topics, it becomes obvious, that among all the topics of TV and Radio news the highest percentage is for political news (TV_{total} -21.7% “ Radio_{total} - 34.0%), then for the topics related to crime (TV_{total} - 20.8, Radio_{total} 22.9%). News about economy have 10.8% opener. And the smallest percentage of openers is for science and religion. It is worth to mention, that during two-week monitoring the topic “war “ as an opener has not been remarked at all.

Table TVR2 Percentage of openers for each topic by channels

| Topic Groups | TV | | Radio | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| | Opener | | Opener | |
| | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Science | 0.8% | 0.8% | .5% | 1.2% |
| Culture | 2.5% | 5.6% | 6.4% | 4.4% |
| Religion | 1.7% | 3.2% | 1.1% | 0.2% |
| Sports | 5.8% | 2.8% | 1.6% | 2.8% |
| Other | 2.5% | 6.8% | 1.6% | 1.6% |
| High Politics | 21.7% | 24.7% | 34.0% | 24.2% |
| History | 5.8% | 1.6% | 2.1% | 2.0% |
| War | 3.3% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 8.3% |
| Foreign affairs | 7.5% | 12.0% | 8.5% | 23.0% |
| Crime and events | 20.8% | 12.7% | 22.9% | 15.4% |
| Social development issues | 9.2% | 8.4% | 11.2% | 6.7% |
| Economics | 10.8% | 16.7% | 9.6% | 8.7% |
| National security | 7.5% | 2.8% | 0.5% | 1.6% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

3.1.3 Actual time context

Reference to different time dimensions is one of the most important criteria of quality estimation⁹ of reporting. The monitoring of Armenian media shows, that news

⁹ “To report the recent developments and events in time is one of the main features of news reporting.

with no any time dimension is a usual case. The calculation of absence of time reference is given in the Table TVR3. It makes clear, that the percentages of news with no reference to time dimensions both on TV and on radio are mainly balanced. “Shant” is an exception, in the case of which the percentage of indefinable cases is the smallest (H1 – 27,2%, Shant – 16,7%, Public radio – 23,3%, Liberty – 24,1%):

Table TVR3 Percentage of undefinable time reference on each channel

| Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Indefinable | 27.2% | 16.7% | 23.2% | 23.3% | 24.1% | 23.7% |
| N | 58 | 22 | 80 | 64 | 79 | 143 |

Missed and “none” cases are excluded.

Results close to each other with these technical indicators, that is form of provision and peculiarities, are observed on one hand between the public media–Public TV and Public Radio, on the other hand between the private ones – Shant and Liberty.

Table TVR4 shows that all the types of media cover mainly the most recent developments. During the monitored period, radio news covered different current events more often: yesterday’s events on radio were remarked by 7.4% more than on TV.

Table TVR4 Reference to time dimensions/the most recent developments

| Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|-----------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Timeliness | | | | | | |
| Yesterday | 66.5% | 68.2% | 67.2% | 77.7% | 71.9% | 74.6% |
| last week | 14.8% | 11.8% | 13.6% | 12.8% | 16.1% | 14.6% |
| Last month | 3.2% | 2.7% | 3.0% | 4.3% | 0.8% | 2.4% |
| Less than last month | 15.5% | 17.3% | 16.2% | 5.2% | 11.2% | 8.5% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 155 | 110 | 265 | 211 | 249 | 460 |

“None”, “indefinable” and missing cases are excluded.

3.1.4 Reference to former time (Time backwards)¹⁰

We separated 6 main points, each of them showing the percentage of reference to different time dimensions both in the past, and in the future for any monitored media.

However, the information should often be put into the context and greater time frames to make it more meaningful and adding to orientation. Therefore the points of time in the articles and TV news were estimated”. Christoph Spurk and Guido Keel, “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media”, “Report on second round of coding (October 2005)”, Winterthur, 2006, pg.14

¹⁰ “News usually makes also a reference to former points of time. We have estimated several time spans up to historical dimensions. It can be considered as a contribution to comprehensiveness when there are references to different points of time in the past in the same article”. See Christoph Spurk and Guido Keel, “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media”, “Report on second round of coding (October 2005)”, Winterthur, 2006, page 15

The below mentioned table shows, that all the five points of time were referred to at once only by Liberty in very rare cases. But generally there were no time dimensions at all both on TV and on radio (TV_{total}=51,8%, Radio_{total}=54,9%), and in the case of reference there was only one point of time mentioned (TV_{total} =34%, Radio_{total}=26,6%).

Table TVR5 Reference to different time dimensions

| Medium <i>Time References</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| 0 time points | 54.7% | 47.3% | 51.8% | 56.1% | 53.9% | 54.9% |
| 1 time points | 33.2% | 35.1% | 34.0% | 28.8% | 24.6% | 26.6% |
| 2 time points | 9.0% | 12.2% | 10.2% | 11.5% | 12.7% | 12.1% |
| 3 time points | 2.2% | 4.7% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 7.5% | 5.3% |
| 4 time points | 0.9% | 0.7% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 1.1% | 0.9% |
| 5 time points | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.1% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 | 330 | 362 | 692 |

An “indefinable” radio case is excluded.

3.1.5 Future points of time

Another characteristic feature of journalism reporting is the presence of forward-looking statement¹¹. Almost half of all the programs refer to the possible developments of the events in the future (Table TVR6).

Table TVR-6 Reference to future

| Medium <i>References To future points</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Yes | 56.1% | 50.7% | 53.9% | 41.5% | 41.0% | 41.3% |
| No | 43.9% | 49.3% | 46.1% | 58.5% | 59.0% | 58.7% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 | 330 | 363 | 693 |

3.2 Topics

Topics too were analyzed during this monitoring. There were 35 possible topics chosen. The coders selected the topic according to the given news. Afterwards some topics were grouped within bigger topic groups for further analysis.

¹¹ Does the article make any statement about the meaning of the issue/problem in the future?(**consequences**, etc.) Christoph Spurk and Guido Keel, “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media”, “Report on second round of coding (October 2005)”, Winterthur, 2006

Both TV and radio refer mostly to the topic “High politics” ($TV_{total}=23,7\%$ and $Radio_{total}=26,8\%$), whereas such topics like culture and science rarely deserve the reporters attention.

Comparison

Comparing the data of “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media: Report on second round of coding” 2006¹² with those of this phase, it is noticeable, that the results of the topics on broadcast are almost the same, if especially taking into consideration the peculiarities of current events of each phase and their influences and reflection on the broadcast.

This time too, like in the previous phases of monitoring¹³ the topics “Migration” ($TV_{total} - 0\%$ and $Radio_{total} - 0,4\%$) and “Regional integration of South Caucasus” ($TV_{total} - 1,9\%$ and $Radio_{total} -1,2\%$) deserved less attention of the journalists. Moreover, during the two weeks of monitoring there was no any coverage of “Migration” on TV, where it is a very acute problem for Armenia and deserves consideration. This time like in the previous case, the social topics (education, health, environment, social problems, media) were referred to the utmost of 10%.

Here the proposed thesis¹⁴, that the local reporters tend to tell the society about the events easy to acquire, seems to be grounded. The results of the regularly conducted monitoring for about two years allow also to argue that the broadcast is occupied mostly by the topics on politics and crime, already acute, up-to-date and more often discussed in Armenian reality, Those make the biggest part of the information and time extension of news.

Comparing the allocation of TV and Radio topics it is noticeable that although the percentage of broadcasting of different topics is mainly the same (Table TVR8), anyway there is certain regularity depending on the type of media and on the topics. Radio refers to the topics *Crime and Events* and *Politics* more often. In the following table the sign (+) indicates the media, which covers a particular topic by greater percentage.

Table TVR7- Topic preferences on radio and on TV

| Medium \ Topic groups | TV | Radio |
|-----------------------|----|-------|
| High Politics | | + |
| History | + | |
| National security | + | |
| War | | + |

¹² Table A11, pg.17, ". Christoph Spurk and Guido Keel, “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media”, “Report on second round of coding (October 2005)”, Winterthur, 2006

¹³ Ibid, page 16, (the results of May 2005 monitoring are also mentioned)

¹⁴ Ibid, page 16

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Foreign affairs | | + |
| Crime and events | | + |
| Social development issues | + | |
| Economics | + | |
| Culture+Science | | + |
| Religion | + | |
| Sports | + | |
| Other | + | |

Table TVR8 Topics of Armenian media

| Topics | Groups | TV total – In % of news | Radio total – In % of news |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | High politics | 23.7% | 26.8% |
| <i>Karabakh</i> | | 5.7% | 6.3% |
| <i>Constitutional reform</i> | | 0.3% | 0.9% |
| <i>Political Reform</i> | | 4.9% | 1.3% |
| <i>Elections</i> | | 1.1% | 3.0% |
| <i>Regional integration South Caucasus</i> | | 1.9% | 1.2% |
| <i>International integration of Armenia</i> | | 1.3% | 1.3% |
| <i>Migration, refugees</i> | | 0.0% | 0.4% |
| <i>Pure politics</i> | | 8.6% | 12.4% |
| | History | 3.0% | 2.0% |
| <i>Armenian genocide</i> | | 0.5% | 1.3% |
| <i>Other history</i> | | 2.4% | 0.7% |
| | National security | 4.3% | 1.3% |
| <i>National security</i> | | 4.3% | 1.3% |
| | War | 2.4% | 6.1% |
| <i>War</i> | | 2.4% | 5.1% |
| <i>Civil war</i> | | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| | Foreign affairs | 10.5% | 19.0% |
| <i>Conflict resolution, peace talks</i> | | 3.0% | 7.6% |
| <i>Pure foreign affairs</i> | | 7.5% | 11.4% |
| | Crime + Events | 15.4% | 17.5% |
| <i>Riots/demonstrations etc.</i> | | 1.1% | 1.7% |
| <i>Ordinary crime</i> | | 6.2% | 6.9% |
| <i>Legal cases</i> | | 0.8% | 2.7% |
| <i>Corruption / Organized crime</i> | | 0.8% | 2.2% |
| <i>Miscellaneous events</i> | | 6.5% | 3.9% |
| | Social development issues | 8.6% | 7.9% |
| <i>Education</i> | | 0.8% | 1.0% |
| <i>Health</i> | | 1.3% | 0.9% |
| <i>Environment</i> | | 2.4% | 1.4% |
| <i>Media</i> | | 0.8% | 0.4% |
| <i>Social problems</i> | | 3.2% | 4.2% |

| Topics | Groups | TV total – In % of news | Radio total – In % of news |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Economics | 14.8% | 8.9% |
| <i>Infrastructure</i> | | 5.4% | 2.6% |
| <i>Industry, business, companies</i> | | 3.2% | 3.0% |
| <i>Finances</i> | | 3.5% | 2.3% |
| <i>Agriculture</i> | | 2.2% | 0.1% |
| <i>Rest of economics</i> | | 0.5% | 0.9% |
| | Culture + Science | 5.4% | 5.9% |
| <i>Culture</i> | | 4.6% | 4.9% |
| <i>Science</i> | | 0.8% | 1.0% |
| | Religion | 2.7% | 0.4% |
| <i>Religion</i> | | 2.7% | .4% |
| | Sports | 3.8% | 2.5% |
| <i>Sports</i> | | 3.8% | 2.5% |
| | Other | 5.4% | 1.6% |
| Total % | | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | | 371 news | 693 news |

3.2.1 Reference and orientation of Radio and TV channels

It is interesting also to compare radio and TV news by their topic preference.

High Politics

The two TV channels devote their broadcasts to the coverage of Politics almost by the same percentage (H1-23,8% and Shant-23,6%). References to political news on Public Radio and Radio Liberty are a bit more (25,8% and 26,8%. In spite of the little difference (to 3%), radio news is more politicized than TV news.

Crime and events

The next more frequently discussed topics *crime and events* also are more often covered by Radio (Public-17,3%, Liberty-17,6%). Public TV has the smallest percent of reference to *crime and events*-14.8%. This topic on Shant forms 16.2% of the whole.

Social development issues

Social development issues are relatively less covered by Radio Liberty-7,4%. This topic is referred to by 8,5% both by Public TV and Public radio. Shant's reference is 8,8% .

Culture and Science

The monitored media cover culture almost equally - by 4%-5% frequency. During two- week monitoring the news program “Horizon” on Shant didn’t refer to the topic *science* at least once. This topic was relatively often covered on Public Radio and Public TV-1.2% and 1.3%.

It is remarkable, that the topics differ depending on the type of media: the selection of TV and Radio topics is not correlated to the Public and private status of the media.

Table TVR9 Percentage of different topic groups on each channel

| Medium <i>Topic groups</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------------|
| Science | 1.3% | 0.0% | 0.8% | 1.2% | 0.8% | 1.0% |
| Culture | 4.9% | 4.1% | 4.6% | 5.5% | 4.4% | 4.9% |
| Religion | 2.2% | 3.4% | 2.7% | .9% | 0.0% | 0.4% |
| Sports | 5.4% | 1.4% | 3.8% | 2.1% | 2.8% | 2.5% |
| Other | 2.2% | 10.1% | 5.4% | 0.9% | 2.2% | 1.6% |
| High Politics | 23.8% | 23.6% | 23.7% | 25.8% | 27.8% | 26.8% |
| History | 4.9% | 0.0% | 3.0% | 2.4% | 1.7% | 2.0% |
| War | 4.0% | 0.0% | 2.4% | 7.0% | 5.2% | 6.1% |
| Foreign affairs | 9.0% | 12.8% | 10.5% | 17.3% | 20.7% | 19.0% |
| Crime and events | 14.8% | 16.2% | 15.4% | 17.3% | 17.6% | 17.5% |
| Social development issues | 8.5% | 8.8% | 8.6% | 8.5% | 7.4% | 7.9% |
| Economics | 14.3% | 15.5% | 14.8% | 10.3% | 7.7% | 8.9% |
| National security | 4.5% | 4.1% | 4.3% | 0.9% | 1.7% | 1.3% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 | 330 | 363 | 693 |

N = absolute number of news for each channel

3.3 Geographical reference

With the help of the next points the geographical expansion of the news was investigated

3.3.1 Domestic/foreign orientation

The table TVR10 shows, that almost half of the news, that is 44% on TV and 35.4% on Radio cover topics *related to Armenia only*. 31.4% of TV news and 19.5% of Radio news cover topics *related to Armenia and/or foreign country*. The overall percentage amount of TV news somehow referring to Nagorno Karabakh is 5.7%

(0.3%+0%+1.6%+3.8%), and of Radio news - 11.3% (1.6%+1%+1.7%+7%): Hence Radio turns to Karabakh twice more often.

Table TVR10 Geographical reference by each channel

| Geographical orientation Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Armenia only | 41.2% | 49.3% | 44.4% | 35.9% | 34.9% | 35.4% |
| Karabakh only | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 1.8% | 1.4% | 1.6% |
| Armenia and Karabakh | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.9% | 1.1% | 1.0% |
| Armenia and foreign country | 30.3% | 33.1% | 31.4% | 22.1% | 17.2% | 19.5% |
| Karabakh and foreign country | 1.4% | 2.0% | 1.6% | 2.8% | 0.8% | 1.7% |
| Armenia, Karabakh and foreign country | 5.0% | 2.0% | 3.8% | 8.6% | 5.5% | 7.0% |
| Foreign country only | 20.4% | 13.5% | 17.6% | 27.3% | 37.7% | 32.8% |
| No geographical reference | 1.4% | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 1.4% | 1.0% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 221 | 148 | 369 | 326 | 361 | 687 |

Missed cases are excluded.

3.3.2 According to topic groups

Viewing the geographical orientations marked by the points *Armenia only* and *Foreign country only* according to the topics, it becomes obvious, that during monitoring period there are no topics about *High Politics* at all within TV news, and they form 7.6% in Radio news. If in the case of print media (see “Quality of Armenian Radio and TV media”, “Report on second round of coding (October 2005)”) topics on *Crime and events* at 70% - 50% referred mainly to a *Foreign country*, then in the case of TV and radio this topic prevails within the news referring to *Armenia only* (TV_{total}= 53,6% - *Armenia only* and 21,4% - *Foreign country only*, Radio_{total}=39,2% - *Armenia only*, 36,7% - *Foreign country only*):

Topics related to *Armenia only* are also dominant within *Social development issues*, but this time the difference is more significant (see tableTVR11). The same is for the topics on *Economics*.

