



Media Monitoring Report:

Coverage of Armenian-Turkish Relations in the Media of Armenia and Turkey

September 2012

The report is produced as part of the “Support to Armenia-Turkey Rapprochement” project funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), which aims to support Armenia-Turkey rapprochement by facilitating engagement between civil society groups, the establishment and development of business partnerships and regional professional networks, as well as enhanced understanding between the people, for peace and economic integration in the region. The project is implemented by a Consortium comprising the Eurasia Partnership Foundation, the International Center for Human Development, the Union of Manufacturers and Businessmen (Employers) of Armenia and the Yerevan Press Club, in cooperation with a number of key Turkish partners including: the Global Political Trends Center, the Turkish- Armenian Business Development Council, Anadolu Kültür, GAYA Research Institute, the Media and Communications Department of Izmir University of Economics, Toplum Gönüllüleri Vakfı, the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation, and the Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey.

The report is made possible by the generous support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of the Yerevan Press Club and the Media and Communications Department of Izmir University of Economics, and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report, compiled by Yerevan Press Club and the Department of Communications at Izmir University of Economics, is based on the findings of monitoring of the Armenian and Turkish mainstream media between October 1, 2011 and November 15, 2011, regarding the coverage of Armenia-Turkey relations. The Turkish team monitored six selected outlets, including three national TV channels – CNN Türk, Star TV and Kanal 7 - and three newspapers - *Cumhuriyet*, *Hürriyet* and *Sabah* - in terms of both news reports and opinion pieces. Both the main newscasts and review/discussion programs of the TV channels were monitored, while in the print media, both the news coverage and commentaries were considered. In Armenia, monitoring included three national TV channels - Public Television of Armenia (PTA First Channel), Yerkir Media and Kentron - and three national newspapers - *Azg*, *Aravot* and *Zhamanak*¹.

The monitoring was conducted over a time period which did not include significant developments related to Armenia-Turkey relations. Particularly, it preceded the debates related to the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's apology for the Dersim massacre, as well as the row between Turkey and France over the French Senate's decision to criminalize genocide denial. The monitoring over this period gave an opportunity to assess the media coverage during a "normal" season, i.e. one without major dramatic events that might alter the coverage pattern. In that sense, the monitoring data provide an important addition to the previous phase of the research, which focused specifically on the periods of heightened attention to Armenia-Turkey relations.

On the basis of the monitoring data analyzed, it is possible to draw certain conclusions:

- As the monitoring data analyzed in this report suggests, there has been a return to the pre-2008 pattern, which was characterized by the more or less constant attention to Turkey on the part of the Armenian media and limited, mostly event-related coverage of Armenia by the Turkish media. While Armenia-Turkey relations and other topics related to Turkey continued to occupy a significant place in Armenian media coverage even despite the lack of progress in Armenia-Turkey developments, the Turkish media exhibited the opposite picture. The monitoring period of the Turkish media confirmed the dominant trend - Turkish media's scarce attention towards Armenia and Armenian issues. With notable exception of the developments related to French President Sarkozy's visit to Armenia in October 2011, the Turkish broadcast media did not include any news or comments on Armenia or Armenians, while the print media included only a limited number of references.
- While the Armenian media continued to actively cover Turkey-related topics, there have been certain changes in the Armenian media coverage trends as well, as compared to previous periods. For instance, the distribution of attitudes in the media pieces studied reflects disillusionment towards the Armenia-Turkey

¹ Monitoring data tables are available at [Yerevan Press Club](#), upon request.

normalization process and a lack of trust in the prospects for improved Armenia-Turkey relations. While the number of pieces with a negative attitude remained relatively limited, the pieces exhibiting positive attitudes were absolutely absent from the studied outlets. Neutral attitudes were present in the majority of the media pieces.

- In the Turkish media, while the general trend is characterized by a lack of attention towards Armenia and Armenians, there is a notable exception of the topic related to the genocide recognition campaign. Armenia and Armenians feature prominently in the Turkish press and TV whenever hot issues such as genocide recognition are raised by the U.S. and the European states/politicians or the Armenian diaspora. In this regard, news/comments are often framed within the context of Turkey's relations with Europe and the U.S. rather than Turkey-Armenia relations per se.
- In both countries, the overwhelming majority of pieces analyzed during the monitoring period were based on sources from their own country, rather than sources from the other country. The lack of primary sources from the other country remains a major pitfall to objective and precise reporting by the Armenian media on Turkey and vice versa.
- State-to-state relations remain the most widely covered aspect of the relations between the two countries. The Armenia-Turkey protocols were still being discussed in the Armenian media coverage during the monitoring period, even though the normalization process had been frozen by that time. The Armenian media also exhibited interest in the internal affairs of Turkey, and to a lesser extent in Turkey's relations with other countries. The interest of Turkish media towards internal developments in Armenia and its relations with other countries has been rather low. In both countries, media coverage of non-political issues is limited - the media tend to focus more on political issues, particularly related to official diplomacy, in which the existing historical controversies between the two countries resurface. With the exception of the stories about the Armenian community in Turkey, stories of ordinary Armenians and non-political issues in Armenia rarely feature in the Turkish media and vice versa.

The recommendations below are based on the above observations and conclusions and are addressed to journalists, other media professionals, the NGO community, international and local donors, as well as other stakeholders:

- While asymmetry in Armenian and Turkish media coverage is to an extent natural given the differences between the countries, interest towards Armenian topics in the Turkish media can and should be encouraged through such measures as journalist exchanges, trainings, workshops, summer courses, study visits, etc.
- Both Armenian and Turkish journalists and media professionals should be encouraged to rely on primary sources in order to provide accurate and comprehensive information on developments in Turkey. Journalist exchanges,

trainings, workshops, summer courses, study visits and other measures that lead to the exposure of Armenian journalists to Turkey can be useful in this regard.

- Journalists in both countries should be encouraged to spread their attention beyond the official state-to-state relations and look toward internal developments, human interest stories and other topics that can offer a fresh view of the other country, rather than repeat the standard narrative promoted by government-supported information sources.
- Deficiencies of mutual coverage can be addressed through developing networks of Armenian and Turkish journalists and other media professionals, who can act as mediators between the media communities of both countries. Such networks are already being created with the help of cooperation projects, such as the Support to Armenia-Turkey Rapprochement project², however these networks need further support in order to continue to function and to advance. These networks should be encouraged to develop beyond the main media centers to include media professionals in the regions, as well as in the field of alternative and new media.

² More information on the project can be found at www.armturkdialogue.net

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. THE MEDIA STUDIED	8
ARMENIA	8
TURKEY	9
3. PRESENCE OF THE SUBJECT OF MONITORING, TYPES OF MEDIA PIECES, SOURCES OF INFORMATION	11
ARMENIA	11
TURKEY	14
4. TOPICS OF COVERAGE	16
ARMENIA	16
TURKEY	17
5. CONNOTATIONS	18
ARMENIA	18
TURKEY	18
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
ATTACHMENT 1	22
I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION	22
II. METHODOLOGY OF THE MONITORING	24

1. INTRODUCTION

As the previous research has shown, there is significant asymmetry between the degree of representation of Armenia in Turkish media and vice versa. There were certain changes in that respect between 2008 and 2010 (as YPC/Izmir University research has also shown³), however, as the current monitoring outcomes suggest, this pattern has returned, and during the monitoring period the discrepancy was quite significant.

As some of the previous research carried out by YPC and its partners suggests, Turkey almost constantly occupies a prominent place in the Armenian media, while Armenia appeared mostly in cases when there was some specific development⁴. With the beginning of the football diplomacy there had been a significant rise in the level of the attention of the Turkish media⁵. However, as the monitoring data analyzed in this report suggest, there has been a return to the pre-2008 pattern, which was characterized by a more or less constant attention to Turkey on the part of the Armenian media and limited, mostly event-related coverage of Armenia by the Turkish media.

