

**ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI  
RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF  
“TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM  
Media research findings**

# CONTENTS

<b>SECTION I.</b>	
<b>REPORT ON MONITORING THE COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CHAPTER I.1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CHAPTER I.2. MONITORING OF ARMENIAN MEDIA</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>THE MEDIA STUDIED: BRIEF OVERVIEW</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>ANALYSIS OF ARMENIAN MEDIA MONITORING FINDINGS</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>CHAPTER I.3. MONITORING OF AZERBAIJANI MEDIA</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>THE MEDIA STUDIED: BRIEF OVERVIEW</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>ANALYSIS OF AZERBAIJANI MEDIA MONITORING FINDINGS</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix.</b>	
<b>TABLES WITH QUANTITATIVE DATA OF ARMENIAN AND AZERBAIJANI MEDIA MONITORING (May 17 - June 30, 2010)</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>SECTION II.</b>	
<b>REPORT ON ROUND TABLES ON THE COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>CHAPTER II.1. GENERAL INFORMATION ON ROUND TABLES</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>CHAPTER II.2. ROUND TABLE ON THE ARMENIAN MEDIA COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>CHAPTER II.3. ROUND TABLE ON THE AZERBAIJANI MEDIA COVERAGE OF AZERBAIJANI-ARMENIAN RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>SECTION III.</b>	
<b>COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS OF MEDIA MONITORING AND ROUND TABLES ON THE COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>CHAPTER III.1. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS OF MEDIA MONITORING AND ROUND TABLE IN ARMENIA</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>CHAPTER III.2. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS OF MEDIA MONITORING AND ROUND TABLE IN AZERBAIJAN</b>	<b>80</b>

# SECTION I.

## REPORT

# ON MONITORING THE COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM

## CHAPTER I.1.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

THE MONITORING of coverage of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations in the media of Armenia and Azerbaijan was administered by Yerevan Press Club and “Yeni Nesil” Journalists Union of Azerbaijan under “Ensuring Public Awareness on Regional Developments” project supported by Friedrich Ebert Foundation.

**The monitoring aimed at determining** the volume of attention that media studied paid to various aspects of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, including the way these relations are influenced by Armenian-Turkish rapprochement process.

The research was administered simultaneously in Armenia and Azerbaijan by a unified methodology and within the same timeframes.

**The monitoring covered 12 media in Armenia and Azerbaijan each** - six TV channels and six newspapers in each country.

In **Armenia** the research focused on: Public Television of Armenia (PTA First Channel), “Kentron”, “Yerkir Media”, “Shant”, “ALM”, Second Armenian TV Channel; “Aravot”, “Golos Armenii”, “Hayastani Hanrapetutiun”, “Haykakan Zhamanak”, “Azg”, “168 Zham” newspapers.

In **Azerbaijan** the research focused on: Public Television of Azerbaijan (“ITV”), “Azad Azerbaijan” (“ATV”), “ANS”, “Lider”, Azerbaijani Television (“AzTV”), “Xazar”; “Azerbaijan”, “Yeni Musavat”, “Azadlyg”, “525ci Gazet”, “Yeni Azerbaijan”, “Zerkalo” newspapers.

**The timeframes for the monitoring:** for six weeks during the period of **May 17 - June 30, 2010**. This period of time was subdivided into two-week monitoring sets, with each of them being monitoring time for two TV channels and two newspapers in each country.

**IN ARMENIA:**

<b>Weeks*</b>	<b>TV</b>	<b>Newspapers</b>
May 17-30, 2010	PTA First Channel "Kentron"	"Aravot" "Golos Armenii"
June 2-15, 2010	"Yerkir Media" "Shant"	"Hayastani Hanrapetutian" "Haykakan Zhamanak"
June 17-30, 2010	"ALM" Second Armenian TV Channel	"Azg" "168 Zham"

*\*No monitoring was made on May 31, June 1 and June 16, 2010*

**IN AZERBAIJAN:**

<b>Weeks*</b>	<b>TV</b>	<b>Newspapers</b>
May 17-30, 2010	"ITV" "ATV"	"Azerbaijan" "Yeni Musavat"
June 2-15, 2010	"ANS" "Lider"	"Azadlyg" "525ci Gazet"
June 17-30, 2010	"AzTV" "Xazar"	"Yeni Azerbaijan" "Zerkalo"

*\*No monitoring was made on May 31, June 1 and June 16, 2010*

**The monitoring object in broadcast media** were the main issues of newscasts as well as current affairs and political discussion programs, aired by the TV channels above within the conditional prime time hours, **19.00-24.00**. The programs that had started but were not over before 19.00 were not considered, with the monitoring starting after the end of this program. The programs that started but were not over before 24.00 were studied in full, until the end.