Table TVR11 Geographical references by topics and by channels

| Topics | Geographical orientation | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| High Politics | <i>Armenia only</i> | 34.0% | 51.4% | 40.9% | 44.7% | 49.0% | 47.0% |
| | <i>Foreign country only</i> | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.7% | 10.0% | 7.6% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | <i>Total N</i> | 53 | 35 | 88 | 85 | 100 | 185 |
| Crime and events | <i>Armenia only</i> | 43.8% | 66.7% | 53.6% | 44.6% | 34.4% | 39.2% |
| | <i>Foreign country only</i> | 25.0% | 16.7% | 21.4% | 23.2% | 48.4% | 36.7% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 32 | 24 | 56 | 56 | 64 | 120 |
| Social development issues | <i>Armenia only</i> | 78.9% | 84.6% | 81.3% | 57.7% | 73.1% | 65.4% |
| | <i>Foreign country only</i> | 5.3% | 0.0% | 3.1% | 26.9% | 11.5% | 19.2% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 19 | 13 | 32 | 26 | 26 | 52 |
| Economics | <i>Armenia only</i> | 67.7% | 65.2% | 66.7% | 63.6% | 42.9% | 54.1% |
| | <i>Foreign country only</i> | 19.4% | 13.0% | 16.7% | 18.2% | 21.4% | 19.7% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 31 | 23 | 54 | 33 | 28 | 61 |

3.3.3 Regions in Armenia

The results of the second phase¹⁵ show, that TV news about the capital are more of the news about the regions by 5,1%. For this phase the difference is 1,8% for TV and 9,9% for Radio: the news about Yerevan are again dominant. Viewing this issue more detailed for each channel separately, then it is notable, that only in the case of Shant the news about Yerevan are less than those about marzes (Yerevan-11,0%, marzes-15,1%). Yet it doesn't mean that Shant has regional orientation in general, but it is conditioned by the channel's relations to only one marz-Shirak and the tradition of covering the problems in this marz. With great difference marzes are "disregarded" also by Radio Liberty (Yerevan-21,3% and marzes- 5,9%).

Table TVR12 Regional expansion/Armenia-marzes distribution

Percentage of news with different geographical references in Armenia

| Medium <i>Regions in Armenia</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Yerevan | 20.2% | 11.0% | 16.2% | 13.9% | 21.3% | 17.8% |
| Marzes | 13.8% | 15.1% | 14.4% | 9.8% | 5.9% | 7.8% |
| Armenia whole | 66.0% | 74.0% | 69.5% | 76.2% | 72.8% | 74.4% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 94 | 73 | 167 | 122 | 136 | 258 |

Cases with "not only Armenia" are excluded.

3.3.4 What foreign countries?

According to the results of 2005 October Monitoring, among TV news about different foreign countries the highest percentage had the news about Europe, then - South Caucasus and USA¹⁶. In 2006 monitoring on both Radio and TV topics about South Caucasus prevail mainly (TV_{total} = 26,6%, Radio_{total}=25,9%). The second place is

¹⁵ Ibid, page 21

¹⁶ Ibid, page 21

taken by Russia (TV_{total}=17,1%, Radio_{total}=13,6%). Then news referring to Europe has high percentage on all channels with the exception of Shant, which refers to Turkey as often as to Russia (21.6%). It is due of mentioning that Shant is distinguished by its special references devoted to Turkish news.

This time the USA has very low percentage and occupies the last places on the list among all the other countries.

Table TVR13. Foreign countries on each channel

| Medium <i>Foreign countries</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Southern Caucasus | 19.2% | 39.2% | 26.6% | 30.1% | 21.9% | 25.9% |
| Turkey | 8.8% | 21.6% | 13.6% | 4.3% | 5.5% | 4.9% |
| Iran | 4.8% | 1.4% | 3.5% | 5.7% | 8.2% | 7.0% |
| Russia | 14.4% | 21.6% | 17.1% | 13.4% | 13.7% | 13.6% |
| CIS | 7.2% | 4.1% | 6.0% | 3.8% | 9.1% | 6.5% |
| Europe | 16.0% | 4.1% | 11.6% | 13.4% | 11.9% | 12.6% |
| USA | 8.8% | 5.4% | 7.5% | 8.1% | 10.5% | 9.3% |
| Rest of world | 20.8% | 2.7% | 14.1% | 21.1% | 19.2% | 20.1% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 125 | 74 | 199 | 209 | 219 | 428 |

Cases with "Armenia only" are excluded.

3.4 Actors

3.4.1 Who are the actors?

Who are the main actors on broadcast? Are they representatives of mostly political or elite sphere, or the society and its separate groups? Table TVR14 shows that TV and radio broadcasts cover international actors more often; 26,6% and 31,1% correspondingly¹⁷. Then with not great difference the *political actors* take the second place, 20, 8% on TV and 21, 9% on radio broadcasts.

In comparison with the previous 2005 monitoring results actors of *civil society and general public* though with not great difference are presented more often on TV (in 2006 *civil society*- 2, 4%, *general public* -11, 9%; in 2005 *civil society*- 1, 9%, *general Public* -9, 8%). The percentage balance of these two actors on radio is the following: *civil*

¹⁷ Compared with the results of the second phase actor groups are presented by the same turn. See *ibid*, page 22, table A17.

society- 2, 4% and *general public* -8, 7%. In the case of separate (non-grouped) actors the highest percentages have:

1. *foreign political bodies* – 18,9% (TV_{total}) and 24,6% (Radio_{total})
2. *central authorities* – 10,5% (TV_{total}) and 8,3% (Radio_{total})
3. *person from general public* – 10,3 % (TV_{total}) and 7,9% (Radio_{total})

In fact according to just the quantitative indicators the society takes the third place as an actor in Armenian media and doesn't almost give place to *local administration* taking the second place.

Table TVR14 The main actors by radio and by TV channels

| Actors Groups | TV % of all actors | | | Radio % of all actors | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
| Political actors | 20.8% | 20.7% | 20.8% | 24.1% | 20.0% | 21.9% |
| <i>President of Armenia</i> | 3.4% | 3.5% | 3.4% | 2.5% | 3.0% | 2.8% |
| <i>Central Authorities</i> | 11.9% | 8.2% | 10.5% | 9.1% | 7.5% | 8.3% |
| <i>Parliament</i> | 3.9% | 6.9% | 5.1% | 5.1% | 2.8% | 3.9% |
| <i>Political party</i> | 1.5% | 2.1% | 1.8% | 7.4% | 6.6% | 7.0% |
| Local Administration | 10.8% | 7.4% | 9.5% | 8.9% | 9.9% | 9.5% |
| <i>Local administrations</i> | 2.0% | 2.7% | 2.3% | 3.0% | 1.5% | 2.2% |
| <i>Judiciary</i> | 2.9% | 0.3% | 1.9% | 1.6% | 3.2% | 2.4% |
| <i>Police</i> | 2.0% | 2.1% | 2.1% | 0.9% | 2.3% | 1.6% |
| <i>Military</i> | 3.8% | 2.4% | 3.2% | 3.4% | 3.0% | 3.2% |
| Economic actors | 5.8% | 3.2% | 4.8% | 5.1% | 5.3% | 5.2% |
| <i>Entrepreneurs, business people</i> | 1.5% | 0.3% | 1.0% | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.2% |
| <i>International business people</i> | 4.1% | 2.7% | 3.5% | 1.4% | 2.1% | 1.8% |
| <i>Employees</i> | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 1.7% | 0.7% | 1.2% |
| Civil society | 1.7% | 3.5% | 2.4% | 4.1% | 1.0% | 2.4% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., national NGO</i> | 0.7% | 2.1% | 1.2% | 3.0% | 0.6% | 1.7% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., international NGO</i> | 1.0% | 1.3% | 1.1% | 1.1% | 0.5% | .7% |
| International actors | 26.3% | 27.1% | 26.6% | 29.7% | 35.9% | 33.1% |
| <i>Inter-governmental organization</i> | 5.5% | 4.5% | 5.1% | 5.4% | 7.9% | 6.7% |
| <i>Foreign political bodies</i> | 17.7% | 20.7% | 18.9% | 22.0% | 26.8% | 24.6% |
| <i>Foreign country as an actor</i> | 3.1% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 2.4% | 1.2% | 1.8% |
| Professionals | 13.5% | 19.9% | 16.0% | 16.6% | 14.0% | 15.2% |
| <i>Culture</i> | 5.8% | 6.4% | 6.0% | 4.2% | 5.4% | 4.9% |
| <i>Churches, religious leaders</i> | 1.0% | 2.7% | 1.7% | 1.2% | 0.2% | 0.7% |
| <i>Media</i> | 1.7% | 3.7% | 2.5% | 6.1% | 4.8% | 5.4% |
| <i>Science/education</i> | 4.9% | 7.2% | 5.8% | 5.1% | 3.5% | 4.2% |

| Diaspora | 1.0% | 0.8% | 0.9% | 1.3% | 0.2% | 0.7% |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|
| <i>Diaspora</i> | 1.0% | 0.8% | 0.9% | 1.3% | 0.2% | 0.7% |
| General Public | 11.4% | 12.5% | 11.9% | 7.5% | 9.8% | 8.7% |
| <i>Person from general public</i> | 9.6% | 11.4% | 10.3% | 7.1% | 8.7% | 7.9% |
| Armenia as a nation | 1.9% | 1.1% | 1.6% | 0.4% | 1.1% | 0.8% |
| <i>Author</i> | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.1% |
| <i>Author</i> | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.1% |
| Other | 8.7% | 4.8% | 7.2% | 2.4% | 3.8% | 3.2% |
| <i>Other</i> | 8.7% | 4.8% | 7.2% | 2.4% | 3.8% | 3.2% |
| Total % | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Total N =responses | 586 | 376 | 962 | 760 | 888 | 1648 |

3.4.2 Number of actors

Number of actors in its turn is a specific indicator to estimate the quality of the media.¹⁸ Basing on the quantitative indicators of the data three main groups were separated (see Table TVR15). TV is more inclusive, as it excels radio broadcast in 6 and more actors' by 41,7%. Possibly different actors at the lowest percent are presented on Public Radio – 7,9% and on radio station Liberty – 9, 6%. Shant and Public TV include 6 and more actors in different news by 54, 7% and 46, 2% correspondingly.

Table TVR15 Number of TV and Radio actors according to channels; calculated in mid-length news¹⁹

| Medium <i>Actors number</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|--------|---------|-------------|
| up to 3 actors | 15.4% | 13.2% | 14.3% | 65.8% | 69.1% | 67.6% |
| 4-5 actors | 38.5% | 32.1% | 35.2% | 26.3% | 21.3% | 23.5% |
| 6 and more actors | 46.2% | 54.7% | 50.5% | 7.9% | 9.6% | 8.8% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 52 | 53 | 105 | 76 | 94 | 170 |

Number of actors according to topics

Examining number of actors in different topics, we can see that both Radio and TV present mostly news with about three actors' participation in *high politics*. Radio station Liberty introduces the greatest percentage (39, 6%) with 6 and more actors, and Public Radio presents the least actors within the framework of this topic (20, 0%).

¹⁸ Ibid, page 23 ("A greater number of actors could be the first indicator for the stories to be more comprehensive")

¹⁹ It should be noted that "mid-length" intervals for both radio and TV are different, 31-90 seconds and 91-180 seconds correspondingly.

Comparing the difference between the public and the private TV channels and radio stations, it is notable that indicators of 6 and more actors are higher on private channels than on public ones.

In the case of *foreign affairs* there are 6 and more actors mostly on Public TV (35, 0%) and the least - on radio station Liberty (10, 7%).

Public TV and Radio Liberty are close to each other with the indicators in the case of *crime and events*, by 24,2% and 28,1% correspondingly. In comparison with Public TV and Liberty, Shant (58,3%) and Public Radio (37,5%) have higher percentages in the case of this topic.

TV news on *social development issues* with 6 and more actors is by 15, 7% more from those on radio, and vice versa, radio news on *economics* with 6 and more actors has, though slightly but higher percent (by 1, 5%).

These results show that there is no difference in number selection of the actors between public and private media.

Table TVR17. Number of actors in different topics

| Topics | Actors number | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| High Politics | <i>up to 3 actors</i> | 39.6% | 48.6% | 43.2% | 65.9% | 41.6% | 52.7% |
| | <i>4-5 actors</i> | 26.4% | 14.3% | 21.6% | 14.1% | 18.8% | 16.7% |
| | <i>6 and more actors</i> | 34.0% | 37.1% | 35.2% | 20.0% | 39.6% | 30.6% |
| | Total N | 53 | 35 | 88 | 85 | 101 | 186 |
| Foreign affairs | <i>up to 3 actors</i> | 45.0% | 21.1% | 33.3% | 71.9% | 77.3% | 75.0% |
| | <i>4-5 actors</i> | 20.0% | 47.4% | 33.3% | 19.3% | 12.0% | 15.2% |
| | <i>6 and more actors</i> | 35.0% | 31.6% | 33.3% | 8.8% | 10.7% | 9.8% |
| | Total N | 20 | 19 | 39 | 57 | 75 | 132 |
| Crime and events | <i>up to 3 actors</i> | 60.6% | 20.8% | 43.9% | 61.4% | 46.9% | 53.7% |
| | <i>4-5 actors</i> | 15.2% | 20.8% | 17.5% | 10.5% | 15.6% | 13.2% |
| | <i>6 and more actors</i> | 24.2% | 58.3% | 38.6% | 28.1% | 37.5% | 33.1% |
| | Total N | 33 | 24 | 57 | 57 | 64 | 121 |
| Social development issues | <i>up to 3 actors</i> | 42.1% | 46.2% | 43.8% | 46.4% | 55.6% | 50.9% |
| | <i>4-5 actors</i> | 26.3% | 7.7% | 18.8% | 35.7% | 18.5% | 27.3% |
| | <i>6 and more actors</i> | 31.6% | 46.2% | 37.5% | 17.9% | 25.9% | 21.8% |
| | Total N | 19 | 13 | 32 | 28 | 27 | 55 |
| Economics | <i>up to 3 actors</i> | 50.0% | 34.8% | 43.6% | 64.7% | 46.4% | 56.5% |
| | <i>4-5 actors</i> | 21.9% | 34.8% | 27.3% | 8.8% | 17.9% | 12.9% |
| | <i>6 and more actors</i> | 28.1% | 30.4% | 29.1% | 26.5% | 35.7% | 30.6% |
| | Total N | 9 | 7 | 16 | 34 | 28 | 62 |

3.4.3 Political affiliation – not balanced

Results of the preferred actor²⁰ by this or that station show that on all the channels almost by the same percentage dominate those actors whose political affiliation is not relevant²¹. Table TVR18 introduces also that among coalition and opposition actors, the first, though with not big difference, predominates over the last (H1 – 4, 4%, Shant – 5, 0%, Public Radio – 6, 6%, Liberty – 5, 1%). The slightest presentation difference between these two groups is on Public Radio – 1, 1%. *Independent* actors too are greatly introduced by each channel.

TV involves *independent actors* more by 2, 3%. Public media in its turn covers *independent actors* more often as compared with the private ones, though this difference is not considerable. Such picture is explainable in Armenian reality, taking into consideration also the topics being covered, because many of the weighty political figures related to those topics, for example, the present president and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Armenia Vardan Oskanyan are “*independent*”; have no party affiliation. The data reveal also that *other parties*’ involvement within broadcast is minor.

Table TVR18 Political/Party Affiliation-1

| <i>Political affiliation</i> | TV | | | Radio | | |
|--|--------|--------|----------|--------|---------|-------------|
| | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
| Coalition | 4.4% | 5.0% | 4.7% | 6.6% | 5.1% | 5.8% |
| Opposition | 1.0% | 2.1% | 1.5% | 4.5% | 2.7% | 3.5% |
| Other parties | 0.2% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 1.2% | 2.0% | 1.6% |
| Independent | 12.1% | 7.7% | 10.4% | 9.9% | 6.5% | 8.1% |
| Party affiliation in Armenia not relevant | 63.6% | 58.4% | 61.5% | 62.1% | 64.7% | 63.5% |
| Unknown | 18.6% | 26.8% | 21.8% | 15.8% | 18.9% | 17.5% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 585 | 377 | 962 | 760 | 887 | 1647 |

Excluding all ‘not relevant’ and ‘unknown’ answers, the percentage will be the following:

Table TVR19 Political/Party Affiliation-2

| <i>Political affiliation</i> | Medium | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|-------|----------|----|---------|-------------|
| | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |

²⁰ Ibid, page 24 (“The political affiliation of the actors in Armenian media was assessed to see whether specific actors were preferred.”)

²¹ This refers to all actors from foreign countries and in mixed groups of Armenians when affiliation is not relevant excluding ‘not relevant’ and ‘unknown’.

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Coalition | 27.1% | 37.9% | 30.7% | 29.8% | 31.0% | 30.4% |
| Opposition | 3.4% | 10.3% | 5.7% | 20.2% | 16.6% | 18.5% |
| Other parties | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.4% | 12.4% | 8.6% |
| Independent | 69.5% | 51.7% | 63.6% | 44.6% | 40.0% | 42.5% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 59 | 29 | 88 | 168 | 145 | 313 |

The picture is quite interesting if taking into consideration our first thesis that the private information sources rather than public ones tend to “sound” the opposition message. Data of this table show clearly that if H1, as expected, doesn’t almost cover opposition figures, then the private channel Shant too, which by the way has a reputation for more objective news station among the society, covers the opposition four times less in its news broadcast (*coalition* -37,9 %, *opposition* – 10,3%). If Public Radio and Padio Liberty cover *coalition* figures almost evenly (PR- 29,8%, Liberty – 31%), then though surprising it may seem, Public Radio covers the *opposition* figures more often in its news (20,2%), by the greatest percent among all the channels included through the survey.