The monitoring period included a period which contained few significant developments related to Armenian-Turkish relations. Particularly, it preceded the debates related to the issue in Turkey regarding Erdoğan's apology for the Dersim massacre, as well as the row between Turkey and France over the French decision to criminalize genocide denial. Therefore, the monitoring over this period gave an opportunity to assess the media coverage during a "normal" season, i.e. one without major dramatic events that might alter the coverage pattern. In that sense, the monitoring data provide an important addition to the previous phase of research, which focused specifically on the periods of heightened attention to Armenian-Turkish relations.

The current report, compiled by Yerevan Press Club and Izmir University of Economics, is based on the findings of the monitoring of the Armenian and Turkish mainstream media between October 1 and November 15, 2011, regarding the coverage of Turkish-Armenian relations. The Turkish team monitored six selected outlets, including three national TV channels – **CNN Türk**, **Star TV** and **Kanal 7** - and three newspapers - **Cumhuriyet**, **Hürriyet** and **Sabah**, in terms of both news reports and opinion pieces. Both the main newscasts and review/discussion programs of the TV channels were monitored, while in the print media, we considered both the news coverage and commentaries. In Armenia the monitoring included 3 national TV channels - **Public Television of Armenia** (PTA First Channel), **Yerkir Media** and **Kentron**, and 3 national newspapers - **Azg**, **Aravot** and **Zhamanak**. In broadcast media, the main editions of

³ Media Research Report: Dynamics of Media Representation of the Armenia-Turkey Normalization Process in Armenian and Turkish Media. by Yerevan Press Club (Armenia) - Faculty of Communication of the Izmir University of Economics (Turkey), 2011, available at http://www.ypc.am/upload/Armenian-Turkish%20Media%20Research_January-May%202011_eng.pdf

⁴ Armenian-Turkish Team Reporting Project, Yerevan Press Club, 2009, p. 7-8

⁵ A good example of that change was the *Hürriyet* newspaper, where in 2008 there were 929 publications mentioning Armenia, compared to only 300 such publications throughout 1998-2004, Armenian-Turkish Team Reporting Project, p. 9.

news programs and the main current affairs/discussion programs were monitored. The methodology of the monitoring is presented in detail in attachment 1, *Background Information and Methodology* of the monitoring report.

2. THE MEDIA STUDIED

Armenia

PUBLIC TELEVISION OF ARMENIA (PTA First Channel) is a part of the Public TV and Radio Company, founded in 2001. The managing body is the Council of Public TV and Radio Company. The daily duration of airtime of the First Channel is 19,5 hours on the territory of Armenia and 24 hours in Yerevan. The programs of the First Channel are received abroad via satellite. The study focused on *Arajin Lratvakan* daily news program (the main newscast at 21.00 was monitored) and its Sunday news and commentary edition (at 21.00) as well as *Hartsazruyts* discussion program (aired five times a week, Monday to Friday, at 23.15). Throughout the monitoring period for PTA First Channel, a total of 879 TV pieces was studied - 850 in news programs (of these, 100 pieces [or 11.8%] dealt with the monitoring subject - 58 in full, 35 in part, 7 contained references to it) and 29 in discussion programs (of these, 8 pieces [or 27.6%] dealt with the monitoring subject - 4 in full, 3 in part, 1 contained a reference to it).

YERKIR MEDIA is a private TV company, founded in 2004 by Husaber CJSC. The daily duration of airtime is 24 hours. The programs of the channel are broadcast abroad via satellite. The study focused on *Yerkirn Aysor* daily news program (the main newscast at 22.00 was monitored) and its Sunday news and commentary edition, *Yerkri Shabat* (at 22.00) as well as *Yerkri Hartse* discussion program (aired five times a week, Monday to Friday at 22.30). Throughout the monitoring period for Yerkir Media, a total of 741 TV pieces was studied - 704 in news programs (of these, 105 pieces [or 14.9%] dealt with the monitoring subject - 69 in full, 28 in part, 8 contained references to it) and 37 in discussion programs (of these, 14 pieces [or 37.8%] dealt with the monitoring subject - 5 in full, 5 in part, 4 contained references to it).

KENTRON is a private TV company, founded in 2004 by Multimedia Kentron TV CJSC. The daily duration of airtime is 24 hours. The study focused on *Epikentron* daily news program (the main newscast at 20.30 was monitored) as well as *Urvagits* discussion program (aired five times a week, Monday to Friday, at 21.21). Throughout the monitoring period for Kentron, a total of 1,079 TV pieces was studied - 1,045 in news programs (of these, 121 pieces [or 11.6%] dealt with the monitoring subject: 74 in full, 36 in part, 11 contained references to it) and 34 in discussion programs (of these, 8 pieces [or 23.5%] dealt with the monitoring subject - 5 in part, 3 contained references to it).

AZG is a daily newspaper (five times a week, Tuesday-Saturday), founded in 2000 by Azg Daily Newspaper LLC. The standard volume is 8/A3 pp. The stated print run is 3,000 copies. During the monitoring period, 32 issues were published. Throughout the monitoring period for Azg a total of 1,015 newspaper pieces was studied. Of these, 160 pieces [or 15.8%] dealt with the monitoring subject: 73 in full, 67 in part, 20 contained references to it.

ARAVOT is a daily newspaper (five times a week, Tuesday-Saturday), founded in 1994 by Aravot Daily Newspaper LLC. The standard volume is 8/A3 pp. The stated print run is 2,151-2,435 copies. During the monitoring period, 32 issues were published. Throughout the monitoring period for *Aravot* a total of 1,017 newspaper pieces was studied. Of these, 76 pieces [or 7.5%] dealt with the monitoring subject: 32 in full, 34 in part, 10 contained references to it.

ZHAMANAK is a daily newspaper (five times a week, Tuesday-Saturday), founded in 1998 by Skizb Media Kentron LLC. The standard volume is 8/A3 pp. The stated print run is 5,300 copies. During the monitoring period, 29 issues were published. Throughout the monitoring period for *Zhamanak* a total of 844 newspaper pieces was studied. Of these, 79 pieces [or 9.4%] dealt with the monitoring subject: 38 in full, 35 in part, 6 contained references to it.

Turkey

CNN TÜRK is a private TV channel founded in 1999 by Doğan Media Group in partnership with Time Warner. The channel has the reputation of being a popular and reliable source of information at the very center of mainstream TV reporting. The daily duration of airtime is 24 hours. The following prime time news and discussion programs have been analyzed in this study:

CNN Türk *Ana Haber* ("CNN Türk Main News") - a daily newscast aired at 18:00 Monday to Friday and at 17:00 on Saturdays and Sundays.

5N1K ("5Ws: Who? What? Where? When? Why? and 1H: How?") - a discussion program aired on Mondays/Tuesdays/Wednesdays/Thursdays at 19:30.

32.Gün ("The 32nd Day") - a news review and discussion program aired on Saturdays at 23:00.

Dört Bir Taraf ("All Sides") - a discussion program aired on Tuesdays/Thursdays at 21:30.

Eğrisi Doğrusu ("Wrongs Rights") - a news review and discussion program aired on Sundays at 21:30.

Ne Oluyor? ("What is Happening?") - a news review and discussion program aired on Fridays at 21:30.

Soru-Yorum ("Question-Comment") - a news review and discussion program aired on Fridays at 19:30.

Tarafsız Bölge ("Neutral Zone") - a news review and discussion program aired on Mondays/Wednesdays/Saturdays at 21:30.

Within the monitoring period for CNN Türk, 698 news pieces were studied. 6 of these dealt with the monitoring subject - 3 in full and 3 in part. Out of the 147 topics discussed in the current affairs and discussion programs, 1 contained a reference to the monitoring subject.