**The monitoring object in print media** were newspaper publications in full, **except** weather forecasts, commercial and political advertising and classifieds, TV and radio program, schedules, "pure" photographs (out of publications and with no titles, headlines, captions), entertaining materials such as crosswords, tests, horoscopes, quizzes, etc. Newspaper supplements and inserts were not studied, either.

During the monitoring process all TV stories/newspaper articles that did refer to Armenia/Azerbaijan, Armenians/Azerbaijanis were studied. TV stories/newspaper articles, **fully or partly** dealing with the monitoring subject, were distributed by **eight sections**.

**FOR ARMENIA:**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Karabagh conflict resolution issue</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey (is in the interest of Armenia; is contrary to the interest of Armenia; unspecified)</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process (must be involved; must not be involved; unspecified)</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances (are necessary for Armenia; are unnecessary for Armenia; unspecified)</b>

**FOR AZERBAIJAN:**

1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey (is in the interest of Azerbaijan; is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan; unspecified)
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process (must be involved; must not be involved; unspecified)
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances (are necessary for Azerbaijan; are unnecessary for Azerbaijan; unspecified)

**Section 4** included pieces that contained a description of Armenia/Azerbaijan as a state, their institutes, assessments of Armenians/Azerbaijanis as individual representatives of the nation, as well as all non-news pieces that narrated about economy, culture, sport, lifestyle, cuisine, traditions and other spheres of each country, its citizens, its relations with other countries, etc.

**Section 5** included pieces that presented current news with no details specified.

**Section 6** included pieces in which the subjects, dealing with Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, including the Karabagh conflict resolution were considered through the prism of the relations between Armenia and Turkey (“football diplomacy”, protocols on the establishment of diplomatic relations and opening of borders, visits/meetings on state level in the context of Armenian-Turkish rapprochement). Besides, for the pieces in this section it was marked additionally whether “The Rapprochement Process between Armenia and Turkey” was in the interest of Armenia (in the Armenian media studied)/in the interest of Azerbaijan (in Azerbaijani media studied), or the impact is not discussed in any way.

**Section 7** included pieces in which the subjects dealing with Armenian-Azerbaijani relations were considered with regard to Turkey’s involvement in Karabagh conflict resolution process. In the TV pieces/publications in this section an additional marking was made as to whether Turkey should or should not be involved in the conflict resolution, or whether the issue was not considered from this perspective.

**Section 8** included pieces that told about potential, either planned or existing regional initiatives/projects with the participation of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under the present circumstances. In the pieces classified under this section an additional marking was made as to whether such initiatives/projects are necessary for Armenia (in Armenian media studied)/for Azerbaijan (in Azerbaijani media studied), or that the issue was not considered in such an aspect.

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

***The following was understood to be a TV piece:***

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

- a. a separate story in the newscast;
- 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 they referred to;
- e. program host text that introduced the TV piece (report, etc.) was considered to be a part of this piece (report, etc.).

***The following was understood to be a newspaper piece:***

The newspaper text unit, distinct in its theme, 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 they referred to;
- c. the headline/subheadline, the lead (i.e., the text after the headline/subheadline that introduced the publication and bore the main message of the article) were considered to be a part of the story they referred to;
- d. editorial comment on a certain publication, distinguished by words “Editor’s note”, “Editorial comment”, etc. was considered to be a separate publication;
- e. 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 as a separate material. If the photograph accompanied the newspaper publication, it was considered to be part of the material it referred to.

In the course of monitoring the following was determined and recorded:

- **total number** of TV and newspaper pieces;
- **number** of TV and newspaper pieces, **fully** or **partly** dealing with the monitoring subject or containing **references** to it;
- **type** of TV/newspaper piece, **fully** or **partly** dealing with the monitoring subject: news/events or analysis/comment;
- **information sources**, used in the TV and newspaper pieces, **fully** or **partly** dealing with the monitoring subject: self-produced information or other Armenian (for Armenian media studied) sources/other Azerbaijani sources (for Azerbaijani media studied); Azerbaijani (for Armenian media studied) sources/Armenian (for Azerbaijani media studied) sources; Turkish sources; other foreign sources (this includes also the missions, correspondents of foreign media in Armenia/Azerbaijan);
- **the number of references to thematic sections** in TV/newspaper pieces, **fully** or **partly** dealing with the monitoring subject.