The following fact deserves attention too; though TV and radio cover *coalition* almost in balance (30,7% and 30,4% correspondingly), from the point of view of *opposition* coverage, radio excels TV channels for several times (5,7% and 18,5% correspondingly), yet it has been already noted that the main percent form news on Public Radio.

3.5 Sources

3.5.1 Source numbers

One of the most important demands to the professionalism of the journalist is to use different sources while writing a story.²²

The results of two-week monitoring of the Armenian media show that radio channels use mostly one source in their news (H1 – 35, 0%, Shant – 25,7%, Public Radio – 45, 5%, Liberty - 33, 6%).

Cases with no source mentioned meet on public channels rather than on private ones. Whereas news stations Shant and Liberty use 5 and more sources in their news (16, 2% and 16, 5%).

Table TVR20 Source numbers in Armenian media

Diversity of sources by channels

²² Ibid page 25 (“To use a high diversity of different sources is one of the main requirements to journalists, ensuring veracity, pluralism and comprehensive information. Thus the number of sources is supposed to be an important indicator for high quality reporting”).

| <i>Medium</i> | | 0 sources | 1 source | 2 sources | 3-4 sources | 5 or more sources | Total % |
|---------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| TV | H1 | 17.0% | 35.0% | 18.4% | 18.8% | 10.8% | 100.0% |
| | Shant | 14.2% | 25.7% | 16.9% | 27.0% | 16.2% | 100.0% |
| | TV total | 15.9% | 31.3% | 17.8% | 22.1% | 12.9% | 100.0% |
| | Total N | 59 | 116 | 66 | 82 | 48 | 371 |
| Radio | PR | 13.9% | 45.5% | 19.7% | 12.7% | 8.2% | 100.0% |
| | Liberty | 10.5% | 33.6% | 19.6% | 19.8% | 16.5% | 100.0% |
| | Radio total | 12.1% | 39.2% | 19.6% | 16.5% | 12.6% | 100.0% |
| | Total N | 84 | 272 | 136 | 114 | 87 | 693 |

Viewing source numbers by topics we see that only 1-2 sources are mentioned in *high politics*. With its 5 and more sources predominates Radio Liberty (H1–9,4%, Shant – 5, 7%, Public Radio – 8, 0% and Liberty– 21, 8%).

TV news on *high politics* with no source mentioned are more often, than those on radio channels (10, 2% and 4, 8%).

0 source percentage of TV news on *crime and events* are again more than it is on radio.

Contrary to this there are few TV news on social and economic topics with 0 source and many news including 3, 4, 5, even more sources (except TV_{Economics/ 5 or more sources}).

So it can be concluded that TV channels are more thorough, conscientious and adequate in preparing mainly political and criminal news (which by the way have the greatest part on TV broadcast, and probably the journalists consider them more important than the others), whereas radio stations do the same in the case of social-economic topics

Table TVR21 Source numbers according to topics

| <i>Topics</i> | Source's number | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| High Politics | <i>0 sources</i> | 7.5% | 14.3% | 10.2% | 5.9% | 4.0% | 4.8% |
| | <i>1 source</i> | 34.0% | 25.7% | 30.7% | 47.1% | 30.7% | 38.2% |
| | <i>2 sources</i> | 32.1% | 28.6% | 30.7% | 22.4% | 20.8% | 21.5% |
| | <i>3-4 sources</i> | 17.0% | 25.7% | 20.5% | 16.5% | 22.8% | 19.9% |
| | <i>5 or more sources</i> | 9.4% | 5.7% | 8.0% | 8.2% | 21.8% | 15.6% |
| | Total N | 53 | 35 | 88 | 85 | 101 | 186 |
| Foreign affairs | <i>0 sources</i> | 15.0% | 5.3% | 10.3% | 17.5% | 17.3% | 17.4% |
| | <i>1 source</i> | 40.0% | 36.8% | 38.5% | 45.6% | 50.7% | 48.5% |
| | <i>2 sources</i> | 10.0% | 15.8% | 12.8% | 28.1% | 13.3% | 19.7% |
| | <i>3-4 sources</i> | 30.0% | 31.6% | 30.8% | 7.0% | 12.0% | 9.8% |
| | <i>5 or more sources</i> | 5.0% | 10.5% | 7.7% | 1.8% | 6.7% | 4.5% |
| | Total N | 20 | 19 | 39 | 57 | 75 | 132 |
| Crime and | <i>0 sources</i> | 37.5% | 4.3% | 23.6% | 10.5% | 15.6% | 13.2% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| events | 1 source | 31.3% | 13.0% | 23.6% | 50.9% | 26.6% | 38.0% |
| | 2 sources | 9.4% | 8.7% | 9.1% | 14.0% | 18.8% | 16.5% |
| | 3-4 sources | 12.1% | 33.3% | 21.1% | 10.5% | 17.2% | 14.0% |
| | 5 or more sources | 9.1% | 37.5% | 21.1% | 14.0% | 21.9% | 18.2% |
| | Total N | 33 | 24 | 57 | 57 | 64 | 121 |
| Social development issues | 0 sources | .0% | 15.4% | 6.3% | 10.7% | .0% | 5.5% |
| | 1 source | 52.6% | 30.8% | 43.8% | 42.9% | 33.3% | 38.2% |
| | 2 sources | 10.5% | 7.7% | 9.4% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 29.1% |
| | 3-4 sources | 10.5% | 15.4% | 12.5% | 17.9% | 11.1% | 14.5% |
| | 5 or more sources | 26.3% | 30.8% | 28.1% | 3.6% | 22.2% | 12.7% |
| | Total N | 19 | 13 | 32 | 28 | 27 | 55 |
| Economics | 0 sources | 12.5% | 8.7% | 10.9% | 11.8% | 3.6% | 8.1% |
| | 1 source | 31.3% | 34.8% | 32.7% | 52.9% | 25.0% | 40.3% |
| | 2 sources | 21.9% | 26.1% | 23.6% | 8.8% | 28.6% | 17.7% |
| | 3-4 sources | 25.0% | 21.7% | 23.6% | 11.8% | 28.6% | 19.4% |
| | 5 or more sources | 9.4% | 8.7% | 9.1% | 14.7% | 14.3% | 14.5% |
| | Total N | 32 | 23 | 55 | 34 | 28 | 62 |

3.5.2. Transparency of sources

It is very important to have an obviously transparent source from the point of view of the affect on the society, as well as of the journalist's good job²³.

As a result it can be noted that the majority of the sources are transparent in TV and in radio news (TV_{total}=89, 8%, Radio_{total}=80, 6%). Shant works more transparently (92, 1%), and Public Radio is the most non-transparent (22, 6%). In respect of source mentioning Shant and Liberty as compared with public TV and radio work more transparently. High indicators of transparency were registered as a result of the second phase of monitoring both on TV and in print media²⁴.

Secret, confidential sources were mentioned only by radio stations (Public Radio – 0, 8%, Liberty – 0, 2%).

Table TVR22 Source transparency in the media

| Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Transparency Of Sources | | | | | | |
| Identified | 88.0% | 92.1% | 89.8% | 76.6% | 83.6% | 80.6% |
| Not identified | 12.0% | 7.9% | 10.2% | 22.6% | 16.3% | 19.0% |

²³ To make sources transparent to the readers is another important requirement enabling the reader/viewer to assess the quality of the source and to form his or her opinion about the provided information. We have asked the coders to assess whether the average reader could identify the source, i.e. not just a name is given (in case the person is not a celebre person known to the average reader) but position or function of that source in an organization". Ibid, page 27

²⁴ See ibid, page 27

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| To be kept secret | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 357 | 280 | 637 | 487 | 657 | 1144 |

Percentages are based on the responses (= sources 1,2,and 3).

3.5.3 Comparison between actors and sources

Let's examine the problem from the angle of whether the actors in the news are also sources of information.

It is clear from table TVR23 that in the course of monitoring one and the same actor almost by the same percentage was presented also as a source. In some cases the same person was a source rather than an actor. Especially on radio by 11,1% predominance "media" is introduced as a source of information (15, 5%) rather than as an actor (5, 4%). Similar phenomenon exists also on TV broadcast, though with less difference of percents (5, 8%, 2, 5%).

Both on radio and on TV sources' percentage, though not considerably, but is higher than the percentage of the actors, if *civil society* is mentioned as an actor.

Though *general public* is covered more often as an actor than as a source, anyhow the difference between these two criteria is not great (TV difference—1,4%, radio difference—2 7%). If compare this indicator with the fixed one²⁵, in media as a result of the second phase, where the difference was 6, 7% (10%-3, 3%), then it is notable that in this case radio and TV involve *general public* as a source of information more often. In the case of *professionals* too the percentage of the sources excel that of the actors, but the difference here is considerable; in the case of TV—6, 2%, in the case of radio-10,5%.

All the results where the percentage of the source excels the percentage of the actor for the same person are underlined in table TVR23.

Generally in the case of *political actors* source percentage excels the percentage of actors; an exclusion is the president of the republic, when the difference is only 0,3%. Whereas in the group of *local administration* actors dominate over sources in the case of the same TV channel.

Table TVR23. Comparison between actors and sources

Percentages of TV/Radio news with single actors and actor groups mentioned

| Actors & Sources | TV total | | Radio total | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | % of all actors | % of all Sources | % of all actors | % of all sources |
| Political actors | 20.8% | 23.0% | 21.9% | 21.8% |
| President of Armenia | 3.4% | 3.1% | 2.8% | 2.1% |

²⁵ See ibid, page 27

| | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Central Authorities | <u>10.5%</u> | <u>11.6%</u> | 8.3% | 8.0% |
| Parliament | <u>5.1%</u> | <u>5.9%</u> | 3.9% | 3.8% |
| Political party | <u>1.8%</u> | <u>2.4%</u> | <u>7.0%</u> | <u>7.9%</u> |
| Local Administration | 9.5% | 7.4% | 9.5% | 6.6% |
| Local administrations | 2.3% | 2.6% | 2.2% | 2.1% |
| Judiciary | 1.9% | 1.9% | 2.4% | 2.1% |
| Police | 2.1% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 0.9% |
| Military | 3.2% | 1.3% | 3.2% | 1.4% |
| Economic actors | 4.8% | 4.0% | 5.2% | 4.4% |
| Entrepreneurs. business people | <u>1.0%</u> | <u>1.3%</u> | 2.2% | 1.8% |
| International business people | 3.5% | 2.6% | 1.8% | 1.3% |
| Employees | 0.2% | 0.2% | 1.2% | 1.2% |
| Civil society | 2.4% | 2.9% | 2.4% | 2.8% |
| Civil soc. org., national NGO | <u>1.2%</u> | <u>1.9%</u> | <u>1.7%</u> | <u>2.1%</u> |
| Civil soc. org., international NGO | 1.1% | 1.0% | 0.7% | 0.7% |
| International actors | 26.6% | 19.5% | 33.1% | 25.0% |
| Inter-governmental organization | 5.1% | 4.3% | 6.7% | 4.4% |
| Foreign political bodies | 18.9% | 15.1% | 24.6% | 20.2% |
| Foreign country as an actor | 2.6% | 0.0% | 1.8% | 0.4% |
| Professionals | 16.0% | 22.2% | 15.2% | 25.7% |
| Culture | <u>6.0%</u> | <u>6.4%</u> | <u>4.9%</u> | <u>4.9%</u> |
| Churches, religious leaders | 1.7% | 1.6% | 0.7% | 0.4% |
| Media | <u>2.5%</u> | <u>5.8%</u> | <u>5.4%</u> | <u>15.5%</u> |
| Science/education | <u>5.8%</u> | <u>8.4%</u> | <u>4.2%</u> | <u>4.8%</u> |
| Diaspora | 0.9% | 0.3% | 0.7% | 0.5% |
| Diaspora | 0.9% | 0.3% | 0.7% | 0.5% |
| General Public | 11.9% | 10.5% | 8.7% | 6.0% |
| Person from general public | <u>10.3%</u> | <u>10.5%</u> | 7.9% | 6.0% |
| Armenia as a nation | 1.6% | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0% |

| Author | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 2.0% |
|---------------------------|------|--------|------|--------|
| Author | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 2.0% |
| Other | 7.2% | 7.2% | 3.2% | 2.2% |
| Others | 7.2% | 7.2% | 3.2% | 2.2% |
| Public document | - | 2.9% | - | 2.9% |
| Total % | 100% | 100.0% | 100% | 100.0% |
| Total N= responses | 962 | 622 | 1648 | 1126 |

“No actor”, “no source” and “indefinable” cases are excluded.

3.5.4 Context of sources

From the angle of journalism not only the source of information but also how the journalist obtains it is important. This part of our report is about the revealing peculiarities of the acquisition methods of the materials by the journalists in Armenia.

First of all only the percentage of *indefinables* is mentioned in table TVR24 and the calculation without ‘unknown’ source context is done in table TVR25.

The first table shows that source contexts are more accurately worked by TV stations, and particularly Public TV has the lowest percentage of *unknown* (16, 8%), in this respect the most accurate is Radio Liberty (25, 9%).

Table TVR24 Source context – Indefinable

| Source context | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------------|
| Indefinable | 16.8% | 19.6% | 28.4% | 28.1% | 25.9% | 26.9% |
| Total N=responses | 358 | 280 | 638 | 487 | 659 | 1146 |

Speaking of the specific ways of acquisition of media materials, it should be noted that for any kind of media the main sources of information are *interview*, *media inquiry*. This certifies that in this case the journalist makes an effort, takes the initiative to get information, this being the indicator of quality of the journalists' job. In this respect the journalists' staff of H1 is more active, and generally TV stations are more progressive (TV_{total} – 43,0%, Radio_{total} – 35,4%) in this.

In comparison with the other stations Liberty's participation in *press conference/press events* is rare (13, 5%) and it has the lowest indicator in the case of *planned events* (14, 1%), on the other hand the most frequent quotes from news agencies are done by this radio station (20,5%, this indicator is more by 12, 5% of the next higher indicator.) This fact may be explained probably by the reason that the editorial of Liberty is not within the Republic of Armenia, so their stories are made by

the foreign reporters on one hand, and on the other the radio station considers its duty to inform Armenia about international news.

It is interesting that public media participates in planned *events* more often than the private (H1 – 23,2%, Public Radio – 23,4%, Shant – 21,8%, Liberty – 14,1%). This fact may be commented by the specificity characteristic to the Armenian reality; in Armenia TV channels are mainly invited in more or less interesting events, as TV is the main source of information for 83% of the society²⁶.

Table TVR25 Source context by different channels

All TV/Radio news without 'unknown' source context

| Medium <i>Source context</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Press conference/press event | 12.8% | 21.3% | 16.4% | 16.6% | 13.5% | 14.8% |
| Press release | 1.3% | 0.4% | 1.0% | 1.4% | 2.3% | 1.9% |
| Planned event | 23.2% | 21.8% | 22.6% | 23.4% | 14.1% | 18.0% |
| Interview, media inquiry | 46.0% | 39.1% | 43.0% | 31.1% | 38.5% | 35.4% |
| Written document | 6.7% | 9.3% | 7.8% | 6.0% | 6.6% | 6.3% |
| Quote from news agency, media | 6.4% | 3.6% | 5.2% | 8.0% | 20.5% | 15.3% |
| Eye witness | 2.0% | 2.7% | 2.3% | 2.0% | 0.4% | 1.1% |
| Other | 1.7% | 1.8% | 1.7% | 11.4% | 4.1% | 7.2% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N=responses | 298 | 225 | 523 | 350 | 488 | 838 |

3.5.5 Direct speech²⁷

We see in table TVR26 that all the channels use mostly direct speech on broadcast. As a result of comparison between radio and TV it becomes obvious that direct speech is more often heard on TV, and that is why paraphrased speech is used rarely on TV rather than on radio.

Direct speech is usually followed with paraphrased speech; it is the most rarely applied method for Shant (19,3%). At the same time this TV station uses direct quotes on its broadcast most frequently (63,2%).

Table TVR26. Source quoted on each channel

²⁶ G.A.Poghosyan, "Armenian society in transformation", "Lusabats" Publishing house, Yerevan, 2003, pages 215-216

²⁷ "Sources that were given the chance to be quoted in direct speech drew greater attention compared to sources only quoted indirectly or paraphrased" See *ibid*, page 29

All TV/Radio news percentages and totals are based on responses

| Medium <i>Source quoted</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Direct speech | 56.7% | 63.2% | 59.6% | 42.1% | 46.8% | 44.8% |
| Indirect speech | 10.1% | 17.5% | 13.4% | 16.0% | 17.2% | 16.7% |
| Paraphrased | 33.1% | 19.3% | 27.0% | 41.9% | 36.0% | 38.5% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N=responses | 356 | 280 | 636 | 487 | 656 | 1143 |

If in the previous report *political actors* were not greatly quoted by direct speech²⁸ on TV, then this time the percentage of *political actors* quoted directly differs seriously²⁹ from the percentage of the indirect and paraphrased quotes (27,4% vs. 16,5% and 14,5%). On the other hand *general public* too is more often quoted in direct speech (15,6% vs. 1,2% and 2,9%). In the case of these two sources the situation is the same also on radio.