STAR TV is the first private TV channel in Turkey, founded in 1989 under the name Magic Box Star, by Magic Box Incorporated AG. In 2004, the channel was taken over by the government and then sold to the Doğan Media Group in 2005. Since then, it has been known for its critical approach to the government's political orientation. In October 2011, Doğan Media Group sold the channel to Doğu Media Group. This takeover, which has led to a shift in the channel's political orientation from an oppositional to a

more compromising stance *vis-à-vis* the government, occurred during the time span of our monitoring. The daily duration of airtime is 24 hours. The study focused on the following programs:

Star Haber (“Star News”) the main newscast (aired Monday to Sunday at 19:00).

Arena, the main discussion program (Mondays at 23:00) aired only once during the monitoring period, due to the changes that occurred during the take-over by the Doğuş Media Group.

Throughout the monitoring period for Star, 751 news pieces were studied, 2 of which partly dealt with the monitoring subject. The total number of discussion program topics was 12, none of which dealt with the monitoring subject.

KANAL 7 is a private TV channel founded in 1994 by the Turkuvaz Media Group. It is a prominent name among pro-Islamist and therefore pro-government TV channels. The daily duration of airtime is 24 hours. The study focused on the following programs:

Kanal 7 Ana Haber (“Channel 7 Main News”) aired Monday to Sunday at 18:00.

Iskele Sancak (“Portside Starboard”), the main discussion program of the channel aired on Fridays at 23:30.

Throughout the monitoring period for Kanal 7, a total of 811 news pieces were studied; 2 of these partly dealt with the monitoring subject. Out of the 5 topics in the current affairs and discussion program, none dealt with the monitoring subject.

CUMHURİYET is a daily newspaper (seven days a week) founded in 1924 by Yunus Nadi. It is currently owned by the Cumhuriyet Trust. With its irreconcilable Kemalist and secularist orientation, it represents the hardline oppositional position to the governments’ policies within the mainstream media. Its daily circulation is around 49,000 to 50,000. During the monitoring period, 45 issues were published. The total number of news stories and opinion pieces studied was 4920, of which 16 dealt with the monitoring subject - 2 in full, 5 in part and 9 containing references to it.

HÜRRİYET is a daily newspaper (seven days a week) founded in 1948 by Sedat Simavi. It was bought by Doğan Media Group in 1994. *Hürriyet* is usually referred to as the “Admiral Ship” of the mainstream media. It represents a skeptical/critical political position *vis-à-vis* the government. It has the second highest circulation among the Turkish press, around 420,000 to 430,000 copies. During the monitoring period, 45 issues were published. The total number of news stories and opinion articles studied was 5268, of which 34 dealt with the monitoring subject - 17 in full, 16 in part and 1 containing a reference to it.

SABAH is a daily newspaper (seven days a week) founded in 1985 by the owner of the Sabah Publication. In 2005, it was bought by Ciner Group. After a financial crisis in 2007, the newspaper was taken over by the government and sold to Çalık Holding in 2008, which is known for its close relations with Prime Minister Erdoğan. Consequently, *Sabah*’s coverage reflects a pro-government political position. Its daily circulation is around 350,000 to 380,000 (2011), which places it third in circulation among newspapers in Turkey. During the monitoring period, 45 issues were published. The

total number of news stories and opinion articles studied was 5882 of which 29 dealt with the monitoring subject - 17 in full, 10 in part and 2 containing references to it.

3. PRESENCE OF THE SUBJECT OF MONITORING, TYPES OF MEDIA PIECES, SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Armenia

Presence of the Subject of Monitoring

As previous research has shown, subjects related to Turkey occupy a relatively stable position in the Armenian media. During the analyzed period, Armenia-Turkey relations and other topics related to Turkey were covered widely in Armenian mass media (in contrast to Turkish media, as the outcomes of the parallel monitoring of Turkish media suggest).

Thus, within the current affairs/discussion programs of the 3 TV channels (Yerkir Media, Kentron, 1st Channel Public Television of Armenia, known by its short name H1), which were studied during the current monitoring, pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it, comprised 30% of the total number of the current affairs/discussion TV pieces. The percentage was somewhat lower for the news programs of the respective 3 channels, representing 12.54% of the news pieces. However, in absolute numbers, this figure remains quite substantial - 326 news pieces. The percentage of coverage devoted to the subject of the monitoring was somewhat lower in the print media studied within the current monitoring, however it still presented quite a respectable figure at 10.95% (or 315 newspaper pieces).

In terms of intensity of coverage by individual media, the leader among the print media studied is *Azg* newspaper - 15.76 % (160 in absolute numbers) of the newspaper pieces either dealt with the subject of the monitoring (partially or completely) or contained references to it. *Zhamanak* and *Aravot* devoted a significantly lower - though still quite substantial - percentage of their coverage to Turkey and Armenia-Turkey relations - 9.36% (79 in absolute numbers) newspaper pieces in case of *Zhamanak* and 7.47% (76 in absolute numbers) in case of *Aravot*.

This almost two-fold difference between these outlets can be explained by the specific position of *Azg* among the Armenian print media - it is a newspaper which is commonly read not only in Armenia proper, but also by Armenians in the Diaspora (mostly in its online version); therefore it devotes more attention to issues of foreign relations and so called "pan-national" issues (i.e. issues that are related not only to Armenia proper but also Armenians living elsewhere), such as the issues of Armenian-Turkish relations and the genocide recognition campaign. *Aravot* and *Zhamanak* are more focused on internal politics and social issues, and during the monitoring period the issue of Armenia-Turkey relations was not very prominent in the debate between different political forces, therefore the relatively lower degree of interest toward Armenia-Turkey relations is understandable.

Among the TV channels monitored, Yerkir Media TV channel was the obvious leader in terms of coverage related to the subject of the monitoring. TV news pieces related to the subject of the monitoring comprised 14.9% (105 news pieces) of the monitored coverage on Yerkir Media, while in the case of the discussion/current affairs programs the percentage was even higher – 37.83% (i.e. 14 out of 37 TV pieces).

In case of H1 (Public Television) the percentage of the news coverage related to the subject of the monitoring comprised 11.76% (100 out of 850) in the news programs and the percentage of the coverage in discussion/current affairs programs was 27.58% (8 out of 29 pieces) .

On Kentron channel, the coverage of the monitoring subject was almost equally high in terms of news programs (11.58% or 121 out of 1045), and somewhat lower for the discussion/current affairs programs, comprising 23.52% (8 out of 34).

The higher level of attention devoted by Yerkir Media, as in the case of *Azg* newspaper, might be connected to the fact that Yerkir Media has many viewers not only in Armenia but also abroad, among the Diaspora Armenian communities, who usually exhibit a high degree of interest to issues of Armenian-Turkish relations⁶.

The print and broadcast media where the news/events coverage was monitored displayed differences in the ratio of news/events coverage to commentary/analysis coverage. While in the broadcast media the majority of the pieces that fully or partly dealt with the subject of the monitoring represented news/events coverage, in the print media the two types of coverage were represented almost equally, with a minor advantage of the analysis/commentary.

Types of Media Pieces

Taken together, the ratio of news/events to commentary and analysis in the three monitored print media stood at 49.1% to 50.9%. Two of the three newspapers, *Aravot* and *Zhamanak*, displayed high percentages of analysis/commentary publications vis-à-vis news - 61,64% against 38.36% (in absolute numbers 28 and 45) in *Zhamanak*, and 62.12% against 37.88% in *Aravot* (in absolute numbers 25 and 41). This trend was counterbalanced by *Azg*, where the news/events coverage comprised 60% (84 articles) and analysis/commentary only 40% (56 articles). However, it has to be noted that since *Azg* in general devoted almost twice as much coverage to Turkey and Armenia-Turkey relations, compared to the other two newspapers, in absolute numbers the quantity of commentary/analysis articles in *Azg* is actually even higher (56 articles compared to 45 in *Zhamanak* and 41 in *Aravot*). Thus, it can be summed up that analytical materials comprised a significant part of the coverage in the monitored print media in Armenia.