## CHAPTER I.2.

### MONITORING OF ARMENIAN MEDIA

#### THE MEDIA STUDIED: BRIEF OVERVIEW

**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 air of the First Channel is 19.5 hours on the territory of Armenia and 24 hours in Yerevan. The programs of the channel can also be received abroad via satellite. The research focused at: the main newscast of PTA First Channel “Haylur” and “Sunday Haylur” current affairs program; “Haylur. Index” newscast; “Real Politics”, “Conversation” and “Banadzev” discussion programs. “Haylur” was aired 6 times a week, Monday-Saturday (the main newscast at 21.00 was monitored), “Sunday Haylur” was issued once a week on Sundays at 21.00, “Haylur. Index” is aired five times a week, Monday to Friday at 19.50. “Real Politics” and “Conversation” were aired once a week at 23.00, on Mondays and Fridays, respectively. During the research period there was only one issue of “Banadzev”, on May 22 at 22.30. Throughout the monitoring period for PTA First Channel (May 17-30, 2010) a total of 315 TV pieces was studied. Of these, 57 pieces (or 18.1%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 27 - in full, 25 - in part, 5 - contained references to it.

**“KENTRON”** is a private TV company, founded in 2004 by “Multimedia Kentron TV” CJSC. The daily duration of air is 24 hours. The research focused at: the main newscast of the “Kentron” “Epikentron” and “Urvagits” discussion program. “Epikentron” was aired every day (the main newscasts of “Epikentron” at 20.30 were monitored). “Urvagits” was aired 5 times a week, Monday to Friday at 21.21. Throughout the monitoring period for “Kentron” (May 17-30, 2010) a total of 229 TV pieces was studied. Of these, 43 pieces (or 18.8%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 20 - in full, 19 - in part, 4 - contained references to it.

**“YERKIR MEDIA”** is a private TV company, founded in 2004 by “Husaber” CJSC. The daily duration of air is 24 hours. The programs of the channel are received abroad via satellite. The research focused at: the main newscast of the “Yerkir Media” “Yerkirn Aysor”; “Yerkri Hartsy” and “Square” discussion programs. “Yerkirn Aysor” went on air every day (its main newscasts at 20.00 were monitored). “Yerkri Hartsy” was aired five times a week, Monday-Friday at 22.30, “Square” went on air once a week, on Saturdays at 21.15. Throughout the monitoring period for “Yerkir Media” (June 2-15, 2010) a total of 229 TV pieces was studied. Of these, 38 pieces (or 16.6%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 15 - in full, 22 - in part, 1 contained a reference to it.

**“SHANT”** is a private TV company, founded in 1994 by “Shant” LLC. The daily duration of air is 24 hours. The programs of the channel can also be received abroad via satellite. The research focused at: the main newscast of the “Shant” “Horizon” and “Supplement to ‘Horizon’” current affairs program; “Prospect” discussion program. “Horizon” was aired six times a week, Monday to Saturday (the main issues of “Horizon” at 22.00 were monitored), “Supplement to ‘Horizon’” - at 22.30 with varying regularity. “Prospect” was aired four times a week, Monday to Thursday at 23.50. Throughout the monitoring period for “Shant” (June 2-15, 2010) a total of 132 TV pieces was studied. Of these, pieces (or 16.7%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 7 - in full, 14 - in part, 1 contained a reference to it.

**“ALM”** is a private TV company, founded in 2000 by “ALM-Holding” LLC. The daily duration of air is 24 hours. The research focused at: the main newscast of “ALM” “Day by Day”; “Zarkerak” current affairs program; “Price of the Question”, “Stance”, “Indeed” (in Russian language), “Nation and State” and “Aytsekart” discussion programs. “Day by Day” was aired every day (the main issues of “Day by Day” at 20.00 were monitored). “Zarkerak” was aired daily (issues at 21.00 were monitored). “Price of the Question” and “Stance” were aired once a week at 21.20, on Tuesdays and Thursdays, respectively, “Indeed” - on Saturdays at 21.30, “Nation and State” - on Sundays at 22.00. During the research period there was only one issue of “Aytsekart”, on June 25 at 21.30. Throughout the monitoring period for “ALM” (June 17-30, 2010) a total of 416 TV pieces was studied. Of these, 95 pieces (or 22.8%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 74 - in full, 19 - in part, 2 - contained references to it.

**SECOND ARMENIAN TV CHANNEL (SECOND CHANNEL)** is a private TV company, founded in 1998 by “Second Armenian TV Channel” LLC. The daily duration of air is 18 hours. The research focused at: the main newscast of the Second Channel “Lraber” and “Fourth Studio” discussion program. “Lraber” was aired six times a week, Monday to Saturday (the main issues of “Lraber” at 23.00 were monitored). “Fourth Studio” was aired five times a week, Monday to Friday at 20.40. Throughout the monitoring period for the Second Channel (June 17-30, 2010) a total of 254 TV pieces was studied. Of these, 61 pieces (or 24%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 38 - in full, 23 - in part, no references were made to the subject.