Table TV27. Type of the speech according to the actors

| Sources Groups | TV total | | | Radio total | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | Direct speech | Indirect speech | Paraphrased | Direct speech | Indirect speech | Paraphrased |
| Political actors | 27.4% | 16.5% | 14.5% | 28.6% | 16.5% | 17.4% |
| <i>President of Armenia</i> | 1.6% | 4.7% | 5.2% | 1.8% | 2.3% | 2.1% |
| <i>Central Authorities</i> | 14.8% | 5.9% | 6.4% | 9.9% | 6.2% | 5.9% |
| <i>Parliament</i> | 7.9% | 4.7% | 1.7% | 6.5% | 2.1% | 2.7% |
| <i>Political party</i> | 3.2% | 1.2% | 1.2% | 10.4% | 5.9% | 6.7% |
| Local Administration | 9.0% | 3.5% | 4.7% | 7.6% | 5.1% | 4.8% |
| <i>Local administrations</i> | 4.0% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 2.8% | 1.5% | .5% |
| <i>Judiciary</i> | 1.8% | 3.5% | 0.6% | 2.5% | 2.3% | 2.0% |
| <i>Police</i> | 1.8% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 0.5% | 0.3% | 1.1% |
| <i>Military</i> | 1.3% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 1.8% | 1.0% | 1.2% |
| Economic actors | 2.6% | 5.9% | 5.8% | 5.6% | 2.3% | 4.2% |
| <i>Entrepreneurs, business people</i> | 0.8% | 2.4% | 1.7% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 1.6% |
| <i>International business</i> | 1.6% | 3.5% | 4.1% | 1.2% | 0.8% | 1.6% |

²⁸ Ibid, page 29

²⁹ As the capacity of the selection concourse is big and we deal with relatively great numbers, then this can be considered as a great difference.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| <i>people</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>Employees</i> | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.5% | 1.5% | 1.0% |
| Civil society | 3.4% | 2.4% | 1.7% | 4.0% | .8% | 2.7% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., national NGO</i> | 2.1% | 2.4% | 1.2% | 2.9% | 0.8% | 2.1% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., international NGO</i> | 1.3% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 1.2% | 0.0% | 0.5% |
| International actors | 12.1% | 32.9% | 26.7% | 12.1% | 39.3% | 31.3% |
| <i>Inter-governmental organization</i> | 3.7% | 4.7% | 5.2% | 2.7% | 7.7% | 6.0% |
| <i>Foreign political bodies</i> | 8.4% | 28.2% | 21.5% | 9.4% | 29.6% | 25.1% |
| <i>Foreign country as an actor</i> | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.1% | 0.2% |
| Professionals | 20.6% | 18.8% | 25.6% | 22.7% | 28.3% | 25.3% |
| <i>Culture</i> | 9.0% | 0.0% | 3.5% | 9.4% | 2.3% | 2.1% |
| <i>Churches, religious leaders</i> | 1.8% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 0.6% | .0% | 0.3% |
| <i>Media</i> | 1.3% | 11.8% | 12.2% | 6.9% | 23.1% | 18.2% |
| <i>Science/education</i> | 8.4% | 7.1% | 8.1% | 5.7% | 2.8% | 4.6% |
| Diaspora | .5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.3% | 0.1% |
| <i>Diaspora</i> | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.2% | 0.3% | .1% |
| General Public | 15.6% | 1.2% | 2.9% | 10.6% | 0.0% | 3.2% |
| <i>Person from general public</i> | 15.6% | 1.2% | 2.9% | 10.6% | 0.0% | 3.2% |
| <i>Armenia as a nation</i> | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Author | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 1.0% | 1.6% |
| <i>Author</i> | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 1.0% | 1.6% |
| Other | 7.7% | 8.2% | 5.2% | 3.1% | 1.3% | 2.1% |
| <i>Others</i> | 7.7% | 8.2% | 5.2% | 3.1% | 1.3% | 2.1% |
| Public document | 0.8% | 5.9% | 5.8% | 2.5% | 3.1% | 4.2% |
| Undefinable | 0.0% | 4.7% | 7.0% | 0.4% | 2.1% | 3.0% |
| Total % | 100% | 100.0% | 100% | 100.0% | 100% | 100.0% |
| Total N=responses | 379 | 85 | 172 | 1297 | 389 | 932 |

3.6 Special quality indicators

The depth of the information was measured via 4 different indicators³⁰. In the below mentioned table five different levels are presented, each showing how many indicators are involved in each level.

3.6.1 Depth levels – indicator of completeness

The most widespread news are those with two *depth levels* referred to. News on Public Radio are more inclusive (*4 depth levels* – 21,2%), but at the same time the highest 0 indicator too (3%) belongs to the same radio broadcast.

There 2 and 3 and not any 0 depth news, on TV compared with radio (TV_{total sum(2+3)} – 61,5%, Radio_{total sum(2+3)} – 50,4%).

In the case of different levels the differences between various channels are not great in general; the greatest difference is on the forth level between Liberty and Shant, and it doesn't excel 14% (21,2% - 7,4%=13,8%).

Table TVR28 Depth of the news

Total percentage of depth levels in all TV/Radio news

| Depth levels | Medium | H1 | Shant | TV Total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| 0 depth levels | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.0% | 0.3% | 1.6% |
| 1 depth level | | 20.6% | 33.8% | 25.9% | 27.0% | 29.2% | 28.1% |
| 2 depth levels | | 38.1% | 25.7% | 33.2% | 22.1% | 30.3% | 26.4% |
| 3 depth levels | | 25.1% | 33.1% | 28.3% | 26.7% | 21.5% | 24.0% |
| 4 depth levels | | 16.1% | 7.4% | 12.7% | 21.2% | 18.7% | 19.9% |
| Total % | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | | 223 | 148 | 371 | 330 | 363 | 693 |

Table ATVR - 3 in the enclosure shows the depth levels in the news with different lengths, and table ATVR -4 – information depth in mid-length news.

Examining the frequency of each separate criterion we will have the following picture:

What is the most often met version, and it appears almost equally on all the channels.

Like in the course of the previous monitoring³¹ this time too the frequency of *consequences* dominates over the *background information*³².

30 1. What did happen? 2. Why did it happen? 3. Does the article provide background information?

4. Does it give an outlook on the consequences?

³¹ Ibid, page 31

On the whole TV excels radio in the first two criteria:

- *What* (by 13,8%)
- *Why* (by 11,8%)

In the case of *background information and consequences* the indicators of radio excel the results of TV:

- *Background information* (by 11,6%)
- *Consequences* (by 6,7%)

See the tables in the enclosure (Table A_{TVR} - 5 to Table A_{TVR} - 8).

3.7 Perspective

Like in the case of *depth level*, *perspectives of coverage* too were measured through several criteria:

- *description of event/problem*
- *political struggle around the issue*
- *daily life perspective (how does it touch the life of ordinary people?)*,

As a result 4 levels were distinguished, each showing number of the above mentioned points existing within the news.

3.7.1 Perspective in general

If in the course of 2005 survey there were articles with *0 perspective* in both press and TV monitoring (for instance sarcastic stories)³³, then there were no such news during this monitoring of both TV and of radio broadcasts, and so the percentage of “*0 perspectives*” is 0, that is each news has at least a *description of event/problem*, or a *daily life perspective* or a *political struggle around the issue*. Table TVR29 shows also that news with *2 perspectives* prevail on TV broadcasts, and that with *1 perspective* – on radio.

At the same time TV broadcast is excelled by radio in news with *3 perspectives* by 2,9% (4,0% - 1,1%). The percentage with *3 perspectives* news is not considerable.

In this respect radio broadcast is more abundant. Relatively great percent of *3 perspectives* are involved in the news on Public Radio (5,2%). If compare the results of this phase with those of the second phase of monitoring, then it is notable that news with *3 perspectives* on TV broadcast met more often in the first case (H1 – 10,5%, Shant

³² “It seems interesting that consequences are mentioned more often than background information, assuming that consequences can only be really understood when background information has been given”. Ibid, page 31.

³³ Ibid, page 33

– 13,5%³⁴). Formerly TV news with 2 *perspectives* was to some extent more (TV_{total} 54,3%), and was relatively little number of news with 1 *perspective* (TV_{total} 32.6%)³⁵.

Table TVR29 Diversity of perspectives

Total percentage of perspectives in all TV/Radio news

| Medium <i>Perspectives</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------------|
| 0 perspectives | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 1 perspective | 43.9% | 48.0% | 45.6% | 57.3% | 49.3% | 53.1% |
| 2 perspectives | 55.2% | 50.7% | 53.4% | 37.6% | 47.7% | 42.9% |
| 3 perspectives | 0.9% | 1.4% | 1.1% | 5.2% | 3.0% | 4.0% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 | 330 | 363 | 693 |

In table A_{TVR} -9 of the enclosure *diversity of perspectives* are calculated for the mid-length news.

3.7.2 Perspective in different topics

In table TVR30 the percentage of each criterion is calculated.

We see that in the case of *high politics* it is characterized mostly as *content /description*. News on Shant for example involves *content / description*. In the topic *high politics daily life* is hinted mostly by Public TV (50,9%) and by Radio Station Liberty (53,5%); these two channels are notable for correlating everyday issues with political topics more often.

On all the channels the topic *crime and events* is mostly related with *daily life* and almost always involve *content/description* by 100%. In the case of *social development issues* too Public TV (81,5%) and Radio Liberty (78,9%) relate this topic to *daily life* by relatively great percentage.

In *economics* the greatest indicators belong to Shant (65,2%) and Liberty (53,6%).

Actually as a result the *social-economic issues* of the society, through the prism of everyday life, are mostly covered by Liberty, and Public Radio is notable for relatively low indicators (*social development issues* 64,3%³⁶, *Economics* – 44,1%).

Table TVR30 Perspectives in different topics

³⁴ Ibid, page 35

³⁵ Ibid, page 35

³⁶ These results are a bit competitive with those on Shant, where news on *social development issues* involve *daily life* by 61,5% frequency.

| Topics | Existence of topic perspectives | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| High Politics | <i>Political struggle</i> | 13.2% | 14.3% | 13.6% | 31.8% | 18.8% | 24.7% |
| | <i>Daily life</i> | 50.9% | 31.4% | 43.2% | 22.4% | 53.5% | 39.2% |
| | <i>Content / description</i> | 98.1% | 100.0% | 98.9% | 96.5% | 97.0% | 96.8% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 53 | 35 | 88 | 85 | 101 | 186 |
| Foreign affairs | <i>Political struggle</i> | 25.0% | 10.5% | 17.9% | 28.1% | 21.3% | 24.2% |
| | <i>Daily life</i> | 20.0% | 31.6% | 25.6% | 26.3% | 20.0% | 22.7% |
| | <i>Content / description</i> | 95.0% | 100.0% | 97.4% | 100.0% | 90.7% | 94.7% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 20 | 19 | 39 | 57 | 75 | 132 |
| Crime and events | <i>Political struggle</i> | 3.0% | 0.0% | 1.8% | 3.5% | 3.1% | 3.3% |
| | <i>Daily life</i> | 42.4% | 58.3% | 49.1% | 38.6% | 54.7% | 47.1% |
| | <i>Content / description</i> | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 96.9% | 98.3% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 33 | 24 | 57 | 57 | 64 | 121 |
| Social development issues | <i>Political struggle</i> | 0.0% | 7.7% | 3.1% | 7.1% | 11.1% | 9.1% |
| | <i>Daily life</i> | 78.9% | 61.5% | 71.9% | 64.3% | 81.5% | 72.7% |
| | <i>Content / description</i> | 100.0% | 92.3% | 96.9% | 96.4% | 92.6% | 94.5% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 19 | 13 | 32 | 28 | 27 | 55 |
| Economics | <i>Political struggle</i> | 6.3% | 8.7% | 7.3% | 11.8% | 10.7% | 11.3% |
| | <i>Daily life</i> | 59.4% | 65.2% | 61.8% | 44.1% | 53.6% | 48.4% |
| | <i>Content / description</i> | 96.9% | 100.0% | 98.2% | 97.1% | 89.3% | 93.5% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 32 | 23 | 55 | 34 | 28 | 62 |

3.8 Angles

Any information may become more comprehensive and trustworthy as a result of different angles; this may also be a reliable method to estimate the quality of the journalism. During this survey the variety of angles was also measured.

Table TVR31 shows that news with *1 and 2 angles* prevail both on TV and on radio mainly. *4 and more angles* meet mostly in the news on Liberty (4,4%) and the least - on Public Radio (0,6%). Shant uses *3 and more angles* overall by 1,4%.

With *3 and 4 angles* radio by 4,9% (=2,3%+2,6%) works effectively rather than TV by 3,0% (=1,9%+1,1%).

According to the data of the second phase of monitoring news with *2 angles* prevail on Shant compared with H1 (40,5%, 17,6%)³⁷. Though the difference this time too is in favor of Shant, but it is not considerable being only 2,2%.

Table TVR31. Variety of angles

| Medium | H1 | Shant | TV | PR | Liberty | Radio |
|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|--------------|
|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|--------------|

³⁷ Ibid, page 36

| Viewpoints | | | total | | | total |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------------|--------|--------|--------------|
| 0 viewpoints | 1.3% | 1.4% | 1.3% | 6.4% | 4.7% | 5.5% |
| 1 viewpoint | 63.2% | 64.2% | 63.6% | 65.3% | 55.1% | 60.0% |
| 2 viewpoints | 30.9% | 33.1% | 31.8% | 23.7% | 33.1% | 28.6% |
| 3 viewpoints | 3.1% | 0.0% | 1.9% | 2.1% | 2.5% | 2.3% |
| 4 or more viewpoints | 0.9% | 1.4% | 1.1% | 0.6% | 4.4% | 2.6% |
| Undefinable | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 1.8% | 0.3% | 1.0% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 | 329 | 363 | 692 |

3.9 Journalist's Opinion

The next criterion focused on by the members of the survey group refers to the journalist's opinion in the news. Table TVR32 shows that neutral journalism, *facts only*, prevails in all stations by more than 80%.

It may be concluded also that the expression of just an opinion on broadcast is not an accepted method of journalism; in each case the percentage of *only opinion* is 0. In the case of TV there is no any note of *more opinion/some facts*, and the percentage of the last on radio is not considerable too.

Interestingly in balance public media spare a bit more place to *some opinion /more facts* (H1 -12,6%, public Radio – 12,1% vs. Shant – 9,5%, Liberty – 10,7%).

Table TVR32. Journalist's Opinion

| Medium | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Share of opinion | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
| Facts only | 80.3% | 88.5% | 83.6% | 84.8% | 81.8% | 83.3% |
| More facts/some opinion | 12.6% | 9.5% | 11.3% | 12.1% | 10.7% | 11.4% |
| Mixed opinion/facts | 7.2% | 2.0% | 5.1% | 2.7% | 5.2% | 4.0% |
| More opinion/some facts | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 2.2% | 1.3% |
| Only opinion | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 | 330 | 363 | 693 |

3.9.1 Transparency of opinion

The estimation results of the possible methods to express an opinion obviously, hidden or disguised, are presented in table TVR33, which shows that the reporters tell their opinions directly, i.e. by *direct statement*, without disguising or hiding them. The percentage of *open declared* is lower on radio rather than on TV, and is the lowest in the case of Public Radio (6,0%). Journalists of the private TV and radio stations disguise

their opinion by more percentage than those of the public ones (Shant – 35,5% and Liberty 39,4%, H1 – 26,2%, Public Radio – 14,0%). If as a result of the previous monitoring Shant considerably excelled H1 in its indicators on *open declaration*³⁸, then this time it gives its place to H1 by 0,3%.

Table TVR33. Transparency of opinion

Transparency percentage of journalist's opinion in 'opinion containing articles'

| Medium <i>Transparency of journalists' opinion</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Hidden opinion | 26.2% | 35.3% | 28.8% | 14.0% | 39.4% | 28.4% |
| Direct statement | 85.7% | 100.0% | 89.8% | 82.0% | 87.9% | 85.3% |
| Open declared | 23.8% | 23.5% | 23.7% | 6.0% | 12.1% | 9.5% |
| Total N=news | 42 | 17 | 59 | 50 | 66 | 116 |

3.9.2 Political favorability of opinion

Within the context of the politicized journalism political orientation of the news on Armenian broadcast was also measured.

The results show that these news are mainly not relevant to *coalition/opposition*. The private stations Shant and Liberty give relatively more preference to *opposition*, and the public ones - to *coalition* (see table TVR-34).

Table TVR-34. Political favorability of opinion

Favorability percentage of journalist's opinion in 'opinion containing articles'

| Medium <i>Favorability of journalists' opinion</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Pro coalition | 4.8% | 0.0% | 3.4% | 4.1% | 0.0% | 1.8% |
| Pro opposition | 0.0% | 5.9% | 1.7% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 4.4% |
| Balanced | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 4.6% | 3.5% |
| Nihilistic | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 9.2% | 6.1% |
| Not in reference to coalition/opposition | 95.2% | 94.1% | 94.9% | 91.8% | 78.5% | 84.2% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N=news | 42 | 17 | 59 | 49 | 65 | 114 |

³⁸ Ibid, page 39

Table A_{TVR} -10 in the enclosure shows the points the journalists comment their opinions in the case they express such

Information about the specific indicators of TV and radio news are presented below in the forth and fifth parts.