In the broadcast media, the situation was somewhat different. In the broadcast media, news/events coverage represented the overwhelming majority of the coverage. If we

⁶ However, it also has to be noted that Yerkir Media cooperated with civil society organizations, involved in Armenian-Turkish normalization projects, and as a result of this cooperation several current affairs/discussion programs were produced - several episodes of *Article 27*, in cooperation with the SATR program, and several episodes of *The Globe* program in cooperation with US-sponsored Armenian-Turkish program implemented by Internews Network, YPC and GPOT. Therefore, the higher degree of coverage on Yerkir Media, can be, at least partly, attributed to the activities of civil society organizations within the framework of efforts aimed at the normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations.

add up the figures for news programs and discussion programs we still end up with a majority of news/events coverage - 95 pieces of 322, or 29.5% (all news 300 pieces, all discussion 22 pieces, total 322, out of which the commentary is 95 or 29.5%). This difference in the percentages of news/events coverage and analysis/comments coverage in print media and broadcast media can be explained by the specificity of each type of media. While television in general is usually more news-oriented, commentary and analysis usually tend to occupy a larger place in print media. So, the fact that commentary/analysis continues to hold a significant place in the print media can be explained by the important role that Armenian-Turkish relations and Turkey as a regional player continue to occupy in Armenia's internal public discussions, in spite of the lack of progress in the process of normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations.

Sources of Information

Regarding the sources of information which were used in the publications studied, the overwhelming majority of pieces analyzed within the current monitoring were based on Armenian sources.

In the print media, Armenian sources were used in 92.83% of publications (259 out of 279), while Turkish sources were used only in 17.14% of cases (54 publications), and other foreign sources in 16.85% (47 publications). From the three newspapers studied within the current monitoring, it was *Azg* that used Turkish sources most often - 27.86% (39 publications out of 140), while *Aravot* used Turkish sources in 9 publications (or 11.84%) and *Zhamanak* in only 6 sources (8.22%).

In the broadcast media's news/events programs, Turkish sources were used in 11.67% of TV pieces dealing with the subject (35 out of 300). Among the TV channels, the leader in terms of using sources of information from Turkey was Yerkir Media (15 news pieces or 15.46%), followed by Kentron TV (13 news pieces or 11.82%). H1 channel was the least likely to use Turkish sources in its news programs (7 news pieces or 7.53%). As it could have been anticipated, Turkish sources were quite rarely used in current affairs/discussion programs - in fact information taken directly from Turkish sources appeared only in 2 cases (out of 22).

Other foreign sources (i.e. sources that are neither Armenian nor Turkish) were used in even less cases, though the difference with the Turkish sources was not big. In all monitored print media taken together, these appeared only in 16.85% of newspaper pieces (47 out of 279). As in the case of Turkish sources, the leader in terms of using foreign sources was *Azg*, which used such sources in 32 publications (22.86%), while *Aravot* and *Zhamanak* used foreign sources in less cases (10 newspaper pieces or 13.7% in *Zhamanak* and 5 newspaper pieces or 6.58% in *Aravot*).

In the three broadcast media together, other foreign sources were used only in 27 TV pieces (out of 300, i.e. 9%). Other foreign sources were used relatively more frequently on H1 (11 news pieces or 11.83%) and Kentron (10 news pieces or 9.09%), while Yerkir Media channel used these only in 6 news pieces (6.19%). In the current affairs/discussion programs, other foreign sources were not used at all.

In this sense there is continuity with the previous phase of research, which also showed that the overwhelming majority of publications in the Armenian print media were based on other Armenian sources (a similar picture was observed in the Turkish print media as well⁷). It can be summed up that Armenian media continue to rely mostly on other Armenian sources to cover developments related to Turkey and Armenian-Turkish relations. While it is perfectly understandable that the preference is given to Armenian sources, a wider use of Turkish sources (even though these sometimes need to be used cautiously) could have helped to provide more profound and precise information about the developments in the neighboring country.

Turkey

Presence of the Subject of Monitoring

The total number of news pieces studied in the three Turkish TV channels throughout the monitoring period (October 1 – November 15, 2011) is 2260 and only 10 dealt with the Armenians and Armenia (0.44%). Out of the 164 topics studied in the current affairs discussion programs, only 1 reference was made to the monitoring subject (0.6%). Out of 16070 news and comments studied in the three newspapers, 79 (0.49%) included Armenian issues, of which 36 (45.5%) fully and 31 (39%) partly dealt with the subject, while 12 (15%) contained references to the monitoring subject.

It was observed that TV news coverage of Armenia and Armenians during the monitoring period was exclusively related to Sarkozy's speech in Yerevan, in which he invited Turkey to accept the genocide and reconcile with its past. However, except for 1 reference, no attention was paid to Sarkozy's speech or any other news/events related to Armenia and Armenians in the current affairs and discussion programs.

Summing up, it can be said that the monitoring period of the Turkish media has been consistent with the dominant trend of scarce attention by the Turkish media to Armenia and Armenian issues. Except for the coverage of French President Sarkozy's call for Turkey to face its past and accept the genocide during his visit to Armenia, Turkish TV did not include any news or comments on Armenia or the Armenians. Coverage by Turkish newspapers slightly exceeds that of television. In addition to the extensive coverage of Sarkozy's speech, newspaper coverage included reports related to the Armenian community in Turkey and the internal life of Armenia. The majority of the news stories related to the Armenian community in Turkey consisted of developments in the murder trial of Hrant Dink. The consecration of the Surp Kirakos church in Diyarbakır also received the attention of the Turkish newspapers. Therefore, during the peak times when the relations between Turkey and Armenia are intense media coverage is extensive, outside peak times Armenia and Armenians receive the least attention in the Turkish media.

Turkish press and broadcast show significantly low interest in Armenian issues in 'normal' times as opposed to 'peak' times such as the commemoration of the 1915 events, the anniversary of the Hrant Dink murder, rapprochement moves between the

⁷ *Media Research Report: Dynamics of Media Representation...*, YPC and Izmir University, 2011.

Turkish and Armenian governments, etc.⁸ However, the issue of Armenia and Armenians features in the Turkish press and TV whenever hot issues such as genocide recognition are raised by the US and European states/politicians, or the Armenian diaspora even outside peak times. In this regard, news/comments are often framed within the context of Turkey's relations with Europe and the USA. Often a negative attitude prevails in the coverage of these hot issues. The EU countries and US politicians appear as the most important third party in the media. Except for the Armenian community in Turkey, stories of ordinary Armenians and non-political issues in Armenia are rarely featured in the Turkish media. Particular attention is paid to the Hrant Dink murder trial; however it has to be taken into account that this attention may sometimes reflect an interest in the issues of the democratization of Turkey or its relations with the EU and its perspectives of European integration, rather than a focus on Armenia-Turkey relations.

Overall, it seems that media coverage of non-political issues is limited. The Turkish media focus more on political issues, particularly related to official diplomacy in which the existing historical controversies between the two countries resurface.

Types and Sources of Media Pieces

TV news coverage did not include any comments or analyses. All TV channels relied solely on self-produced information or information from other Turkish sources. CNN Türk covered six of these news stories (60%), three of which fully dealt with the monitoring subject, while three had partial coverage. Four news stories covered by CNN Türk (67%) were classified as neutral, while the other two were negative (33%). Kanal 7 included a total of two news stories, both of which partly dealt with the subject. These stories were both classified as negative. Star also reported a total of two news stories, both of which partly dealt with the monitoring subject. These stories were both classified as neutral.