**“ARAVOT”** is a daily newspaper (five times a week, Tuesday-Saturday), founded in 1994 by “Aravot Daily Newspaper” LLC. The standard volume is 16/A3 pp. The stated print run is 2,581-2,798 copies. During the monitoring period 10 issues were published. Throughout the monitoring period for “Aravot” (May 17-30, 2010) a total of 641 pieces was studied. Of these, 106 pieces (or 16.5%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 78 - in full, 22 - in part, 6 - contained references to it.

**“GOLOS ARMENII”** is a Russian-language newspaper (three times a week, Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday), founded in 1991 by “Golos” LLC. The standard volume is 8/A2 pp. The stated print run is 3,425 copies. During the monitoring period 5 issues were published. Throughout the monitoring period for “Golos Armenii” (May 17-30, 2010) a total of 284 pieces was studied. Of these, 73 pieces (or 25.7%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 56 - in full, 13 - in part, 4 - contained references to it.

**“HAYASTANI HANRAPETUTIUN”** is a daily newspaper (five times a week, Tuesday-Saturday), founded in 1990 by “Hanrapetutiun” CJSC. The standard volume is 6/A2 pp. The stated print run is 6,000 copies. During the monitoring period 10 issues were published. Of these, 4 issues had a volume of 8/A2 pp., and 1 - 4/A2 pp. Throughout the monitoring period for “Hayastani Hanrapetutiun” (June 2-15, 2010) a total of 355 pieces was studied. Of these, 89 pieces (or 25.1%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 49 - in full, 40 - in part, no references were made to the subject.

**“HAYKAKAN ZHAMANAK”** is a daily newspaper (five times a week, Tuesday-Saturday), founded in 1999 by “Dareskizb” LLC. The standard volume is 8/A3 pp. The stated print run is 7,690-7,960 copies. During the monitoring period 10 issues were published. Throughout the monitoring period for “Haykakan Zhamanak” (June 2-15, 2010) a total of 345 pieces was studied. Of these, 42 pieces (or 12.2%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 26 - in full, 16 - in part, no references were made to the subject.



“**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 10 issues were published. Throughout the monitoring period for “Azg” (June 17-30, 2010) a total of 341 pieces was studied. Of these, 86 pieces (or 25.2%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 66 - in full, 19 - in part, 1 contained a reference to it.

“**168 ZHAM**” is a newspaper (three times a week, Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday), founded in 2004 by “168 Zham” LLC. Standard volume is 8/A3 pp. The stated print run is 5,000 copies. During the monitoring period 6 issues were published, 2 of them having 16/A3 pp. Throughout the monitoring period for “168 Zham” (June 17-30, 2010) a total of 227 pieces was studied. Of these, 59 pieces (or 26%) were dealing with the monitoring subject: 42 - in full, 17 - in part, no reference to the subject were made.

## **ANALYSIS OF ARMENIAN MEDIA MONITORING FINDINGS**

### **CONTENT CATEGORIES**

Throughout the monitoring period (May 17 - June 30, 2010) the total number of pieces on the six TV channels studied made 1,575, and the number of those in the six newspapers studied - 2,193.

Both the broadcast and the print media displayed significant interest overall to the Armenian-Azerbaijani issues, which accounted for 1/5 of the overall coverage: 20.7% of the total number of pieces studied in the newspapers and 20.1% of the total number of pieces studied on TV were dealing with the subject of monitoring or contained references to it.

Another sign of enhanced attention can be seen in the fact that, when speaking about the relations between the two countries, the Armenian media in most of the cases devoted their pieces to the subject completely: 69.7% in newspapers, 57.3% on TV channels. The share of pieces, partly dealing with the monitoring subject, came up to 27.9% in newspapers and to 38.6% on TV channels. Only in 11 newspaper (2.4%) and 13 TV pieces (4.1%) references to the subject were made. This low indicator is most probably due to the circumstance that the media studied preferred to treat the subject in detail, when speaking about Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, rather than refer to it in passing.

At the same time, the coverage by all 12 media studied was mostly news. On TV channels, 77.2% of the total number of pieces fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject were news, 22.8% - were analytical. In newspapers - 69.4% and 30.6%, respectively. And while the emphasis on events is quite understandable, one would expect the print media to be more profound in covering the issues of public concern, among which the Armenian-Azerbaijani relations and Karabagh conflict resolution primarily can be classed with no hesitation. Meanwhile, in May-June 2010 the coverage of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations by both broadcast and print media was due mostly to the appearance of some news and events, such as summits, statements of state and public figures of the two countries, OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairmen). Hence, more than a threefold prevalence of news over analytical pieces on the TV air and more than the twofold prevalence in newspaper pages. It should be stressed here that there was very little “pure” analysis in the TV pieces/publications, fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject - opinions, judgments and comments of reviewing nature were predominant.