4. Special indicators of TV news

Specific indicators characteristic to TV only were measured and analyzed with the help of the below mentioned tables during the survey.

4.1 Technical aspects of pictures

4.1.1 Number of scenes

The number of different scenes was calculated for the news. Of course, the longer is the news, the bigger is the probability of various *scenes*. In table TV01 however we can see that short and mid-length news prevail on TV. Taking into consideration this reason it is notable (table TV-1) that news with 2-3 different *scenes* dominate mainly on TV (TV_{total} – 36,7%) and then news with 4-6 *scenes* (TV_{total} – 27,5%). One scene news is mostly broadcasted on Shant (12,2% vs. 4,5%).

Table TV-1 Number of scenes

| Scenes | Medium | H1 | Shant | TV Total |
|--------------------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| 1 scene | | 4.5% | 12.2% | 7.5% |
| 2-3 scenes | | 39.0% | 33.1% | 36.7% |
| 4-6 scenes | | 28.7% | 25.7% | 27.5% |
| 7 and more scenes | | 27.8% | 29.1% | 28.3% |
| Total % | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | | 223 | 148 | 371 |

4.1.2 Frequency of scenes' changes

Interesting differences are revealed as a result of the relationship analysis between the scenes and the changes according to the TV channels; *scene changes* excel the number of *scenes* more than twice, i.e. by 22,3% on Shant in the case when that indicator is only 1,3% for Public TV. Shant (4,1%) leaves Public TV (1,8%) behind also in the usage of twice more *scene changes* towards *scene numbers*, though this time by minor percent difference. The same occurs in the case of more, but less than two times usage of *scene changes* towards *scene numbers* (Shant – 41,2%, H1 – 39,0%). Whereas in the balanced usage of *scene numbers and scene changes* Public TV (15,7%) leaves Shant behind (11,6%) by 4,1%. In the usage of the necessarily minimal objective *scene changes* Public TV is again considerably ahead of Shant (H1 – 42,2%, Shant – 28,4%).

Thus it is obvious that the usage of scene changes on Shant is spread compared with Public TV which has a negative reflection on the quality of reporting and may be conditioned by a small number of necessary clips adequate with the text information.

Table TV2 Frequency of scenes' changes

| <i>Number of Scene changes</i> \ Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| >2 x scene number | 1.3% | 22.3% | 9.7% |
| =2 x scene number | 1.8% | 4.1% | 2.7% |
| >1 x scene number | 39.0% | 41.2% | 39.9% |
| =1 x scene number | 15.7% | 4.1% | 11.1% |
| <1 x scene number | 42.2% | 28.4% | 36.7% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 |

Analysing the usage frequency of *scene changes* according to the length³⁹ of TV news, it is notable that Public TV adds its *scene change* parallel to the duration of the news, though the main addition both in mid-length and in long news is between the interval of more, but less than two times usage of *scene changes towards scene numbers* (mid-length news– 78,8%, long news– 73,2%)

In the case of Shant the formula §as long news, as more *scene changes*! deviates from its course, because of the tendency of a great number of usage of *scene changes*, which has already been mentioned about in the comment of the previous table. While using *scene changes* in its mid-length news Shant has high and almost equal indicators in both intervals §>1 x *scene number*! and §>2 x *scene number*! (43,4% and 41,5% correspondingly). Even in 5,7% cases of short-length news on Shant *scene changes* excel the twice amount of *scene numbers* in the case when that indicator for Public TV equals to 0.

Table TV3 Frequency of scene changes in news with different lengths

| <i>Number of Scene changes</i> \ Medium | | >2 x scene number | =2 x scene number | >1 x scene number | =1 x scene number | <1 x scene number | Total % |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| H1 | <i>Short</i> | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12.3% | 22.3% | 65.4% | 100% |
| | <i>Medium</i> | 1.9% | 1.9% | 78.8% | 9.6% | 7.7% | 100% |
| | <i>Long</i> | 4.9% | 7.3% | 73.2% | 2.4% | 12.2% | 100% |
| | Total N | 3 | 4 | 87 | 35 | 94 | 223 |
| Shant | <i>Short</i> | 5.7% | 3.8% | 30.2% | 5.7% | 54.7% | 100% |
| | <i>Medium</i> | 41.5% | 7.5% | 43.4% | 1.9% | 5.7% | 100% |
| | <i>Long</i> | 19.0% | 0.0% | 52.4% | 4.8% | 23.8% | 100% |
| | Total N | 33 | 6 | 61 | 6 | 42 | 148 |

³⁹ The length grouping criteria of TV news, as shown on page 6, table TV-01, are the following: short – up to 90 seconds, mid-length – 91-180 seconds, long – 181 and more seconds.

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| TV Total | <i>Short</i> | 1.6% | 1.1% | 17.5% | 17.5% | 62.3% | 100% |
| | <i>Medium</i> | 21.9% | 4.8% | 61.0% | 5.7% | 6.7% | 100% |
| | <i>Long</i> | 12.0% | 3.6% | 62.7% | 3.6% | 18.1% | 100% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 36 | 10 | 148 | 41 | 136 | 371 |

4.1.3 Standing pictures

The frequency of *standing pictures* on broadcast is observable in table TV-3. Generally Public TV uses *standing pictures more than twice* often (14,8% vs. 4,7%). From just the point *using* it is already notable that *mainly standing pictures* and *few standing pictures* on H1 have equally proportioned greater percents - 39,4%. Among the points of *standing pictures* on “Shant” the dominance is in favor of *only standing pictures*.

Table TV-4 Standing pictures

| <i>Standing pictures</i> \ Medium | H1 | Shant | Total % of N |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Using | 14.8% | 4.7% | 10.8% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 |
| Only standing pictures | 21.2% | 57.1% | 27.5% |
| Mainly standing pictures | 39.4% | 14.3% | 35.0% |
| Few standing pictures | 39.4% | 28.6% | 37.5% |
| Total % | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Total N | 33 | 7 | 40 |

4.1.4 Use of Archives

Usage of archive materials doesn't considerably differ on Shant and on Public TV (12,9% and 8,0%); Similar results were fixed also during the previous monitoring⁴⁰. The investigative group, being involved also within the field phase, considered important to mention also the fact when the text and the picture correlated to the past events, had no the label “Archive”.

Here it should be noted that Public TV is the heir of that in Soviet Armenia and today directs its archive. Probably that is the reason of about 5% difference of the archive materials

Table TV-5. Use of Archives

| <i>Archive</i> \ Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|----------|
| Using | 12.9% | 8.0% | 10.9% |
| Total N=response | 496 | 326 | 822 |

⁴⁰ Ibid, page 40

4.2 Picture Topics

4.2.1 What topics are shown?

In table TV-6 it is possible to see what the picture is about independent of the text. It is obvious that in respect of pictures half of Shant broadcast is full of scenes adequate to the point *people talking* (40,9%), the percentage of *interviews* is great too (25,2%). These two types of pictures occupy also the broadcast of Public TV almost in balance (29,5% and 21, 6%). In the total calculation (TV_{total}) the percentage of *people talking* is 34,0%, *interviews* – 23,0%. These two form 57,7% together. The same was observable also in the results of the previous monitoring, where these two formed 60%⁴¹ and in the case of which too *people talking* was used more by Shant than by H1. This time too a range of thematic pictures acute for the Armenian society are drawn out of Armenian broadcast.

Table TV-6. Picture Topics

⁴¹ “From this list it can be clearly derived that the pictures seem to be mainly selected by how easy they are to get (people talking), and not by how well they might illustrate the news”. Ibid, age 41.

| Picture topic groups \ Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| People talking | 29.5% | 40.9% | 34.0% |
| Street life | 8.5% | 7.1% | 7.9% |
| Interview | 21.6% | 25.2% | 23.0% |
| Elections, voting | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.6% |
| Migration, refugee | 0.2% | 0.0% | 0.1% |
| War | 1.2% | 0.0% | 0.7% |
| Crime and events | 6.0% | 2.4% | 4.7% |
| Social development (education, health, media) | 2.6% | 3.6% | 3.0% |
| Economic activity | 7.8% | 6.1% | 7.2% |
| National security | 3.0% | 1.8% | 2.6% |
| Science | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.6% |
| Culture | 4.4% | 2.8% | 3.8% |
| Religion | 1.2% | 1.5% | 1.3% |
| Sports activity | 1.0% | 0.6% | 0.9% |
| Other | 11.1% | 5.5% | 8.9% |
| Undefinable | 0.4% | 0.9% | 0.6% |
| Total % | 100% | 100 % | 100 % |
| Total N=responses | 495 | 325 | 820 |

Social development=education+ health+ media+ Social problems, poverty

Economic activity= Economic activity+ Finances, money+ Agriculture+ Infrastructure

Crime and events =Natural disasters+Legal cases+Demonstrations, riot

4.3 Picture Places

4.3.1 Place of scenery

It was measured also the scenes referred to by the pictures on broadcast. The table shows that both Shant and H1 broadcast mainly *press conference* (Shant – 17,0%, H1 – 15,1%) and *urban scene* (Shant – 15,3%, H1 – 15,0%). Here again it may be fixed that like in the previous phase of monitoring, news are presented through the scenes and pictures easy to acquire⁴².

⁴² Ibid, page 42-43 (“It seems as if cameramen goes just the places that are convenient, i.e. inside Yerevan, to film public and state building, or simply street life”).

Table TV-7 Place of scenery

Percentage of picture places of all three scenes

| Picture places \ Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Studio | 4.1% | 11.2% | 7.0% |
| Press conference | 9.5% | 17.0% | 12.6% |
| Urban scene | 15.0% | 15.3% | 15.1% |
| Rural scenery | 7.6% | 5.2% | 6.6% |
| Public building/place | 11.5% | 15.1% | 13.0% |
| Conference | 15.1% | 7.4% | 11.9% |
| Office | 10.1% | 7.9% | 9.2% |
| School. university | 1.6% | 0.3% | 1.0% |
| Hospital | 0.6% | 1.6% | 1.0% |
| Industrial sites. en | 2.5% | 2.7% | 2.6% |
| Other, undefinable | 22.5% | 16.2% | 19.9% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N=responses | 515 | 365 | 880 |

4.3.2 Geographical reference

Taking into consideration the *undefinables* (Table TV-8), it was calculated also the particularly pictured geographical scenes (Table TV-9). As in the last monitoring the percentage (TVtotal – 51,4%) of Yerevan scenes is considerably great again. Shant, as was already mentioned, though covering marzes' problems more often (see table TVR12), uses Yerevan pictures frequently rather than H1 (54,4% vs. 49,3%). But at the same time pictures *other cities in Armenia* (supposed to be Gyumri) on Shant are more by 1,3% and pictures *villages/regions in Armenia* are less by 0,7%. Table TVR12 (topics'distribution into regional expansion /Armenia-marzes) shows that both the capital and the marzes are included in the topics almost in balance (Yerevan – 11,0%, marzes – 15,1%). Comparison of these two topics shows that though the marzes are of the same importance on broadcast, «the operator's camera functions only in the capital», and an impression is formed that Yerevan journalists don't trip to marzes, moreover there are a little reports received from marz/local stations (both of the TV channels have their branches in different marzes of Armenia).

Table TV-8 Geographical reference/ Undefinable

Percentage of undefinable cases of picture geographical reference of all three scenes

| Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total |
|-------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Indefinable | 1.4% | 1.5% | 1.5% |
| Total N=response | 494 | 326 | 820 |

Table TV-9 Geographical reference

Percentage of picture geographical reference of all three scenes excluding undefinable cases

| Picture places | Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Yerevan | | 49.3% | 54.5% | 51.4% |
| Other cities in Armenia | | 4.9% | 6.2% | 5.4% |
| Villages/regions in Armenia | | 6.6% | 5.9% | 5.3% |
| Karabakh | | 3.3% | 0.9% | 2.4% |
| Foreign country | | 35.9% | 32.4% | 34.5% |
| Total % | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N=responses | | 487 | 321 | 808 |

It is necessary also to mention that quite a great percent of the pictures (Shant–32,4%, H1–35,9%) refers to *foreign country* scenes, let's note that this doesn't suppose preparation of own materials too; scenes picturing *foreign country* are often archive materials, or are taken from foreign TV news. This remark is equally fair for both TV channels.

4.4 Picture Actors

4.4.1 Presentation of Actors

Actors' involvement in news pictures shows the preference given to them by TV channels in news provision. That is why we have analysed the frequency of actors' involvement in the scenes.

Table TV10 presents an interesting picture; Public TV gives the greatest preference to *general public* in all its scenes (19,2%), whereas Shant - to *professionals* showing them by 25,1% frequency.

Among the video actors of Public TV the second and the third places in 1% and 2% difference are taken by *international actors* (18,2%) and by *political actors* (17,2%). In the case of Shant *political actors* (21,8%) and *general Public* (20,3%) taking the second and the third places are beyond *professionals* on the first place by 3,3% and 4,8% correspondingly. It is notable that in respect of the scene presentation *political actors* though not the first, but are on the front line for both TV channels.

4.4.2 Comparison between picture actors and text actors

Comparing the actors presented in the picture with those in the text we reveal the following facts. On H1 *political actors* had less strength (17,2%) in the scenes than in the

texts (21,8%), in the case when the percentages on Shant grew from 20,7% to 21,8%. *Professionals* percents have grown in the scenes of both TVs; on H1 – by 3,4%, on Shant – 5,2%.

It is characteristic that monosemantic and balanced growth was registered in the case of the scene actor *general public* by 7,8% on each channel. This also may be conditioned by the easily acquired scenes with participation of *general public*; as far as the last is rarely presented as a text actor, it is introduced in the scenes as a background picture.

Table TV-10. The actors' involvement in the text and in the picture

Percentage of picture and text actors (scenes 1-3, actors1-3)

| Actors Groups | Presentation in text % of all actors | | | Presentation in picture % of all actors | | |
|---|---|--------------|-----------------|--|--------------|-----------------|
| | H1 | Shant | TV total | H1 | Shant | TV total |
| Political actors | 20.8% | 20.7% | 20.8% | 17.2% | 21.8% | 19.9% |
| <i>President of Armenia</i> | 3.4% | 3.5% | 3.4% | 2.7% | 2.1% | 2.4% |
| <i>Central Authorities</i> | 11.9% | 8.2% | 10.5% | 10.1% | 7.9% | 9.2% |
| <i>Parliament</i> | 3.9% | 6.9% | 5.1% | 4.4% | 9.7% | 6.6% |
| <i>Political party</i> | 1.5% | 2.1% | 1.8% | 1.5% | 2.1% | 1.7% |
| Local Administration | 10.8% | 7.4% | 9.5% | 10.8% | 6.6% | 9.1% |
| <i>Local administrations</i> | 2.0% | 2.7% | 2.3% | 1.2% | 2.1% | 1.6% |
| <i>Judiciary</i> | 2.9% | .3% | 1.9% | 2.7% | .3% | 1.7% |
| <i>Police</i> | 2.0% | 2.1% | 2.1% | 2.2% | 1.4% | 1.9% |
| <i>Military</i> | 3.8% | 2.4% | 3.2% | 4.7% | 2.8% | 3.9% |
| Economic actors | 5.8% | 3.2% | 4.8% | 6.1% | 2.7% | 4.7% |
| <i>Entrepreneurs, business people</i> | 1.5% | 0.3% | 1.0% | 0.7% | 0.0% | .4% |
| <i>International business people</i> | 4.1% | 2.7% | 3.5% | 2.0% | 1.0% | 1.6% |
| <i>Employees</i> | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 3.4% | 1.7% | 2.7% |
| Civil society | 1.7% | 3.5% | 2.4% | 1.5% | 2.4% | 1.8% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., national NGO</i> | 0.7% | 2.1% | 1.2% | 0.5% | 2.1% | 1.1% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., international NGO</i> | 1.0% | 1.3% | 1.1% | 1.0% | .3% | .7% |
| International actors | 26.3% | 27.1% | 26.6% | 18.2% | 15.1% | 16.9% |
| <i>Inter-governmental</i> | 5.5% | 4.5% | 5.1% | 4.4% | 1.7% | 3.3% |

| organization | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Foreign political bodies | 17.7% | 20.7% | 18.9% | 13.3% | 13.4% | 13.3% |
| Foreign country as an actor | 3.1% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 0.5% | 0.0% | .3% |
| Professionals | 13.5% | 19.9% | 16.0% | 16.9% | 25.1% | 20.4% |
| Culture | 5.8% | 6.4% | 6.0% | 6.4% | 7.2% | 6.7% |
| Churches, religious leaders | 1.0% | 2.7% | 1.7% | 2.2% | 3.8% | 2.9% |
| Media | 1.7% | 3.7% | 2.5% | 2.9% | 6.9% | 4.6% |
| Science/education | 4.9% | 7.2% | 5.8% | 5.4% | 7.2% | 6.2% |
| Diaspora | 1.0% | 0.8% | 0.9% | 0.7% | 0.7% | .7% |
| Diaspora | 1.0% | 0.8% | 0.9% | 0.7% | 0.7% | .7% |
| General Public | 11.4% | 12.5% | 11.9% | 19.2% | 20.3% | 19.7% |
| Person from general public | 9.6% | 11.4% | 10.3% | 19.2% | 20.3% | 19.7% |
| Armenia as a nation | 1.9% | 1.1% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Author | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | .5% | .0% | .3% |
| Author | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | .5% | .0% | .3% |
| Other | 8.7% | 4.8% | 7.2% | 7.4% | 5.2% | 6.5% |
| Others | 8.7% | 4.8% | 7.2% | 7.4% | 5.2% | 6.5% |
| Total % | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Total N =responses | 586 | 376 | 962 | 407 | 290 | 697 |

excluding “no actors” and “indefinables”.