Coverage of Armenia and Armenians in the Turkish print media seems more extensive than the TV coverage. However, the overall coverage of Armenia and Armenians was still significantly low; out of 16070 news pieces and comments only 79 (0.49%) were related to the subject of monitoring with 36 pieces (45%) fully and 31 (39%) partly dealing with the subject, while 12 pieces (15%) only contained references to it. A significant part of this coverage was also related to Sarkozy's speech in Armenia. Out of 16 (0.3%) news stories and comments in *Cumhuriyet*, 2 (12.5%) fully and 5 (31%) partly dealt with the subject and 9 (56%) contained references to it. *Sabah* had 29 (0.3%) news stories and comments of which 17 (58%) fully and 10 (34%) partly dealt with Armenia and the Armenians, of which 2 (7%) contained references to it. Finally, out of 34 news stories and comments in *Hürriyet*, 17 (50%) fully and 16 (47%) partly dealt with the subject and only 1 (3%) had a reference to it.

⁸ Media Research Report: Dynamics of Media Representation of the Armenia-Turkey Normalization Process in Armenian and Turkish Media, Yerevan Press Club (Armenia) and Faculty of Communication of the Izmir University of Economics (Turkey), 2011, available at http://www.ypc.am/upload/Armenian-Turkish%20Media%20Research_January-May%202011_eng.pdf

News stories, 79% (53), appeared more than comments, 21% (14), in press coverage. Finally, the Turkish newspapers' choice of news sources is either that of their own reporters and news agencies or other Turkish sources 99% (66). Out of 66 news stories, only in 1 news piece, 1%, an Armenian source - and in another a foreign news source 1% - were mentioned in addition to a Turkish source. As demonstrated in this monitoring, as well as in the previous research, using Armenian sources in the Turkish media is a rarely occurring exception.

4. TOPICS OF COVERAGE

Armenia

The majority of newspaper and TV pieces that discussed Turkey were connected to Armenian-Turkish relations. Armenian-Turkish relations (this category excluded the Armenia-Turkey protocols and official negotiations, which was a separate category, as discussed below) remain the main focus of interest of the Armenian media when it comes to Turkey. Thus in the print media monitored, 62% of publications dealt with Armenian-Turkish relations (excluding the protocols). A similar pattern was observed in the broadcast media. In the news programs of the 3 monitored TV channels, 57.33% of the TV pieces dealt with Armenian-Turkish relations, and this figure for discussion/current affairs programs was 72.73% of the TV pieces (these figures also exclude the protocols, which were monitored as a separate category). Other Turkey related topics discussed in Armenian media included the internal life of Turkey, Turkey's external relations and Turkey's relations with Azerbaijan.

While Armenian-Turkish relations in general are still the main reason why the Armenian media is interested in Turkey-related topics, the Armenian-Turkish protocols and official negotiations related to them now occupy a certain place in the media coverage in Armenia, however their share is quite moderate related to other aspects of Armenian-Turkish relations. Thus in the print media studied within the current monitoring, the topic of protocols and official negotiations between the two countries was present in 16.85 % of publications (47 out of 279), while Armenian-Turkish relations in general (i.e. outside of the scope of protocols and official negotiations) were touched upon in 62% of publications (173 out of 279). A similar picture could be observed in the broadcast media. In the news programs, the protocols and official negotiations were discussed in 44 cases (14.67%), while Armenian-Turkish relations in general, with the exclusion of the official negotiations, were discussed in 57.33% of news pieces (172 out of 300). The protocols and official negotiations also occupied a moderate place in the current affairs/discussion programs (5 cases or 27.73%).

The internal life of Turkey was covered more extensively in the news programs of the TV channels (23%), and to a lesser extent in the discussion/current affairs programs (18.18%) and in the print media (12.19%). The percentage of the coverage that was devoted to the external relations of Turkey (not related to Armenian-Turkish relations) was more or less similar in the print media (16.85%) and in the news programs (16%), and insignificantly lower in current affairs/discussion programs of TV channels (13.64%). The coverage of relations between Turkey and Azerbaijan, which was studied as a separate category within the current monitoring, was not very widespread; it was

relatively higher in print media (7.86%), lower in news programs (3.67%) and appeared only once in current affairs/discussion programs on the monitored TV channels (on Yerkir Media).

Of course, certain developments related to Armenia-Turkey relations did take place within the period of analysis and were thus present in the media coverage of that period. The Turkey-related coverage in Armenian media of that period focused on several topics, of which probably the most significant events were the declarations made by the French President Sarkozy during his visit to Yerevan on October 8 and the Turkish reaction to these declarations, the consecration of the Surp Kirakos church in Diyarbakır on October 22, the earthquake in Van province on October 23 and the reactions of various actors to the earthquake. Turkey was also often mentioned in connection to the events in Syria and Northern Iraq, particularly the Turkish support to opponents of the Assad regime in Syria, and Turkish military operations against Kurds in Northern Iraq were covered by Armenian media. Besides this, relations between Turkey and Azerbaijan, Turkey's attempts to play a role in the Nagorno-Karabakh peace process, as well as Turkey's relations with Russia, particularly negotiations regarding gas contracts were discussed in the Armenian media.

Turkey

In TV news coverage, all ten news stories (100%) are related generally to the relations between Armenia and Armenians with European states and political actors. Consequently, European states and political actors emerge in seven news stories (70%) as the most important third party. Only one news piece - 10% - is related to the Turkish-Armenian community. Similar to the TV coverage, Turkish-Armenian relations in general received the highest coverage in the print media 89% (60 out of 79). All 7 news pieces in *Cumhuriyet* (100%), 29 out of 34 in *Hürriyet* (88%), and 24 out of 29 in *Sabah* (89%) were related to Turkey-Armenia relations in general. However, in the Turkish newspapers, the most significant third party mentioned was Turkey's Armenian community, 51%, while the European Union and politicians comprised the second significant third party, 33%, followed by the Armenian diaspora, 18%, the USA, 5%, and Russia, 3%.

There was no coverage of the subjects related to the Armenia-Turkey protocols either in the Turkish newspapers or on the TV channels studied during the monitoring period.

The internal life of Armenia was completely absent in TV coverage while it appeared partially in three news stories, 4%, in print media.

Similarly, the external relations of Armenia were absent in TV coverage, while in print media only 1 news story, 1.5%, related to the subject.

The Karabagh conflict and Armenian-Azerbaijani relations were not covered on TV; however, in print media, three news stories, 4.5%, were related to the subject.

5. CONNOTATIONS

Armenia

Neutral connotations dominated in all cases, constituting about 90% of the coverage; however, there was up to 10% of negative coverage in most cases. There was no positive coverage of Turkey and Armenia-Turkey relations within the current monitoring period. The absence of positive coverage is in contrast to those trends of coverage which were observed during the active phase of football diplomacy, when positive connotations were quite visible even in media outlets which have usually been noted for harsh positions on Turkey and relations with Turkey⁹.

The coverage was mostly neutral on current affairs/discussion programs on TV channels studied within the monitoring, as only 2 out of 30 pieces contained a negative attitude (i.e. 6.67%, both on Yerkir Media). The percentage of negative attitudes was somewhat higher in the news programs, comprising 11.35% (37 out of 326), with Yerkir Media and H1 having the higher percentages (15.23%, 16 out of 105 news pieces for Yerkir Media, 13%, 13 out of 100 news pieces for H1), and Kentron having the lowest percentage (6.61%, 8 out of 121).

In print media, the negative connotations were present in about 10.48% of the pieces related to the subject of the monitoring. Of the 3 newspapers studied in the monitoring, the relatively higher percentage of newspaper pieces with negative connotations was observed in *Azg* – 11.88% (19 out of 160), and relatively lower rates of negative connotations were observed in *Zhamanak* (8.87%, 7 out of 79) and *Aravot* (9.21%, 7 out of 76).