The certain similarity between the broadcast and print media can also be seen when considering the information sources, used in the TV and newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject. When covering the relations between the two countries, the media preferred to publish self-produced information or information from other Armenian sources: 96.4% on TV channels, 89.4% in newspapers. Very seldom did the TV channels address other foreign sources (5%) and even less so - the Azerbaijani and Turkish sources (2.3% each). The newspapers were much more active in using other foreign (14.2%) and Azerbaijani sources (11.3%), and, similarly to TV channels, they quoted Turkish sources, only rarely (2.7 %). *(The cases where the sum of the indicators exceeds 100% are due to a fact that if one TV/newspaper piece used several sources of information/contained references to two or more thematic sections, all of them were recorded in appropriate cells.)*

Of the Azerbaijani sources the Armenian media mostly quoted news agencies/news portals “APA”, “Trend”, 1news.az, Vesti.az, Bakililar.az Internet forum, “GyunAz TV” online television, “Azadlyg”, “Yeni Musavat”, statements by the AR Foreign and Defense Ministries. At the same time quite often the TV and newspaper pieces did not name the specific sources of information, the information was just quoted from “Azerbaijani sources”, “Azerbaijani web-sites”. The same general quotes were made from the Turkish sources.

## **COVERAGE OF THEMATIC SECTIONS IN ARMENIAN MEDIA STUDIED**

### **1. Karabagh Conflict Resolution Issue**

The Karabagh conflict resolution issue was the obvious leader in terms of frequency of reference to the section both by broadcast and print media receiving over half of the coverage of the total number of references to all thematic sections: on TV channels - 57.5%, in newspapers - 51.8%. A similar picture could be seen in the previous studies, administered in 2001-2009. Thus, one can speak about the traditionally high interest of Armenian media to Karabagh issue.

In 2010 the media continued discussing the possible solutions to the Karabagh conflict (armed or peaceful), statements of Azerbaijani representatives about the readiness of the country to solve the problem by war were quoted along with the threats made by the AR President Ilham Aliyev to resume military actions, his other statements on Mountainous Karabagh. The media dismissed the allegations of Turkey that an agreement was reached with Armenia about returning two occupied regions to Azerbaijan. Much critical coverage was given to Resolution 2216 of the European Parliament “EU Strategy in South Caucasus”, in particular the chapter that dealt with MK conflict resolution. Media published the statements by the RA Foreign Minister, the public forces of the country that noted that the Resolution ran contrary to the EU and OSCE Minsk Group stance, does not correspond to the Madrid principles, that the Bulgarian MP Evgeni Kirilov (whose report became the basis for the Resolution) had never visited either Karabagh or the region. Some of the political forces of the country called this document absurd. Same degree of criticism was displayed to the idea of forming a PACE subcommittee to resolve the conflict in Mountainous Karabagh and to be headed by the present PACE Chairman Mevlut Cavusoglu. Opinions were voiced that being a Turk Cavusoglu would not be able to be objective in Karabagh conflict resolution issue, and therefore his appointment is contrary to the interests of Armenia and is unacceptable. Traditionally, coverage was given to the OSCE Minsk Group activities - mostly as news. The renewed Madrid principles also received coverage by stingy communications never disclosing the content of the principles

(which is actually typical for most of the official documents on Karabagh conflict resolution). Enhanced interest by the Armenian media studied was displayed towards the military doctrine of Azerbaijan, adopted on June 8 by the AR parliament, in which, the media stressed, Armenia was defined as an aggressor. As the publications noted, the doctrine mostly concentrates on the issues of occupied territories, their return and restoration of territorial integrity of Azerbaijan. Print media featured pieces that discussed the stances of Russia, Iran on Karabagh conflict resolution. One of the publications noted that Turkey imposes its will on Azerbaijan, arms it, and it is Turkey that constitutes the primary danger for Karabagh. In another article the visit of the RF President Dmitriy Medvedev in Yerevan to be paid to Yerevan in August was a reason to analyze a version that the Russian leader must bring the final resolution option with him.

Yet most of the media attention during the monitoring period was paid to the incident of early morning of June 19 in Mardakert district of Mountainous Karabagh, when, as a result of shootings, four soldiers from Armenia were killed, with another four being wounded, and one soldier from Azerbaijan was killed, too. The incident was qualified as a provocation, a sabotage attack. The media voiced hypotheses that the incident may possibly be related to the June 17 meeting of Presidents of Russia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairmen. It was noted that Ilham Aliyev was going to the summit in hope that Russia would exert pressure on Armenia and the MK issue would be solved in favor of Azerbaijan, yet these plans did not come true and the AR President interrupted the visit (he did not even take part in the Petersburg International Economic Forum, the main annual economic summit of Russia and CIS countries), came back to Azerbaijan, with the shooting in Mardakert district taking place immediately afterwards. The MK incident was described as an attempt of Azerbaijan to check how prepared Armenian army is, to exert pressure on Armenia, intimidate Armenian soldiers - to settle the Karabagh issue soon, together with Turkey.