4.4.3 Percentage of picture actors speaking in direct speech

Besides the actors' presence in the scenes their verbal participation is of great importance too. In news provision participation of the actors speaking in direct speech is of special significance. Table TV12 shows that *professionals* heard speaking have the greatest percentage among scene actors (32,0%) on Shant, *political actors* (22.8%) are on the second place, whereas it is vice versa on Public TV; *political actors* are the first by 24,4%, and *professionals* are the second by 23,3%. As to the participation of *general public* on both TVs it appears rather as a background actor than one heard speaking.

Table TV12 Percentage of picture actors speaking in direct speech

| Actors | Presentation in picture % of all actors | | | Speaking in direct speech % of all actors | | |
|---------------|--|--------------|-----------------|--|--------------|-----------------|
| | H1 | Shant | TV total | H1 | Shant | TV total |
| Groups | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Political actors | 17.2% | 21.8% | 19.9% | 24.4% | 22.8% | 23.7% |
| <i>President of Armenia</i> | 2.7% | 2.1% | 2.4% | 1.5% | 1.1% | 1.3% |
| <i>Central Authorities</i> | 10.1% | 7.9% | 9.2% | 13.6% | 8.7% | 11.4% |
| <i>Parliament</i> | 4.4% | 9.7% | 6.6% | 6.7% | 10.3% | 8.3% |
| <i>Political party</i> | 1.5% | 2.1% | 1.7% | 2.6% | 2.7% | 2.6% |
| Local Administration | 10.8% | 6.6% | 9.1% | 10.4% | 7.6% | 9.1% |
| <i>Local administrations</i> | 1.2% | 2.1% | 1.6% | 1.9% | 3.3% | 2.5% |
| <i>Judiciary</i> | 2.7% | 0.3% | 1.7% | 3.7% | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| <i>Police</i> | 2.2% | 1.4% | 1.9% | 2.6% | 1.9% | 2.3% |
| <i>Military</i> | 4.7% | 2.8% | 3.9% | 2.2% | 2.4% | 2.3% |
| Economic actors | 6.1% | 2.7% | 4.7% | 4.5% | 1.6% | 3.2% |
| <i>Entrepreneurs, business people</i> | 0.7% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 1.3% | 0.0% | 0.7% |
| <i>International business people</i> | 2.0% | 1.0% | 1.6% | 1.7% | 1.1% | 1.4% |
| <i>Employees</i> | 3.4% | 1.7% | 2.7% | 1.5% | 0.5% | 1.1% |
| Civil society | 1.5% | 2.4% | 1.8% | 2.2% | 3.0% | 2.5% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., national NGO</i> | .5% | 2.1% | 1.1% | .6% | 2.4% | 1.4% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., international NGO</i> | 1.0% | 0.3% | 0.7% | 1.5% | 0.5% | 1.1% |
| International actors | 18.2% | 15.1% | 16.9% | 9.7% | 8.4% | 9.1% |
| <i>Inter-governmental organization</i> | 4.4% | 1.7% | 3.3% | 3.9% | 1.6% | 2.9% |
| <i>Foreign political bodies</i> | 13.3% | 13.4% | 13.3% | 5.8% | 6.8% | 6.3% |
| <i>Foreign country as an actor</i> | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Professionals | 16.9% | 25.1% | 20.4% | 23.3% | 32.0% | 27.2% |
| <i>Culture</i> | 6.4% | 7.2% | 6.7% | 8.6% | 10.0% | 9.3% |
| <i>Churches, religious leaders</i> | 2.2% | 3.8% | 2.9% | 2.6% | 3.5% | 3.0% |
| <i>Media</i> | 2.9% | 6.9% | 4.6% | 3.7% | 7.3% | 5.3% |
| <i>Science/education</i> | 5.4% | 7.2% | 6.2% | 8.4% | 11.1% | 9.6% |
| Diaspora | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 1.3% | 1.1% | 1.2% |
| <i>Diaspora</i> | .7% | .7% | .7% | 1.3% | 1.1% | 1.2% |
| General Public | 19.2% | 20.3% | 19.7% | 16.2% | 19.5% | 17.7% |
| <i>Person from general</i> | 19.2% | 20.3% | 19.7% | 16.2% | 19.5% | 17.7% |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| public | | | | | | |
| Armenia as a nation | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Author | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.4% |
| Author | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.4% |
| Other | 7.4% | 5.2% | 6.5% | 7.3% | 4.1% | 5.9% |
| Others | 7.4% | 5.2% | 6.5% | 7.3% | 4.1% | 5.9% |
| Total % | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Total N =responses | 407 | 290 | 697 | 463 | 369 | 832 |

5. Special indicators of Radio news: Peculiarities of Soundbits

5.1 Technical aspects of soundbits

5.1.1 Number of soundbit providers

Besides text content radio news consists also of soundbits, which like the scenes in TV news, were analysed within the framework of this survey.

The participants' number in the provision of radio news is shown in table R1.

Public Radio by 66,1% and Liberty by 63,1% show vividly that in Armenian practice radio news are mainly presented by *§1 provider*¹, that is by the presenter, and the participation of the second presenter or a journalist, moreover of the additional sources are very rare (Radio_{total} ` 35.5%). Though Public Radio goes ahead of Liberty in the case of *§2-3 providers*¹ by 3,5%, it remains beyond the last in the case of *§4-6 providers*¹ and *§7 and more providers*¹ by 3,1% and 3,4% correspondingly.

Table R-1 Number of different soundbit providers

| Medium <i>Soundbit providers' number</i> | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| 1 provider=reporter | 66.1% | 63.1% | 64.5% |
| 2-3 providers | 20.0% | 16.5% | 18.2% |
| 4-6 providers | 11.5% | 14.6% | 13.1% |
| 7 and more providers | 2.4% | 5.8% | 4.2% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 330 | 363 | 693 |

The presenter is included

5.1.2 Frequency of soundbits

There are *sound changes* between the *providers* in radio news. The *change* indicator was calculated through the measurement of the relationship between different *soundbit providers* and *soundbit changes*. *Change* indicators are almost the same both for Public Radio and for Liberty. It is characteristic that the number of *soundbit providers* and *soundbits* are mainly equal - Radio_{total} 66,7%, and such a great indicator is related mainly to the dominance of *§1 provider*¹ within radio news. However almost in a quarter of cases number of *soundbits* excels the twice number of *soundbit providers* (Radio_{total} 23,2%).

Table R-2 Percentage of soundbits and soundbit providers on each radio channel

| Number of Soundbits | Medium | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---|---------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| >2 x soundbit providers' number | | 21.2% | 25.1% | 23.2% |
| =2 x soundbit providers' number | | 3.9% | 1.9% | 2.9% |
| >1 x soundbit providers' number | | 6.7% | 7.7% | 7.2% |
| =1 x soundbit providers' number | | 68.2% | 65.3% | 66.7% |
| Total % | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | | 330 | 363 | 693 |

Calculation of the *change* indicator according to the length⁴³ of radio news shows: the longer is the news, the greater is the *change* indicator. As expected, in short news on both radio channels there are no *changes* at all or the number of *soundbits* are equal to the number of *soundbit providers*. The mentioned formulas function for both channels; the twice more great number of *soundbits* towards *soundbit providers* exists only in the longest radio news (H1 – 57,4% and Liberty – 66,9%).

Table R-3 Percentage of soundbits and soundbit providers in different length news on each channel

| Number of Soundbits | | >2 x soundbit providers' number | =2 x soundbit providers' number | >1 x soundbit providers' number | =1 x soundbit providers' number | Total % |
|----------------------------|----------------|---|--|---|--|----------------|
| Medium | | | | | | |
| PR | <i>Short</i> | .0% | .0% | .0% | 100.0% | 100% |
| | <i>Medium</i> | .0% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 97.4% | 100% |
| | <i>Long</i> | 57.4% | 9.8% | 17.2% | 15.6% | 100% |
| | Total N | 70 | 13 | 22 | 225 | 330 |
| Liberty | <i>Short</i> | .0% | .0% | .0% | 100.0% | 100% |
| | <i>Medium</i> | .0% | 1.1% | 4.3% | 94.7% | 100% |
| | <i>Long</i> | 66.9% | 4.4% | 17.6% | 11.0% | 100% |
| | Total N | 91 | 7 | 28 | 237 | 363 |
| Radio total | <i>Short</i> | .0% | .0% | .0% | 100.0% | 100% |
| | <i>Medium</i> | .0% | 1.2% | 2.9% | 95.9% | 100% |
| | <i>Long</i> | 62.4% | 7.0% | 17.4% | 13.2% | 100% |
| | Total N | 161 | 20 | 50 | 462 | 693 |

5.2 Content aspects of soundbits

5.2.1 Context of soundbits

From the point of view of quality estimation of the news on radio it is important the context in which the collection of radio information is done; whether it is done for radio especially or not.

⁴³ Length grouping criteria in radio news, as shown in table R-01, page 6, are the following: short – up to 30 seconds, mid-length – 31-90 seconds, long – 91 and more seconds.

The context uncertainty for Public Radio is 12,1%, for Liberty – 10,4%.

Table R-4 Context/ Indefinable

| Medium | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Indefinable | 12.1% | 10.4% | 11.2% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 231 | 278 | 509 |

Excluding the *indefinable* cases in general both radio stations accomplish the collection of soundbit information especially for their channels, though in the case of this indicator Liberty excels Public Radio by 17,4% (Liberty – 69,1%, Public Radio – 51,7%).

Table R-5 Soundbit context on each channel

| Medium | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---------------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Soundbit context | | | |
| Radio only | 51.7% | 69.1% | 61.3% |
| Not for radio only | 48.3% | 30.9% | 38.7% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 203 | 249 | 452 |

5.2.2 Do the soundbits provide additional information?

Content quality of radio news greatly depends on the fact whether news providers tell new information or not. In this respect too Public Radio is beyond Liberty (by 4,5%), though has rather high indicator – 87, 9%.

Table R-6 Additional information got from soundbit providers

| Medium | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Additional info providing | | | |
| Provides new info | 87.9% | 92.4% | 90.4% |
| Doesn't provide new info | 12.1% | 7.6% | 9.6% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 232 | 277 | 509 |

5.2.3 Emotional context of soundbits

Interesting results were received about the emotional context of the news provision. In the course of monitoring Public Radio, by 14,6%, presented more neutral and unemotional news in the case, when Liberty's neutrality in the context of news presentation towards the emotionally saturated ones formed 6,8%. It should be noted that these indicators refer to the context provided by *soundbit providers* and not by the presenter.

Table R-7 Emotional context of soundbits

| Medium <i>Soundbit providers' emotion</i> | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| Natural | 57.3% | 53.4% | 55.2% |
| Emotional | 42.7% | 46.6% | 44.8% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 232 | 277 | 509 |

5.3 Who are the soundbit providers ?

5.3.1 Presentation of soundbit providers

When besides the presenter other participants that are *soundbit providers* are selected by radio stations to provide news, they are led with their primary characteristics. In this respect it is interesting to know who, as news providers, are given preference to by radio channels.

Though in general the honor of news presentation belong to the presenters (see table R1), however calculations for the other cases show that the greatest preference by both radio is given to the *political actors* (Public Radio – 36,2%, Liberty – 20,7%). Of course, in this respect the two radio channels can stand together conditionally, as the preference given to the *political actors* by Public Radio not only excels Liberty's indicator, but also goes ahead of *professionals* by 16,4% with its *soundbit providers*, taking the second place by its frequency. In comparison with Public Radio Liberty gives preference to *political actors* only by 1,4% among *soundbit providers* confronted with *general public* (19,3%) on the second place.

5.3.2 Comparison between soundbit providers and text actors

It is characteristic that on Public Radio *general public* is on the last positions among *soundbit providers*; they were given soundbit opportunity at 5,6% cases. Yet *general public* as an actor is presented more often within public news (7,5%), whereas

on Liberty it is presented less frequently as an actor (9,8%) than as a *soundbit provider* (19,3% see, the comparing table R4.)

So it can be noted that Radio Station Liberty gives more preference to the soundbits involvement of general public, than Public Radio does.

Continuing the participation comparison between the news content and *soundbit providers'* involvement in them, we note that in the case of Public Radio the greatest progress by 13,1% occurred in respect of participation of the presenter and the journalist, and the frequency increase of soundbit participation of *political actors* is on the second place by 12,1%. Whereas in the case of Liberty the greatest increase of participation was registered for *general public* by 9,50%, and the second place was taken by the author's 8,6% participation flight from 0 level of his involvement. For both radio stations the greatest indicators of decrease of soundbit participation have *international actors* (Public Radio – 25,8%, Liberty – 24,1%).

Table R-8 Percentage of soundbit providers and text actors: who are the soundbit providers compared with the text actors on each channel?

| Actors Soundbit Providers | Soundbit providers | | | Text actors | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| | PR | Liberty | Radio total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
| Groups | | | | | | |
| Political actors | 36.2% | 20.7% | 27.7% | 24.1% | 20.0% | 21.9% |
| <i>President of Armenia</i> | .9% | 1.4% | 1.2% | 2.5% | 3.0% | 2.8% |
| <i>Central Authorities</i> | 12.9% | 8.2% | 10.4% | 9.1% | 7.5% | 8.3% |
| <i>Parliament</i> | 11.2% | 3.9% | 7.2% | 5.1% | 2.8% | 3.9% |
| <i>Political party</i> | 11.2% | 7.1% | 9.0% | 7.4% | 6.6% | 7.0% |
| Local Administration | 9.5% | 7.5% | 8.4% | 8.9% | 9.9% | 9.5% |
| <i>Local administrations</i> | 5.6% | 1.8% | 3.5% | 3.0% | 1.5% | 2.2% |
| <i>Judiciary</i> | 1.7% | 3.6% | 2.7% | 1.6% | 3.2% | 2.4% |
| <i>Police</i> | .4% | .4% | .4% | 0.9% | 2.3% | 1.6% |
| <i>Military</i> | 1.7% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 3.4% | 3.0% | 3.2% |
| Economic actors | 3.0% | 7.1% | 5.3% | 5.1% | 5.3% | 5.2% |
| <i>Entrepreneurs, business people</i> | .4% | 5.4% | 3.1% | 2.0% | 2.5% | 2.2% |
| <i>International business people</i> | .9% | .7% | .8% | 1.4% | 2.1% | 1.8% |
| <i>Employees</i> | 1.7% | 1.1% | 1.4% | 1.7% | 0.7% | 1.2% |
| Civil society | 6.5% | 1.8% | 3.9% | 4.1% | 1.0% | 2.4% |

| Actors Soundbit Providers Groups | Soundbit providers | | | Text actors | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| | PR | Liberty | Radio total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
| Civil soc. org., national NGO | 5.2% | 1.1% | 2.9% | 3.0% | 0.6% | 1.7% |
| Civil soc. org., international NGO | 1.3% | .7% | 1.0% | 1.1% | 0.5% | .7% |
| International actors | 3.9% | 11.8% | 8.2% | 29.7% | 35.9% | 33.1% |
| Inter-governmental organization | .9% | 2.9% | 2.0% | 5.4% | 7.9% | 6.7% |
| Foreign political bodies | 3.0% | 8.9% | 6.3% | 22.0% | 26.8% | 24.6% |
| Foreign country as an actor | 3.6% | 2.1% | 3.0% | 2.4% | 1.2% | 1.8% |
| Professionals | 19.8% | 17.1% | 18.4% | 16.6% | 14.0% | 15.2% |
| Culture | 7.3% | 11.8% | 9.8% | 4.2% | 5.4% | 4.9% |
| Churches, religious leaders | .9% | .0% | .4% | 1.2% | 0.2% | 0.7% |
| Media | 1.7% | 1.4% | 1.6% | 6.1% | 4.8% | 5.4% |
| Science/education | 9.9% | 3.9% | 6.6% | 5.1% | 3.5% | 4.2% |
| Diaspora | 1.7% | .4% | 1.0% | 1.3% | 0.2% | 0.7% |
| Diaspora | 1.7% | .4% | 1.0% | 1.3% | 0.2% | 0.7% |
| General Public | 5.6% | 19.3% | 13.1% | 7.5% | 9.8% | 8.7% |
| Person from general public | 5.6% | 19.3% | 13.1% | 7.1% | 8.7% | 7.9% |
| Armenia as a nation | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 1.1% | 0.8% |
| Author | 13.4% | 8.6% | 10.7% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.1% |
| Author | 13.4% | 8.6% | 10.7% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.1% |
| Other | .0% | 4.6% | 2.5% | 2.4% | 3.8% | 3.2% |
| Others | 9.1% | 3.9% | 2.5% | 2.4% | 3.8% | 3.2% |
| Noise | .4% | 1.1% | .8% | - | - | - |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Total N=responses | 232 | 280 | 512 | 760 | 888 | 1648 |

5.3.3 Soundbit providers according to text topics

Distribution of *soundbit providers* according to different informational topics also gives some impression about the functioning style and orientation of media. Table

R5 shows that in the case *political actors'* participation in all the topics Public Radio excels Liberty. It is interesting that on Public Radio participation of *civil society* is rather great in the topic *high politics* (10,2%). In news on *social development issues* the greatest percentage of soundbit participation again have *political actors* (31%), whereas on Liberty the greatest percentage belong to *general public* (41%), yet the last is presented by 3,4% in the same topic on public broadcast. Here *general public* is presented with the greatest relative indicator within the framework of *crime and events* (5,7%).