It is interesting to compare these results with the data of the previous phase of the common research carried out by YPC and Izmir University. In that research, which focused on the coverage throughout “active” periods, the negative connotations comprised about 12% of all newspaper pieces analyzed; however about 4% of the newspaper pieces had positive connotations. Moreover, while in the overall picture the negative connotations were more common than positive, during the period of the football diplomacy - when the normalization had just started and it had created a lot of optimism both in Armenia and Turkey - the two attitudes were almost equal. If we compare the previous phase of research with the current monitoring, it becomes obvious that the degree of negative publications has remained almost the same - 12% in the previous research, and about 10.48% in the current research¹⁰; however, the positive trend has virtually disappeared. It can be argued that this is a consequence of the profound disillusionment with the outcomes of the normalization process on the Armenian side, at least as reflected by the media.

Turkey

⁹ see *Media Research Report: Dynamics of Media Representation...*, YPC and Izmir University, 2011.

¹⁰ These data are for the print media; broadcast media were not included in the previous phase of research.

In Turkish TV news coverage, out of 10 news stories, 3 fully dealt with the monitoring subject (30%), while seven pieces dealt partly with the subject (70%). Six of these news pieces (60%) were neutral, while four of them (40%) were negative.

In newspaper coverage, 62 of the news pieces and comments were classified as neutral (79%) and 17 as negative (21%).

In all newspapers, neutral coverage far exceeded the negative coverage - 81% in *Cumhuriyet*, 76% in *Hürriyet* and 78% in *Sabah*, while the figures for negative coverage were 18%, 24% and 20% respectively. This outcome, although small in scale, is also compatible with the results of our previous research in which football diplomacy and the Hrant Dink murder case were presented positively, whereas US President Barack Obama's speech on the commemoration of 1915 and debates on genocide recognition in the European parliaments had negative connotations.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The monitoring was conducted over a time period which did not include significant developments related to Armenia-Turkey relations. Particularly, it preceded the debates related to the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's apology for the Dersim massacre, as well as the row between Turkey and France over the French Senate's decision to criminalize genocide denial. The monitoring over this period gave an opportunity to assess the media coverage during a "normal" season, i.e. one without major dramatic events that might alter the coverage pattern. In that sense, the monitoring data provide an important addition to the previous phase of the research, which focused specifically on the periods of heightened attention to Armenia-Turkey relations.

On the basis of the monitoring data analyzed, it is possible to draw certain conclusions:

- As the monitoring data suggests, there has been a return to the pre-2008 pattern, which was characterized by the more or less constant attention to Turkey on the part of the Armenian media and limited, mostly event-related coverage of Armenia by the Turkish media. While Armenia-Turkey relations and other topics related to Turkey continued to occupy a significant place in Armenian media coverage even despite the lack of progress in Armenia-Turkey developments, the Turkish media exhibited the opposite picture. The monitoring period of the Turkish media confirmed the dominant trend - Turkish media's scarce attention towards Armenia and Armenian issues. With notable exception of the developments related to French President Sarkozy's visit to Armenia in October 2011, the Turkish broadcast media did not include any news or comments on Armenia or Armenians, while the print media included only a limited number of references.
- While the Armenian media continued to actively cover Turkey-related topics, there have been certain changes in the Armenian media coverage trends as well, as compared to previous periods. For instance, the distribution of attitudes in the

media pieces studied reflects disillusionment towards the Armenia-Turkey normalization process and lack of trust in the prospects for improved Armenia-Turkey relations. While the number of pieces with a negative attitude remained relatively limited, the pieces exhibiting positive attitudes were absolutely absent from the studied outlets. Neutral attitudes were present in the majority of the media pieces.

- In the Turkish media, while the general trend is characterized by a lack of attention towards Armenia and Armenians, there is a notable exception of the topic related to the genocide recognition campaign. Armenia and Armenians feature prominently in the Turkish press and TV whenever hot issues such as genocide recognition are raised by the U.S. and the European states/politicians or the Armenian diaspora. In this regard, news/comments are often framed within the context of Turkey's relations with Europe and the U.S. rather than Turkey-Armenia relations per se.
- In both countries, the overwhelming majority of pieces analyzed during the monitoring period were based on sources from their own country, rather than sources from the other country. The lack of primary sources from the other country remains a major pitfall to objective and precise reporting by the Armenian media on Turkey and vice versa.
- State-to-state relations remain the most widely covered aspect of the relations between the two countries. The Armenia-Turkey protocols were still being discussed in the Armenian media coverage during the monitoring period, even though the normalization process had been frozen by that time. The Armenian media also exhibited interest in the internal affairs of Turkey, and to a lesser extent in Turkey's relations with other countries. The interest of Turkish media towards internal developments in Armenia and its relations with other countries has been rather low. In both countries, media coverage of non-political issues is limited - the media tend to focus more on political issues, particularly related to official diplomacy, in which the existing historical controversies between the two countries re-surface. With the exception of the stories about the Armenian community in Turkey, stories of ordinary Armenians and non-political issues in Armenia rarely feature in the Turkish media and vice versa.

The recommendations below are based on the above observations and conclusions and are addressed to journalists, other media professionals, the NGO community, international and local donors, as well as other stakeholders:

- While asymmetry in Armenian and Turkish media coverage is to an extent natural given the differences between the countries, interest towards Armenian topics in the Turkish media can and should be encouraged through such measures, as journalist exchanges, trainings, workshops, summer courses, study visits, etc.
- Both Armenian and Turkish journalists and media professionals should be encouraged to rely on primary sources in order to provide accurate and comprehensive information on developments in Turkey. Journalist exchanges,

trainings, workshops, summer courses, study visits and other measures that lead to the exposure of Armenian journalists to Turkey can be useful in this regard.

- Journalists in both countries should be encouraged to spread their attention beyond the official state-to-state relations and look toward internal developments, human interest stories and other topics that can offer a fresh view of the other country, rather than repeat the standard narrative promoted by government-supported information sources.
- Deficiencies of mutual coverage can be addressed through developing networks of Armenian and Turkish journalists and other media professionals, who can act as mediators between the media communities of both countries. Such networks are already being created with the help of cooperation projects, such as the Support to Armenia-Turkey Rapprochement project¹¹, however these networks need further support in order to continue to function and to advance. These networks should be encouraged to develop beyond the main media centers to include media professionals in the regions, as well as in the field of alternative and new media.

¹¹ More information on the project can be found at www.armturkdialogue.net.

ATTACHMENT 1

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND METHODOLOGY FOR MONITORING THE COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-TURKISH/TURKISH-ARMENIAN RELATIONS IN THE MEDIA IN ARMENIA AND TURKEY

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. **The aim of the monitoring is to** determine through the analysis of quantitative data:

- the level of attention that the studied media in Armenia/Turkey paid to various aspects of Armenian-Turkish relations;
- the attitude of the studied media in Armenia/Turkey toward the other country;
- existence and frequency of negative stereotypes in the studied media in Armenia/Turkey.

2. The monitoring is administered simultaneously in Armenia and Turkey using a unified methodology and within the same timeframes.

3. **Time frame of the monitoring is *October 1 - November 15, 2011***

4. Monitoring includes **6 media in Armenia** and **6 media in Turkey**

IN ARMENIA:

3 national TV channels - Public Television of Armenia (PTA First Channel), Yerkir Media, Kentron

3 national newspapers - *Azg, Aravot, Zhamanak*

IN TURKEY:

3 national TV channels - CNN Türk, Kanal 7, Star

3 national newspapers - *Cumhuriyet, Hürriyet, Sabah*

5. **Subject of the monitoring**

In Armenian media - all TV materials and newspaper publications which include any mention of Turkey/Turks.

In Turkish media - all TV materials and newspaper publications which include any mention of Armenia/Armenians.