While it was noted that shootings do take place in the borderline regions, this very incident intensified the talks about the possible resumption of the war. In this regard the issue of how prepared Armenia is for the war started to be discussed. Along with the publicizing of representatives of the leadership of Armenia and MK (from now on all similar actions by Azerbaijan would be receiving an adequate response), statements of AR representative were quoted, too (in particular, saying that unless Armenia stops these provocations it will receive even stronger attacks). Media published opinions of Russian experts on the possible placement of Russian troops along the border, the stance of Iran, anticipating a similar plan from the US and NATO and saying it would not allow peace troops so close to its borders. The response from the international community appeared, calling Armenia and Azerbaijan to establish peace. The joint statement of US, France and Russia Presidents on June 26 on MK issue that stress the need for the leaders of Armenia and Azerbaijan to work out the final agreement on the peaceful resolution of the conflict, basing on the fundamental principles and agreements reached, was broadly commented in media by Armenian politicians and experts. The latter ones stressed in particular that nothing new was said, that presidents of the three countries, primarily, should have condemned the incident in Mardakert region and that they again want to impose unilateral concessions on Armenia. The words of the AR Foreign Minister Elmar Mamedyarov were also given an assessment. The Minister had qualified the incident as a sign that the Karabagh conflict is not frozen, as a forewarning to the global community that in order to prevent the war the Armenian troops must leave Karabagh and the issue of occupied territories must be resolved. This statement was qualified to be "the same old song" in the Armenian media.

The incident of June 18-19 in Mardakert District of MK can be named to be the main event of the monitoring period. This incident and the related developments became the subject matter for numerous newspaper and TV pieces in newscasts and discussion programs.

## **2. Reporting on the Life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the Conflict Context**

On the six TV channels studied this thematic section was rated the second (13.3% of the total number of references to all thematic sections), in the six newspapers studied it shared the 3rd and the 4th ranks (12.5%) with the section "Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey".

Along with the pieces on the daily life in Mountainous Karabagh, an important subject during the study period was the parliamentary elections in MK on May 23. The question of their being democratic was discussed in the context of recognition of MK's independence by the international community, as an established legitimate state. The idea that unlike the elections in Azerbaijan, those in MK were administered in a democratic manner (as a confirmation the assessments of international observers were quoted). This statement was illustrated by various examples of election campaigns being undemocratic in AR. Thus, the opinion of the PACE co-rapporteur on Azerbaijan was quoted, who said at one of the sessions of the PACE that none of the elections in Azerbaijan met the European standards. The negative response of Azerbaijan to parliamentary elections in MK was given quite active coverage too, it was reported that Azerbaijan included the international observers at these elections into a blacklist, announced them to be personae non grata and banned them from entering the country. One of the publications contained advice to Azerbaijani politicians to see to the situation in their own country, for example to fulfill the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights and to liberate the journalists imprisoned, to try and understand why reports by reputable international organizations record consistent retreat from democratic rights and freedoms in their country, and the AR leader is increasingly seen to be not simply a dictator, but a despotic ruler, and even a sultan. A supposition was made that ahead of parliamentary elections in MK a provocative communication that Armenia is about to surrender seven districts to Azerbaijan is released.

Of other developments in the section one can single out also the response of the Azerbaijan to the roaming agreement of the Tajikistan T-cell company with Karabagh Telecom. The indignation of Azerbaijani media was quoted in particular: this agreement was alleged to mean a factual recognition of Mountainous Karabagh by this Muslim state.

## **3. Armenian-Azerbaijani Relations with No Direct Link to Karabagh Issue**

Both on TV channels and in newspapers studied this section received minimal coverage, getting to the 7th and 6th ranks, respectively: 1.2% of the total number of references of broadcast media to all thematic sections and 2.5% of pieces in print media.

In many pieces, dealing with the subject, the Armenian-Azerbaijani relations were considered in the aspect of sports events. Thus criticism of the behaviors of Azerbaijani weightlifters with regard to Armenian sportsmen at the Europe Championship in Valencia. The media reported on the matches between the sportsmen of the two counters at various competitions. It was noted that Azerbaijan had refused taking part in Europe Championship of basketball for females held in Yerevan, and the Armenian chess player Levon Aronyan would not take part in the FIDE tournament that should be held in 2011 in Baku, going to another country instead to have the same tournament in other group. The

report from Eurovision-2010 on Norway spoke about the relations between the Armenian and Azerbaijani delegations, while another piece recalled Eurovision-2009 when the Azerbaijani national security services interrogated the citizens simply for having voted for the Armenian singers.