Table R-9 Soundbit providers according to text topics on each channel

| Text topic groups | Sound. providers' groups | Political actors | Local admin | Economic actors | Civil society | Inter national actors | Profess ionals | General public | Author | All others | Total % |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|------------|---------|
| | Medium | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Politics | PR | 54.2% | 3.4% | 1.7% | 10.2% | 6.8% | 8.5% | 5.1% | 10.2% | .0% | 100% |
| | Liberty | 37.2% | 6.4% | .0% | 1.3% | 23.1% | 5.1% | 17.9% | 7.7% | 1.3% | 100% |
| | Radio total | 44.5% | 5.1% | 0.7% | 5.1% | 16.1% | 6.6% | 12.4% | 8.8% | .7% | 100% |
| | Total N | 61 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 22 | 9 | 17 | 12 | 1 | 137 |
| Foreign affairs | PR | 17.6% | 11.8% | .0% | .0% | 5.9% | 35.3% | .0% | 29.4% | .0% | 100% |
| | Liberty | 5.6% | 11.1% | .0% | .0% | 44.4% | 16.7% | 5.6% | 16.7% | .0% | 100% |
| | Radio total | 11.4% | 11.4% | .0% | .0% | 25.7% | 25.7% | 2.9% | 22.9% | .0% | 100% |
| | Total N | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 35 |
| Crime and events | PR | 30.2% | 22.6% | 3.8% | 1.9% | 3.8% | 28.3% | 5.7% | 3.8% | .0% | 100% |
| | Liberty | 17.0% | 10.6% | 10.6% | 4.3% | 4.3% | 17.0% | 25.5% | 6.4% | 4.2% | 100% |
| | Radio total | 24.0% | 17.0% | 7.0% | 3.0% | 4.0% | 23.0% | 15.0% | 5.0% | 2.0% | 100% |
| | Total N | 24 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 23 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 100 |
| Social developm ent issues | PR | 31.0% | 10.3% | .0% | 10.3% | 3.4% | 10.3% | 3.4% | 24.1% | 6.9% | 100% |
| | Liberty | 15.4% | 10.3% | .0% | 2.6% | 2.6% | 7.7% | 41.0% | 7.7% | 12.8% | 100% |
| | Radio total | 22.1% | 10.3% | 0.0% | 5.9% | 2.9% | 8.8% | 25.0% | 14.7% | 10.3% | 100% |
| | Total N | 15 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 10 | 7 | 68 |
| Economy | PR | 53.6% | 3.6% | 7.1% | 10.7% | 0.0% | 3.6% | .0% | 21.4% | .0% | 100% |
| | Liberty | 24.2% | 3.0% | 33.3% | 3.0% | 6.1% | 3.0% | 6.1% | 15.2% | 6.1% | 100% |
| | Radio total | 37.7% | 3.3% | 21.3% | 6.6% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.3% | 18.0% | 3.3% | 100% |
| | Total N | 23 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 61 |

5.3.4 Soundbit providers according to soundbit duration

If the preference given to *soundbit providers* by radio channels becomes apparent by making their voice hear and involving them in news provision, then the importance of *soundbit providers* and the value of their message for radio channel are revealed through the overall *soundbit duration* of their participation.

On the whole the *soundbit duration* of one *soundbit provider* is imparted almost in balance on Liberty (21,8%-29,3%) and in the case of *16-45 seconds* it is joined on Public Radio (40,1%).

Table R-10 the overall soundbit duration of the providers

| <i>Soundbit duration for a provider</i> \ Medium | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|---|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| 0-15 seconds | 18.5% | 26.4% | 22.9% |
| 16-45 seconds | 40.1% | 29.3% | 34.2% |
| 46-90 seconds | 20.3% | 22.5% | 21.5% |
| 91 and more seconds | 21.1% | 21.8% | 21.5% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N=responses | 232 | 280 | 512 |

Table R11 shows that on Public Radio within all the levels of soundbit lengths the greatest indicators belong to *political actors*. This is conditioned not only by the unambiguous importance of the *political actors* in news provision on Public Radio, but also by their great involvement in general (see table R8).

As to Liberty in the longest *91 and more seconds* the greatest percentage have again *political actors* by 28,9%, who are followed by *professionals* at 20,7%, in the case of *46-90 seconds* political actors with 28,3% are followed by *general public* (20,4%). If this fact is compared also with the front position of *general public* (26,0%) and the level of presentation of *professionals* within *16-45 seconds*, then it may be summarized that among *soundbit providers* *political actors*, *general public* and *professionals* have a special place and importance with the length of their soundbit participation.

Table R-11 Percentage of soundbit providers according to soundbit duration on each channel

| <i>Soundbit providers</i> \ Soundbit duration | Medium | <i>0-15 seconds</i> | <i>16-45 seconds</i> | <i>46-90 seconds</i> | <i>91 and more seconds</i> |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Political actors | <i>PR</i> | 33.3% | 42.0% | 38.3% | 22.0% |
| | <i>Liberty</i> | 15.0% | 13.5% | 28.3% | 28.9% |
| | <i>Radio total</i> | 22.2% | 28.8% | 32.4% | 26.1% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 70 | 130 | 84 | 59 |
| Local admin | <i>PR</i> | 7.3% | 7.4% | 9.3% | 17.6% |
| | <i>Liberty</i> | 7.3% | 5.3% | 12.5% | 2.2% |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | <i>Radio total</i> | 7.3% | 6.4% | 11.2% | 8.4% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 23 | 29 | 29 | 19 |
| Economic actors | <i>PR</i> | 2.4% | 2.5% | 2.8% | 3.3% |
| | <i>Liberty</i> | 3.6% | 10.6% | 6.6% | 9.6% |
| | <i>Radio total</i> | 3.2% | 6.2% | 5.0% | 7.1% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 10 | 28 | 13 | 16 |
| Civil society | <i>PR</i> | 4.9% | 9.5% | 6.5% | 4.4% |
| | <i>Liberty</i> | 2.1% | 1.4% | 2.6% | .7% |
| | <i>Radio total</i> | 3.2% | 5.8% | 4.2% | 2.2% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 10 | 26 | 11 | 5 |
| International actors | <i>PR</i> | 4.1% | 2.9% | 2.8% | 4.4% |
| | <i>Liberty</i> | 20.2% | 9.6% | 5.3% | 3.7% |
| | <i>Radio total</i> | 13.9% | 6.0% | 4.2% | 4.0% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 44 | 27 | 11 | 9 |
| Professionals | <i>PR</i> | 29.3% | 19.3% | 14.0% | 15.4% |
| | <i>Liberty</i> | 17.1% | 22.6% | 9.2% | 20.7% |
| | <i>Radio total</i> | 21.8% | 20.8% | 11.2% | 18.6% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 69 | 94 | 29 | 42 |
| General public | <i>PR</i> | 8.9% | 5.8% | 10.3% | 1.1% |
| | <i>Liberty</i> | 21.2% | 26.0% | 20.4% | 8.1% |
| | <i>Radio total</i> | 16.5% | 15.1% | 16.2% | 5.3% |
| | <i>Total N</i> | 52 | 68 | 42 | 12 |

5.3.5 Soundbit providers according to soundbit frequency

Another indicator of the importance of *soundbit providers* is the frequency of their soundbits or the continuity of their participation. Each *soundbit provider* may be involved within the presentation of the news once or be allowed to present his message continuously.

With the help of table R12 we can see that in all the cases of the mentioned *soundbit providers* Public Radio gives them a chance of single participation more often, which certifies about the style and the established tradition in news provision of the radio station. The same is observable for Liberty with some exceptions; different soundbits of the *political actors* often sound *5 and more times* by 31, 7%, then *3-4 times* by 30,9% and then only once by 28,8%. It may be considered that *political actors* rather than other actors are given wider opportunity to comment their message through the continuity of soundbits by Liberty.

For both radio stations the greatest indicator of single soundbit provision belong to *general public* (Public Radio – 91,9%, Liberty – 55,1%), which makes to suppose that participation of the last in providing radio news is not of so deep essence.

Table R-12 Soundbit providers according to soundbit frequency

| <i>Soundbit providers</i> | Soundbit frequency | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Political actors | <i>once</i> | 47.1% | 28.8% | 39.7% |
| | <i>2 times</i> | 20.6% | 8.6% | 15.7% |
| | <i>3-4 times</i> | 22.5% | 30.9% | 25.9% |
| | <i>5 and more times</i> | 9.8% | 31.7% | 18.7% |
| | Total N | 204 | 139 | 343 |
| Local admin | <i>once</i> | 49.1% | 48.9% | 49.0% |
| | <i>2 times</i> | 39.6% | 12.8% | 27.0% |
| | <i>3-4 times</i> | 11.3% | 19.1% | 15.0% |
| | <i>5 and more times</i> | 0.0% | 19.1% | 9.0% |
| | Total N | 53 | 47 | 100 |
| Economic actors | <i>once</i> | 40.0% | 34.6% | 35.8% |
| | <i>2 times</i> | 33.3% | 15.4% | 19.4% |
| | <i>3-4 times</i> | 20.0% | 28.8% | 26.9% |
| | <i>5 and more times</i> | 6.7% | 21.2% | 17.9% |
| | Total N | 15 | 52 | 67 |
| Civil society | <i>once</i> | 55.0% | 36.4% | 51.0% |
| | <i>2 times</i> | 20.0% | 27.3% | 21.6% |
| | <i>3-4 times</i> | 15.0% | 27.3% | 17.6% |
| | <i>5 and more times</i> | 10.0% | 9.1% | 9.8% |
| | Total N | 40 | 11 | 51 |
| International actors | <i>once</i> | 47.4% | 50.0% | 49.5% |
| | <i>2 times</i> | 21.1% | 20.8% | 20.9% |
| | <i>3-4 times</i> | 31.6% | 13.9% | 17.6% |
| | <i>5 and more times</i> | 0.0% | 15.3% | 12.1% |
| | Total N | 19 | 72 | 91 |
| Professionals | <i>once</i> | 63.4% | 42.6% | 52.6% |
| | <i>2 times</i> | 19.6% | 18.9% | 19.2% |
| | <i>3-4 times</i> | 12.5% | 18.9% | 15.8% |
| | <i>5 and more times</i> | 4.5% | 19.7% | 12.4% |
| | Total N | 112 | 122 | 234 |
| General public | <i>once</i> | 91.9% | 55.1% | 63.0% |
| | <i>2 times</i> | 0.0% | 10.3% | 8.1% |
| | <i>3-4 times</i> | 8.1% | 15.4% | 13.9% |
| | <i>5 and more times</i> | 0.0% | 19.1% | 15.0% |
| | Total N | 37 | 136 | 173 |

Summary

The data received as a result of monitoring are very expressive, interesting, reflect actually the peculiarities of the Armenian journalism from the quantitative point of view and answer a range of questions. We make notes and deductions not only to fill the conclusions of the second phase of monitoring, but to draw forth also new thesis, to explain and to reveal the characteristics of the Armenian media.

The summary presents the main we noted and fixed during different phases of this survey.

TECHNICAL ASPECTS

- ✓ Short news is more characteristic to TV news and to radio broadcasts.
- ✓ The difference between the quantity of TV and radio openers is not very great. Political then crime topics have a great deal of openers among all the topics on TV and radio broadcasts.
- ✓ Monitoring of the Armenian media shows that news with no mentioned point in time is not a rare case. On the other hand all the channels cover mostly the most recent developments. In the course of monitoring radio news referred to different current events more often.
- ✓ Usually there is no mentioned point in time in news on both TV and on radio, and if there is , then only 1point.
- ✓ Almost half of all the programs involve orientations inclined to the possible developments of the events.

TOPICS

The topic **high politics** is strongly covered both on TV and on radio; radio is full of also with the topics **crime and events**.

Comparing the results of two phases: In this phase too the topics **migration, regional integration of South Caucasus** and **social problems** deserved little attention of the journalists.

Conclusion: The thesis drawn forth in the previous phase is stated again; that is the journalists are inclined to tell the society the news easy to acquire. The broadcast is mainly occupied with already acute, new-fashioned and the frequently discussed topics related to politics and crime. these compiling the biggest part of the informational and time space of media.

GEOGRAPHICAL REFERENCE

Mainly topics related to *Armenia only* are discussed both on TV and on radio. It is worth mentioning that even topics related to Nagorno Karabakh are covered twice more often on TV than on radio.

Comparing the results of two phases 1: If in print media topics related to *crime and events* were directed mainly to a *foreign country*, then in the case of TV and radio these prevail in news directed to *Armenia only*.

Comparing the results of two phases 2: In this phase like in the previous one news related to Yerevan prevails.

Comparing the results of two phases 3: According to the results of the previous phase news about Europe, then South Caucasus and the USA had the greatest percentage among the news devoted to different foreign countries. In the monitoring results of 2006 topics directed mainly to South Caucasus, then to Russia, Europe dominate. In the informational field of Shant Turkey is touched equally to Russia; among Armenian media Shant is noted for its special remarks devoted to Turkish news. This time the USA among all the countries has quite low percentage.

ACTORS

International actors are more often noted on TV and on radio. Then with no great difference *political actors* take the second place. The third place belongs to *general public* almost, equal with *local administration*.

Comparing the results of two phases: In comparison with the monitored results of 2005 the actors *civil society* and *general public* though not greatly but are more often presented on TV this time.

Note 1: Comparing the differences between the public and private TV and radio channels, it may be noted that the indicator of various actors is higher on private rather than on public stations.

The results received show that among *coalition and opposition* actors, though not considerably, but coalition actors have a dominating place. *Independent actors* also have a high percentage on broadcast.

Note 2: This picture is explainable taking into consideration also the covered topics in Armenian reality, as many of the weighty figures of the political field related to those topics have no party affiliation.

Note 3: The following fact deserves attention too; if radio and TV present coalition almost in balance, then in the presentation of opposition radio excels TV for several times.

SOURCES

Generally radio channels mention one source in their news. Cases with no source mentioned are more in public media rather than in the private.

Conclusion: TV channels are more detailed, conscientious and accurate in preparing *political and crime* news and probably are considered more important by TV journalists, whereas in the case of radio *social-economic* topics are paid more attention to contradicting the topics on page 53.

The sources are mainly transparent in the news on TV and radio. In this case too private channels work relatively more transparent than public ones.

Comparing the results of two phases: comparing the results of this phase with those of the second phase covered by media, it is notable that *general public* in this case is involved as a source of information more often both by radio and by TV.

All types of media gather information mainly by means of *interview, media inquiry*.

Note: In this respect the journalists' staff of H1 is more active, and generally TV stations are more progressive from this standpoint (preparation for different media events).

Public media is more notable for its participation in *planned events* than the private one.

DIRECT SPEECH

Comparing the results of two phases: This time *general public* is quoted in direct speech more often.

SPECIAL QUALITY INDICATORS

In *high politics daily life* is remarked more often by Public TV and by radio station Liberty.

Note: these two channels differ from the others in relating the political topics to the social problems more often. Almost always the topic *crime and events* is mostly related with *daily life* on all the channels. The *social-economic issues* of the society are mostly covered by Liberty through the prism of everyday life.

ANGLES

Generally news with 1 and 2 *angles* dominates both on TV and on radio. 4 and more *angles* are met mostly in the news on Liberty and the least on Public Radio.

JOURNALISTIC OPINION

In all the stations neutral journalism with *facts only* version dominates by more than 80%.

Hypothesis: It may be concluded that expressing an opinion is not an accepted method only in the case of TV news; in all the cases the percentage of *only opinion* is 0.

Note: Private TV journalists disguise their opinions more than those of the public TV.

COALITION/OPPOSITION

The results show that news on Armenian broadcast is mostly non-relevant to *coalition/opposition*. The private stations Shant and Liberty give relatively more preference to *opposition*, and the public ones – to *coalition*.

SPECIAL INDICATORS OF TV NEWS

TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE PICTURES

Conclusion: Compared with Public TV, Shant uses a great number of *scene changes*, which has a negative reflection on the quality of the journalism and may be conditioned by a small number of necessary clips adequate with the text information.