6. Object of the monitoring

In broadcast media - the main episode of news program and the main current affairs/discussion programs of the TV channels above:

	IN ARMENIA:	News / News and Comment Programs	Current affairs / Discussion Programs
1	PTA First Channel	Arajin Lratvakan (Monday-Saturday at 21.00)	Hartsazruyts (Monday-Friday at 23.15)
		Sunday issue of Arajin Lratvakan (Sundays at 21.00)	
2	Kentron	Epikentron (Monday-Sunday at 20.30)	Urvagits (Monday-Friday at 21.21)
3	Yerkir Media	Yerkirn Aysor (Monday- Saturday at 22.00) Yerkri Shabat (Sundays at 22.00)	Yerkri Hartse (Monday-Friday at 22.30)

	IN TURKEY:	News / News and Comment Programs	Current affairs / Discussion Programs
1	CNN Türk	Ana Haber (“Main News”) (Monday-Friday at 18.00, Saturday-Sunday at 17.00)	1. Beş N Bir K (“Five Ws One H”) (Monday-Thursday at 19.30) 2. Soru-Yorum (“Question-Comment”) (Fridays at 19.30) 3. Gün (“Day”) (Saturdays at 19.45) 4. Tarafsız Bölge (“Neutral Territory”) (Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays at 21.30) 5. Dört Bir Taraf (“Four Sides”) (Tuesdays and Thursdays at 21.30) 6. Ne Oluyor? (“What is Happening?”) (Fridays at 21.30) 7. Eğrisi Doğrusu (“Wrongs Rights”) (Sundays at 21:30)
2	Kanal 7	Ana Haber (“Main News”) (Monday-Friday at 18.00) Hafta Sonu Haberleri (“Weekend News”) (Saturday-Sunday at 18.00)	İskele Sancak (“Portside Starboard”) (Fridays at 23:30)

3	Star	Star Haber (“Star News”) (Monday- Sunday at 19.00)	Arena (Monday at 00.30)
---	------	--	-----------------------------------

In print media - the mentioned newspapers were studied fully **except** weather forecasts, commercial/political/social advertising and classifieds, TV and radio schedules, “pure” photographs (out of publications and with no titles, headlines, captions), entertainment material such as crosswords, tests, horoscopes, quizzes, etc. Newspaper supplements and inserts were not studied either.

II. METHODOLOGY OF THE MONITORING

The main unit of the study is **a TV piece** and **a newspaper piece**.

The following is understood to be a TV piece:

A unit of airtime, distinguished by subject, composition and design, i.e.:

- a. a separate story in the news program
- b. a separate communication, read by the program host
- c. a part (section, story) of a program, dealing with various subjects/issues and distinguished by subject, composition and design (jingles, captions, etc.)
- d. announcements of stories were considered to be a part of the piece to which they referred
- e. program host text that introduced the TV piece (report, etc.) was considered to be a part of this piece (report, etc.).

At the same time:

- **News programs** are divided into stories, each of which is considered as a separate piece
- **Current affairs/discussion programs** are considered as follows:
 1. If the program is dealing with one subject/discussion theme, it is considered as one separate piece
 2. If the program is fragmented, i.e. is divided into separate thematic blocks, each of these blocks is considered as one separate piece.

The following is understood to be a newspaper piece:

A unit of text, distinguished by subject, composition and design, i.e.:

- a. a separate article, news report, interview, etc.
- b. announcements of publications were viewed to be a part of the publication to which they referred

c. the headline/subtitle, the lead (i.e., the text after the headline/subtitle that introduced the publication and bore the main message of the article) were considered to be a part of the story to which they referred

d. an editorial comment on a certain publication, distinguished by words “Editor’s note”, “Editorial comment” etc., was considered to be a separate piece

e. a photograph (pictures, cartoons, collages, illustrations, charts, etc.) that was not a part of a newspaper publication but contained a headline or a text or had a message was considered a separate piece. If the photograph accompanied the newspaper publication, it was considered to be part of the piece to which it referred.

In the course of monitoring the following ***is determined and recorded***:

1. Total number of TV/newspaper pieces

Every day the monitors count and record the total number of TV/newspaper pieces in the news and discussion programs of TV channels studied, and the monitored newspapers, ***except*** weather forecasts, commercial/political/social advertising and classifieds, TV and radio schedules, “pure” photographs (out of publications and with no titles, headlines, captions), entertaining materials such as crosswords, tests, horoscopes, quizzes, etc.

Measuring of this category is done ***in units***.

2. Total number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it

Monitors count and record the total number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it.

Measuring of this category is done ***in units***.

3. Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces

Monitors determine and record in the appropriate column the form of the presence of the topic of the monitoring in the TV/newspaper piece:

1. TV/newspaper piece ***fully*** dealing with the monitoring subject.

A piece is considered fully dealing with the monitoring subject even if it includes references to other topics that are not the subject of monitoring, but these references are subordinate to the monitoring subject.

2. TV/newspaper piece ***partly*** dealing with the monitoring subject.

A piece is considered partly dealing with the monitoring subject when, irrespective of its volume, it equally deals with the monitoring subject along with other topics which are not the subject of monitoring.

3. TV/newspaper piece containing a ***reference*** to the monitoring subject

The cases considered as a reference to the monitoring subject occur when the monitoring subject is only mentioned but there is no supplementary information or characteristic ascribed to it.

Measuring of this category is done *in units*.

4. Attitude (positive, negative, neutral) to the monitoring subject in TV/newspaper pieces

Monitors determine and record in the appropriate column the attitude - **positive (+)**, **negative (-)** or **neutral (0)** to the subject of the monitoring, expressed in the TV/newspaper pieces, **fully** or **partly** dealing with the monitoring subject, or **containing references** to it.

A negative or positive attitude is determined on the basis of **words, expressions or phrases** that are contained in the piece and create a clearly positive or clearly negative general impression about the subject of the monitoring - **Turkey/Turks** (*for Armenian media*) or **Armenia/Armenians** (*for Turkish media*). Where there is no such clear attitude, it is recorded as neutral.

In every piece only one connotation (+; - ; or 0) to the subject of the monitoring is recorded.

Note 1: Positive/negative attitude needs to be expressed in the piece **directly through words**, having a positive or negative nature. In cases where there is no such clarity, i.e. a positive/negative attitude is expressed indirectly (e.g. through irony), the mention is recorded as neutral.

Note 2: In this category, only the attitude to the **subject of the monitoring** is recorded, i.e. to **Turkey/Turks** (*for Armenian media*) and **Armenia/Armenians** (*for Turkish media*), and not the attitude to different aspects of Armenian-Turkish relations (the protocols, opening the border, etc.). For example, if the piece contains a negative attitude toward the protocols (opening the border, football diplomacy, etc.), without having verbally expressed a negative attitude toward Turkey/Turks or Armenia/ Armenians, the mention is not considered negative.

Note 3: If the piece (e.g. interview) contains both negative and positive opinions to the monitoring subject expressed by the interviewees and the position of the author of the piece/journalist/media is absent, the mention is recorded as neutral. If the author of the piece/journalist/media together with the quoted opinions expresses his/her own attitude to the subject of the monitoring, it is recorded as positive or negative depending on the attitude of the author/journalist/media.

Measuring in this category is done *in units*.

ATTENTION: THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES ARE STUDIED ONLY IN THE PIECES FULLY OR PARTLY DEALING WITH THE SUBJECT OF THE MONITORING

5. Type of TV/newspaper pieces fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject

If the piece deals **fully** or **partly** with the monitoring subject, the type of piece is determined and recorded in the appropriate column:

1. **News/Events** (i.e. containing only facts without any analysis or commentary)

2. *Analysis/Comment*

Measuring in this category is done *in units*.

6. Information sources used in the TV/newspaper pieces fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject

If the piece deals *fully* or *partly* with the monitoring subject, the information sources used in the piece are determined and recorded in the appropriate column.