A number of pieces told about the wish of Azerbaijan to block Armenia from taking part in regional projects, including the refusal to cooperate under EU Eastern Partnership program. The report on the assembly of CIS, Caucasus and Black Sea Socintern Committee and opinion was voiced that the involvement of Azerbaijani representative in this event will contribute to the establishment of dialogue, communication on the basis of socialism values, and development of joint actions. The absence of Azerbaijani representatives at the NATO conference in Yerevan was interpreted as another sign that Azerbaijan continues to take a rigid stance in terms of cooperating with Armenia in international projects. When addressing the anti-Armenian politics of Azerbaijan in various spheres the need to wage counter-propaganda for Armenia was stressed.

#### **4. Everything that Relates to Azerbaijan (as a Country, a State, its Institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as Individual Representatives of a Nation, of a State)**

The TV channels paid to his subject twice less time than the newspapers: 6.9% of the total number of references to all thematic sections in broadcast media (4th rank) and 13.6% - in print media (2nd rank).

The media referred to the relations between Azerbaijan and Turkey (in this context an opinion was voiced, among others, that the fraternity of the two countries is false and is strengthened by the gas pipeline). Pieces on destruction of Shiite mosques in Baku appeared. Issues of military facilities of Azerbaijan were stressed, along with the development of its military doctrine, the budget of the country and the economic recession. As noted above, the parliamentary elections in MK were a pretext to remind about the illegitimacy of election campaigns in Azerbaijan. The media ran communications on the report of the PACE Monitoring Committee on Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, where it was mentioned that the Azerbaijani opposition is out of parliament because of the imperfect election legislation. The report on Azerbaijan heard on June 24 at the summer session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe was heard. Other critical assessments of Azerbaijan were voiced as quoted from reports of various international and foreign organizations. It was noted that a draft law being developed in Azerbaijan would enable the AR Constitution Court, in the case of military actions to postpone the conductance of national elections, to prolong the authority of the parliament and the president. On various occasions media addressed the issue of Azerbaijani journalists, bloggers who are imprisoned. The media wrote that the deterioration of Turkish-Israeli relations is sensitive for Azerbaijan, and the rallies to support the Palestinians in Azerbaijan to please Turkey are a sign of double standards that Azerbaijan adheres to, as it at the same time tries to restrict the rights of people in Karabagh. In one of the publications, titled "Even Textbooks Are Falsified in Azerbaijan", referring to Iranian web sites, said that the Azerbaijani authorities fund and support anti-Armenian sentiment among Azerbaijanis living in Iran. Armenian media reported on the process of Mathew Bryza's nomination to be the US Ambassador in Azerbaijan, on the visit of the US Minister of Defense Robert Gates to Azerbaijan, on the letter from Barak Obama that the Minister gave to Ilham Aliyev, about the withdrawal of British Petroleum from Azerbaijan.

#### **5. Developments in Azerbaijan and/or Related to It**

Similarly to the section of “Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue”, “Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it” received very insignificant coverage: on TV channels - 2.5% of the total number of references to all thematic sections (6th rank), in newspapers - 2% (7th rank). In the first case this low interest is overall explained by the virtual non-existence of relations between the two countries in the domain that are not linked to Karabagh resolution, which is due to the conflict. In the second case, this is due to the small number of pieces which contain pure news. In other words, the Armenian media, when telling about a certain event in Azerbaijan, do it in a quite detailed manner, opening the parenthesis, which allows putting these pieces into other thematic sections, primarily “Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)”. A similar picture was observed in the two previous media research on Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, too.

## **6. Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey**

This section received identical interest from all 12 media studied: TV channels - 13% of the total number of references to all thematic sections (3rd rank), newspapers - 12.5% (3-4 ranks, sharing them with “Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context”). As noted in “Background Information” section, the process of normalization of relations between Armenia and Turkey was also studied to see whether it complies with the interests of Armenia.

In the majority of pieces the issue of whether the process is to the benefit of Armenia was not raised: 64.2% of the total number of references to this section on TV channels 57.9% - in newspapers. The process of Armenia-Turkey rapprochement was considered from various perspectives. It was noted, for example, that the process is very pressured by superpowers, each having its own interests, and that this pressure causes the suspension of the Armenian-Turkish relation upon the initiative of the Armenian party, that the EU must reconsider its stance on the issue. The media voiced the statements by the Turkey's Prime Minister Erdogan saying that unless progress is attained in Karabagh resolution, no progress is possible in Armenian-Turkish relations and that the Armenian Diaspora is very much in the way of the rapprochement. The words of Azerbaijan's President Ilham Aliyev were quoted saying that Armenia nourished hopes to open the border with Turkey yet the principled stance of the Turkish party destroyed all these plans. Much attention was paid to the official stance of Yerevan. Thus, at the meeting with the NATO Secretary General the Armenian President Serzh Sargsian noted, that when putting forth pre-conditions, Turkey had exhausted its credibility reserve. Turkey's digression from the previously reached agreements was explained by the unwillingness or inability of the Turkish leadership to solve the issue, or by the pressure that Azerbaijan exerts on Turkey. It was stressed that the process will continue when Turkey is ready to respect mutual agreements and ratifies the Armenian Turkish protocols, that relations should be established without pre-conditions and within reasonable timeframes.