STANDING PICTURES AND ARCHIVES

Public TV uses twice more *standing pictures*.

Comparing the results of two phases and notes: *Archive* usage by Shant and by Public TV doesn't considerably differ. There were cases when the text and the picture concerned the past events without the label 'Archive'.

TOPICS OF PICTURES

In respect of pictures Shant is full of scenes adequate to the point *people talking*. The percentage of interviews is also great. These two types of pictures almost in balance exist also on Public TV.

Comparing the results of two phases: The same was investigated also in the results of previous monitoring. This time too a range of thematic pictures (for example, related to the topics migration, refugee or social development (education, health, media)), which are actual today for the Armenian society remain beyond the broadcast.

PLACES OF PICTURES

Shant as well as Public TV broadcast mostly *press conferences* and *urban scenes*.

Conclusion: Though marzes' broadcasting is of the same importance, however there is an impression that the journalist's camera operates mainly in the capital, and the reporters from Yerevan don't trip to marzes.

PICTURES ACTORS

General public is given the greatest preference by H1 in all its scenes, and *professionals* – by Shant. In respect of scenes' presentation *political actors* are not the first but at least one of the leading actors for both TV stations. *General public* is presented mainly in the scenes as a background picture.

SPECIAL INDICATORS OF RADIO NEWS:

TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF SOUNDBITS-

In Armenian practice radio news is usually broadcasted by *1 provider*, i.e. is by the presenter, whereas participation of the second presenter or a journalist, moreover the additional sources are quite rare in this case.

CONTENT ASPECTS OF SOUNDBITS

Generally both radio stations gather sound information especially for their stations. The content quality of Radiolur depends mainly on the fact whether the information providers tell new information or not. In this respect too Public Radio gives place to Liberty, though has a quite higher indicator. The results are interesting on the emotional context of news provision. In the course of monitoring information provided by Public Radio was more neutral, without emotions in the case when Liberty's neutrality in the context of news provision was $\pm\pm\pm$ among the emotionally saturated ones.

WHO ARE THE SOUNDBIT PROVIDERS ?

Political actors are given the greatest preference by both radio stations in broadcasting news. Of course thereupon the two channels can stand up to each other rather conditionally because the preference given to *political actors* by Public Radio not only excels the indicator of Liberty, but with its *soundbit providers* it is also ahead of the *professionals* taking the second place. It is notable that *general public* is considerably beyond among the *soundbit providers*.

Thus it may be noted that Liberty rather than Public Radio give more preference to the sound involvement of *general public*.

Public Radio excels Liberty in all the topics with the political actors' participation.

It is interesting that on Public Radio participation of *civil society* in the topic *high politics* is rather high.

On Public Radio in news on *social development issues* the greatest deal belongs again to *political actors*, whereas on Liberty the biggest percentage has *general public*, at that the last exists in the same topic on Public Radio. With relatively the greatest indicator on Public Radio *general public* is presented within the framework of the topic *crime and events*.

On Public Radio in all the levels of soundbit lengths the greatest indicators belong to political actors. This is conditioned not only by the unambiguous importance of the political actors in news provision on Public Radio, but also by their great involvement in general. In all the mentioned cases of *soundbit providers* Public Radio allot them a chance of single participation, which in fact certifies about the style and the established tradition in news provision of this radio station. The same picture is observable for Liberty with some exceptions; different soundbits of *political actors* sound often 5 and more times

Hypothesis: It may be considered that *political actors* are given a wider opportunity by Liberty rather than by Public Radio to comment their speech by way of soundbits' frequency.

The greatest indicators of single soundbit participation for both radios belong to *general public* which makes consider that participation in radio news provision of the last is not of so deep essence.

Annex

Table A_{TVR} 1 Percentage of openers according to topics

| <i>Topic Groups</i> | TV | | | Radio | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|--------------------|
| | Opener | | Total % | Opener | | Total % |
| | Yes | No | | Yes | No | |
| Science | 33.3% | 66.7% | 100.0% | 14.3% | 85.7% | 100.0% |
| Culture | 17.6% | 82.4% | 100.0% | 35.3% | 64.7% | 100.0% |
| Religion | 20.0% | 80.0% | 100.0% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| Sports | 50.0% | 50.0% | 100.0% | 17.6% | 82.4% | 100.0% |
| Other | 15.0% | 85.0% | 100.0% | 27.3% | 72.7% | 100.0% |
| High Politics | 29.5% | 70.5% | 100.0% | 34.4% | 65.6% | 100.0% |
| History | 63.6% | 36.4% | 100.0% | 28.6% | 71.4% | 100.0% |
| War | 44.4% | 55.6% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Foreign affairs | 23.1% | 76.9% | 100.0% | 12.1% | 87.9% | 100.0% |
| Crime and events | 43.9% | 56.1% | 100.0% | 35.5% | 64.5% | 100.0% |
| Social development issues | 34.4% | 65.6% | 100.0% | 38.2% | 61.8% | 100.0% |
| Economics | 23.6% | 76.4% | 100.0% | 29.0% | 71.0% | 100.0% |
| National security | 56.3% | 43.8% | 100.0% | 11.1% | 88.9% | 100.0% |
| Topic groups total | 32.3% | 67.7% | 100.0% | 27.1% | 72.9% | 100.0% |

Table A_{TVR} 2 Percentages of TV/Radio news with single actors and actor groups

| <i>Actors Groups</i> | TV total - % of all 3 actors mentioned | Radio total - % of all 3 actors mentioned |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Political actors | 20.6% | 23.7% |
| <i>President of Armenia</i> | 3.4% | 3.1% |
| <i>Central Authorities</i> | 10.2% | 8.7% |
| <i>Parliament</i> | 5.0% | 4.3% |
| <i>Political party</i> | 2.0% | 7.6% |
| Local Administration | 9.6% | 10.3% |
| <i>Local administrations</i> | 2.5% | 2.6% |
| <i>Judiciary</i> | 1.9% | 3.1% |
| <i>Police</i> | 2.2% | 1.7% |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Military | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| Economic actors | 4.5% | 5.7% |
| <i>Entrepreneurs, business people</i> | .9% | 2.7% |
| <i>International business people</i> | 3.4% | 1.7% |
| <i>Employees</i> | .2% | 1.2% |
| Civil society | 2.6% | 2.7% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., national NGO</i> | 1.2% | 2.0% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., international NGO</i> | 1.4% | .7% |
| International actors | 27.5% | 31.0% |
| <i>Inter-governmental organization</i> | 5.1% | 6.8% |
| <i>Foreign political bodies</i> | 19.4% | 22.5% |
| <i>Foreign country as an actor</i> | 3.0% | 1.7% |
| Professionals | 15.7% | 14.3% |
| <i>Culture</i> | 5.0% | 5.4% |
| <i>Churches, religious leaders</i> | 1.9% | .7% |
| <i>Media</i> | 2.6% | 3.5% |
| <i>Science/education</i> | 6.2% | 4.5% |
| Diaspora | 0.7% | 1.0% |
| <i>Diaspora</i> | .7% | 1.0% |
| General Public | 11.7% | 8.2% |
| <i>Person from general public</i> | 10.2% | 7.3% |
| <i>Armenia as a nation</i> | 1.5% | .8% |
| Author | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| <i>Author</i> | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Other | 7.0% | 3.1% |
| <i>Other</i> | 7.0% | 3.1% |
| Total % | 100% | 100% |
| Total N | 267 news, 801 responses | 404 news, 1212 responses |

The news with less than 3 actors excluded.

Table A_{TVR}-3. Diversity of depth levels according to the news length

| <i>Depth levels</i> | TV total | | | Radio total | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| | 0-90 seconds | 91-180 seconds | 181 and more seconds | 0-30 seconds | 31-90 seconds | 91 and more seconds |
| 0 depth levels | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | .8% | 1.8% | 2.3% |
| 1 depth level | 44.3% | 12.4% | 2.4% | 44.2% | 34.7% | 7.4% |
| 2 depth levels | 36.1% | 36.2% | 22.9% | 29.8% | 31.8% | 19.4% |
| 3 depth levels | 15.3% | 39.0% | 43.4% | 20.8% | 22.4% | 28.3% |
| 4 depth levels | 4.4% | 12.4% | 31.3% | 4.5% | 9.4% | 42.6% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N = 371 news | 183 | 105 | 83 | 265 | 170 | 258 |

Table ATVR-4. News depth (diversity of depth levels in mid-length news)

| <i>Depth levels</i> \ Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| 0 depth levels | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.9% | 0.0% | 1.8% |
| 1 depth level | 7.7% | 17.0% | 12.4% | 30.3% | 38.3% | 34.7% |
| 2 depth levels | 40.4% | 32.1% | 36.2% | 18.4% | 42.6% | 31.8% |
| 3 depth levels | 28.8% | 49.1% | 39.0% | 34.2% | 12.8% | 22.4% |
| 4 depth levels | 23.1% | 1.9% | 12.4% | 13.2% | 6.4% | 9.4% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 52 | 53 | 105 | 76 | 94 | 170 |

Table ATVR-5. More information on news. What did happen and why did it happen? Do news have background and consequences? (percentage of depth levels in all TV/Radio news)

| <i>Medium</i> \ Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| What? | 100% | 99.3% | 99.7% | 94.8% | 99.7% | 97.4% |
| Why? | 75.8% | 61.5% | 70.1% | 56.7% | 59.8% | 58.3% |
| Background | 22.9% | 14.9% | 19.7% | 36.1% | 27.0% | 31.3% |
| Consequences | 38.1% | 38.5% | 38.3% | 48.5% | 41.9% | 45.0% |
| Total N | 223 | 148 | 371 | 330 | 363 | 693 |

Table ATVR-6. Diversity of perspectives (in mid-length news)

| <i>Perspectives</i> \ Medium | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| 0 perspectives | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 1 perspective | 17.3% | 26.4% | 21.9% | 60.5% | 55.3% | 57.6% |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 2 perspectives | 82.7% | 71.7% | 77.1% | 32.9% | 43.6% | 38.8% |
| 3 perspectives | 0.0% | 1.9% | 1.0% | 6.6% | 1.1% | 3.5% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 52 | 53 | 105 | 76 | 94 | 170 |

Table A_{TVR}-7. Percentage explanation of journalist's opinion in 'opinion containing articles'

| Medium <i>Explanation rate of journalists' opinion</i> | H1 | Shant | TV total | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|
| For all opinions | 70.7% | 64.7% | 69.0% | 73.5% | 54.5% | 62.6% |
| For some opinions | 19.5% | 29.4% | 22.4% | 16.3% | 43.9% | 32.2% |
| For no opinion | 9.8% | 5.9% | 8.6% | 10.2% | 1.5% | 5.2% |
| Total % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Total N | 41 | 17 | 58 | 49 | 66 | 115 |

Table A_{TV}—8. Percentage of picture actors and actor groups speaking

| Actors Groups | Speaking rates of 1-3 picture actors in 1-3 scenes | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | H1 | | Shant | | TV total |
| | % | N | % | N | |
| Political actors | 29.6% | 68 | 26.9% | 42 | 28.5% |
| <i>President of Armenia</i> | 3.9% | 9 | 1.9% | 3 | 3.1% |
| <i>Central Authorities</i> | 16.5% | 38 | 11.5% | 18 | 14.5% |
| <i>Parliament</i> | 6.5% | 15 | 10.3% | 16 | 8.0% |
| <i>Political party</i> | 2.6% | 6 | 3.2% | 5 | 2.8% |
| Local Administration | 8.7% | 20 | 6.4% | 10 | 7.8% |
| <i>Local administrations</i> | 2.2% | 5 | 3.8% | 6 | 2.8% |
| <i>Judiciary</i> | 3.5% | 8 | .0% | 0 | 2.1% |
| <i>Police</i> | 1.7% | 4 | .6% | 1 | 1.3% |
| <i>Military</i> | 1.3% | 3 | 1.9% | 3 | 1.6% |
| Economic actors | 3.9% | 9 | 2.6% | 4 | 3.4% |
| <i>Entrepreneurs, business people</i> | 1.3% | 3 | | 0 | .8% |
| <i>International business people</i> | 2.2% | 5 | 1.9% | 3 | 2.1% |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Employees | .4% | 1 | .6% | 1 | .5% |
| Civil society | 2.2% | 5 | 3.8% | 6 | 2.8% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., national NGO</i> | .9% | 2 | 3.2% | 5 | 1.8% |
| <i>Civil soc. org., international NGO</i> | 1.3% | 3 | .6% | 1 | 1.0% |
| International actors | 20.9% | 48 | 16.0% | 25 | 18.9% |
| <i>Inter-governmental organization</i> | 6.5% | 15 | 2.6% | 4 | 4.9% |
| <i>Foreign political bodies</i> | 14.3% | 33 | 13.5% | 21 | 14.0% |
| <i>Foreign country as an actor</i> | .0% | 0 | .0% | 0 | .0% |
| Professionals | 16.5% | 38 | 25.0% | 39 | 19.9% |
| <i>Culture</i> | 7.0% | 16 | 9.6% | 15 | 8.0% |
| <i>Churches, religious leaders</i> | 1.7% | 4 | 2.6% | 4 | 2.1% |
| <i>Media</i> | .9% | 2 | 2.6% | 4 | 1.6% |
| <i>Science/education</i> | 7.0% | 16 | 10.3% | 16 | 8.3% |
| Diaspora | .4% | 1 | .6% | 1 | .5% |
| <i>Diaspora</i> | .4% | 1 | .6% | 1 | .5% |
| General Public | 11.3% | 26 | 14.1% | 22 | 12.4% |
| <i>Person from general public</i> | 11.3% | 26 | 14.1% | 22 | 12.4% |
| <i>Armenia as a nation</i> | .0% | 0 | .0% | 0 | .0% |
| Author | .9% | 2 | .0% | 0 | .5% |
| <i>Author</i> | .9% | 2 | .0% | 0 | .5% |
| Other | 5.7% | 13 | 4.5% | 7 | 5.2% |
| <i>Others</i> | 5.7% | 13 | 4.5% | 7 | 5.2% |
| Total | 100% | 230 | 100% | 156 | 100% |
| N=responses | | | | | 386 |

Table AR-9. Percentage of soundbit providers according to soundbit duration on each channel

| Soundbit providers | Soundbit duration | PR | Liberty | Radio total |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Political actors | <i>0-15 seconds</i> | 20.1% | 20.9% | 20.4% |
| | <i>16-45 seconds</i> | 50.0% | 20.1% | 37.9% |
| | <i>46-90 seconds</i> | 20.1% | 30.9% | 24.5% |
| | <i>91 and more seconds</i> | 9.8% | 28.1% | 17.2% |
| | Total N | 204 | 139 | 343 |
| Local admin | <i>0-15 seconds</i> | 17.0% | 29.8% | 23.0% |
| | <i>16-45 seconds</i> | 34.0% | 23.4% | 29.0% |
| | <i>46-90 seconds</i> | 18.9% | 40.4% | 29.0% |
| | <i>91 and more seconds</i> | 30.2% | 6.4% | 19.0% |
| | Total N | 53 | 47 | 100 |
| Economic actors | <i>0-15 seconds</i> | 20.0% | 13.5% | 14.9% |
| | <i>16-45 seconds</i> | 40.0% | 42.3% | 41.8% |
| | <i>46-90 seconds</i> | 20.0% | 19.2% | 19.4% |
| | <i>91 and more seconds</i> | 20.0% | 25.0% | 23.9% |
| | Total N | 15 | 52 | 67 |
| Civil society | <i>0-15 seconds</i> | 15.0% | 33.3% | 19.2% |
| | <i>16-45 seconds</i> | 57.5% | 25.0% | 50.0% |
| | <i>46-90 seconds</i> | 17.5% | 33.3% | 21.2% |
| | <i>91 and more seconds</i> | 10.0% | 8.3% | 9.6% |
| | Total N | 40 | 12 | 52 |
| International actors | <i>0-15 seconds</i> | 26.3% | 54.2% | 48.4% |
| | <i>16-45 seconds</i> | 36.8% | 27.8% | 29.7% |
| | <i>46-90 seconds</i> | 15.8% | 11.1% | 12.1% |
| | <i>91 and more seconds</i> | 21.1% | 6.9% | 9.9% |
| | Total N | 19 | 72 | 91 |
| Professionals | <i>0-15 seconds</i> | 32.1% | 27.0% | 29.5% |
| | <i>16-45 seconds</i> | 42.0% | 38.5% | 40.2% |
| | <i>46-90 seconds</i> | 13.4% | 11.5% | 12.4% |
| | <i>91 and more seconds</i> | 12.5% | 23.0% | 17.9% |
| | Total N | 112 | 122 | 234 |
| General public | <i>0-15 seconds</i> | 29.7% | 29.9% | 29.9% |
| | <i>16-45 seconds</i> | 37.8% | 39.4% | 39.1% |
| | <i>46-90 seconds</i> | 29.7% | 22.6% | 24.1% |
| | <i>91 and more seconds</i> | 2.7% | 8.0% | 6.9% |
| | Total N | 37 | 137 | 174 |