Information sources are divided into the following subcategories:

FOR ARMENIAN MEDIA:

1. **Self-produced information/other Armenian sources**
2. **Turkish sources** (including local franchises of transnational corporations, e.g. CNN Turkey or Newsweek Turkey)
3. **Other foreign sources** (including the services/missions/correspondents of foreign media in Armenia, e.g. Armenian Service of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, as well as official information of international organizations, embassies etc., e.g. “the press service of the OSCE”).

FOR TURKISH MEDIA:

1. **Self-produced information/other Turkish sources** (including local franchises of transnational corporations, e.g. CNN Turkey or Newsweek Turkey)
2. **Armenian sources**
3. **Other foreign sources** (including the services/missions/correspondents of foreign media in Turkey, e.g. correspondent of France-Presse in Ankara, as well as official information of international organizations, embassies etc., e.g. “the press service of the OSCE”).

If a piece does not reference any sources it is considered to be in the category of “self-produced information”.

In every piece, only one reference to each subcategory of information sources is recorded.

If the piece contains several subcategories of information sources, all of them are recorded in the appropriate column.

Measuring in this category is done *in units*.

7. Thematic sections touched upon in the pieces, fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject

All pieces *fully* or *partly* dealing with the monitoring subject are distributed between the following **5 sections**:

FOR ARMENIAN MEDIA:

1.	Armenian-Turkish relations in general, with the exception of the Armenia-Turkey protocols (involvement of a third official party, involvement of Armenian and Turkish Diasporas, involvement of Turkey's Armenian community)
2.	Armenia-Turkey protocols and official negotiations related to them (involvement of a third official party, involvement of Armenian and Turkish Diasporas, involvement of Turkey's Armenian community)
3.	Internal life of Turkey without connection to Armenian-Turkish relations
4.	External relations of Turkey, with the exception of Armenian-Turkish relations and Turkish-Azerbaijani relations
5.	Turkish-Azerbaijani relations without connection to Armenian-Turkish relations

FOR TURKISH MEDIA:

1.	Turkish-Armenian relations in general, with the exception of the Armenia-Turkey protocols (involvement of a third official party, involvement of Armenian and Turkish Diasporas, involvement of Turkey's Armenian community)
2.	Armenia-Turkey protocols and official negotiations related to them (involvement of a third official party, involvement of Armenian and Turkish Diasporas, involvement of Turkey's Armenian community)
3.	Internal life of Armenia without connection to Turkish-Armenian relations
4.	External relations of Armenia, with the exception of Turkish-Armenian relations and Turkish-Azerbaijani relations
5.	The Karabagh conflict and Armenian-Azerbaijani relations without connection to Turkish-Armenian relations

NOTES TO THEMATIC SECTIONS:

Section 1 includes pieces in which relations between the two countries are touched upon in different aspects, without mentioning the rapprochement process, related to the protocols about the establishment of diplomatic relations and opening of the borders (e.g. this section includes pieces about the life of Turkey's Armenian community, service in the Akhtamar church, issues of Armenian property in Turkey, developments related to Hrant Dink's murder, etc.).

Section 2 includes pieces which specifically deal with the rapprochement process between the two countries launched in 2008 ("football diplomacy", Armenia-Turkey protocols about the establishment of diplomatic relations and opening of the borders, visits/meetings between officials in the framework of Armenian-Turkish rapprochement).

In all the pieces accounted for in **Sections 1** and **2**, the following is also to be determined - the **involvement of a third official party, involvement of Armenian and Turkish Diasporas, involvement of Turkey's Armenian community** in the relations between the two countries in general, as well as in the rapprochement process. Thus,

the references to the above actors are determined and recorded in the appropriate column.

At the same time, the category “Involvement of a third official party” is divided into **5 subcategories**:

1. **USA**
2. **EU and individual EU member states**
3. **Russia**
4. **Azerbaijan**
5. **Other countries**

Note: A *third official party* is understood to be **the executive power (President, Government), legislative power (Parliament), local self-government bodies**. Involvement of a third official party is recorded only in those cases where the state bodies mentioned above are taking decisions, suggesting initiatives etc., regarding Armenian-Turkish relations/protocols/negotiations.

For each piece only one reference to each of the categories/subcategories of “Involvement...” is recorded.

If the piece refers to several categories/subcategories of “Involvement...” all of them are recorded in the appropriate column.

If the piece contains **no references** to any categories/subcategories of “Involvement...” the piece is marked in the column “unspecified”.

Measuring in this category is done **in units**.

Section 3 includes pieces devoted to events and different aspects of the internal life of Turkey/Armenia, which do not touch upon the issue of relations between the two countries (e.g. elections, Kurdish issue, headscarf issue, military-civilian relations in Turkey - *for Armenian media*; elections, opposition rallies, economic situation in Armenia - *for Turkish media*).

Section 4 includes pieces devoted to events and different aspects of the external relations of Turkey/Armenia with different countries, international institutions etc., which do not touch upon (*for Armenian media*) Armenian-Turkish relations or Turkish-Azerbaijani relations and (*for Turkish media*) Armenian-Azerbaijani relations (e.g. Turkey-EU relations, Turkish military operations in North Iraq - *for Armenian media*; Armenian President’s visit to Moscow, Armenia-Georgia relations - *for Turkish media*).

Section 5 includes pieces which touch upon Turkish-Azerbaijani relations (*for Armenian media*) and Karabagh conflict and Armenian-Azerbaijani relations (*for Turkish media*), but Armenian-Turkish relations are not mentioned in any way (e.g. Erdoğan’s visit to Baku, the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline, the football match between Turkey and Azerbaijan - *for Armenian media*; negotiations between Sargsyan and Aliyev, ceasefire violations in Karabagh - *for Turkish media*).

8. Number of references to thematic sections in the TV/newspaper pieces fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject

Monitors determine and record in the appropriate column ***the number of references to thematic sections*** in the pieces, ***fully*** or ***partly*** dealing with the monitoring subject.

For each piece only one reference to each of the thematic sections is recorded.

If the piece contains references to two or more thematic sections, each of these references is recorded in the relevant section.

Measuring in this category is done ***in units***.

9. Stereotypes, used in the TV/newspaper pieces fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject

If the piece deals ***fully*** or ***partly*** with the monitoring subject, the presence of stereotypes in the piece are determined and recorded in the appropriate column.

A “stereotype” is understood to include thoughts and ideas that are repeated with a certain frequency yet take various verbal expressions, their connotations or direct meaning always being negative.

Each team of monitors, upon mutual consultation, determined the 3 most widespread stereotypes.

FOR ARMENIAN MEDIA:

- 1. Turkey/Turks are prone to violence, aggression, expansion**
- 2. Turkey/Turks are uncivilized, with a low level of cultural development, incapable of producing material or spiritual values**
- 3. Turkey/Turks are incapable of positive evolution, progress, any signs of modernization/Europeanization/progress and use deception and masks to conceal their “real essence”**

FOR TURKISH MEDIA:

- 1. Armenians are prone to lies, treachery, conspiracies, they lack chastity**
- 2. Armenia is an undeveloped country, weak and depends on the Diaspora**
- 3. Armenia/Armenians are driven by a hidden agenda to disintegrate Turkey; to achieve these ends they use imperialist forces (the USA, European countries) and are in turn used by the imperialist forces and internal enemies (including the PKK)**

If one piece contains 2 or 3 of the stereotypes described above, each is recorded in the appropriate column.

Measuring in this category is done *in units*.

III. TECHNOLOGY OF THE MONITORING

- a.** On a daily basis, the monitors count and record in the coding tables all necessary data for each media.
- b.** Data received for the whole period of the monitoring is generalized for each media, and also for the three broadcast and the three print media overall.
- c.** The monitoring report is preceded by a brief description of each medium.