In 26.4% of TV pieces in this section and 38.2% of newspaper publications, it was noted that the Armenian-Turkish process is not to the benefit of Armenia, primarily because Turkey, violating the agreements reached, poses pre-conditions that are unacceptable for Armenia. Linking the issue of the Karabagh resolution with the process of normalization was named to be one of the main reasons that induced Armenia to stop the process. At the same time it was stressed that Yerevan is ready to move ahead and resume the negotiations, if Ankara gives up its preconditions. It was noted that any attempts by Turkey to link the Armenian-Turkish relations with the Karabagh conflict must be seen negatively

in Armenia. Radical opinions were published, too: any rapprochement with Turkey threatens Armenian national security, Turks are unable to forget the recent past full of blood, that they are “criminals”, “eternal oppressors” and “executioners”.

And only in five TV pieces (9.4% of the total number of references to this section) and four newspaper pieces (5.3%) opinion was expressed that the rapprochement is in the interest of Armenia. Yet all of them expressed the stance of the representatives of foreign states or international structures. For example, with a reference to the “Anadolu” news agency the appeal of UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to continue the Armenian-Turkish rapprochement, since it is in the interest of both countries, their people. The communication on the upcoming visit of the US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to the region the opinion of the Deputy Secretary of State Philip Gordon noting that the Clinton’s visit to Armenia aims also at reviving the rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey, ratification of protocols from which not only the countries themselves would benefit, but the region in general. The opinion of the UK Ambassador to Armenia was published as saying that his country was disappointed with the pause in Armenian-Turkish relations, that there is no alternative in the dialogue and it is to the interest of both countries.

And only one newspapers piece, titled “The Problem Is Not the Common History of Armenian and Turkish People, but in the Turkey’s Denial of Armenian Genocide, in the Unanimity of Power and People and the Common Armenophobia”, resented the stances for and against the rapprochement. One of the pieces of the story noted that the normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations is positive for Armenia, both in terms of cultural links, and freeing of mentality, getting to know each other and each other’s history, etc. The author of the article quoted his own arguments, reflected in the headline: the denial of Armenian Genocide and armenophobia in Turkish society are not to be dismissed, and hence, the rapprochement is meaningless.

## **7. Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh Conflict Resolution Process**

This section ranked the fifth in both broadcast media and print media: on TV channels - 5.7% of the total number of references to all thematic sections, in newspapers - 5.2%. As noted in the “Background Information” chapter, this section for the TV and newspapers pieces had an additional perspective specified - where the Turkey should or should not be involved in the Karabagh conflict resolution.

In the opinion of all 12 media studied, Turkey must not be involved in the MK issue resolution process: 82.6% of the total number of references to this section on TV channels, 90.6% - in newspapers. In seven pieces only (17.4% on TV and 9.4% in newspapers) this aspect was not considered at all.

The conflict resolution is the prerogative and exclusive competence of the OSCE Minsk Group and Turkey has nothing to do here - that was the bottom line of the vast majority of pieces on this subject. Armenia would not allow Turkey getting involved in Karabagh conflict resolution process, all the attempts of Turkey in this regard are doomed to failure. Turkey has nothing to do with the conflict resolution process, and the attempts to manipulate this subject by it, in particular, by the Prime Minister Erdogan resulted in Armenia slamming the door before Turkey and isolating it. This unequivocal reluctance to see Turkey as a mediator in the MK conflict is explained primarily by the fact that it is on the side of Azerbaijan and hence is unable to be unbiased with regard to MK conflict. One of the newspapers even voiced the supposition that the frequent violations of the ceasefire on the Armenian-Azerbaijan border must be viewed as part of political effort of Azerbaijan

aiming at rapidly changing the negotiations format to involve Turkey. Resolution 2216 “EU Strategy in South Caucasus” of the European Parliament, noted above and criticized by the media, was interpreted also to say that by stressing the important roles played by Turkey, US and Russia in conflict resolution in South Caucasus, the European Parliament allowed for the possibility of Turkey’s involvement in Karabagh conflict resolution, which is dangerous. At the same time, opinions were quoted saying that the efforts of Turkey to intervene into the Karabagh process were not supported by the international community.

#### **8. Regional Initiatives/Projects with the Involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under Current Circumstances**

The Armenian media studied had not addressed this thematic section throughout the monitoring period.



## **CHAPTER I.3.**

### **MONITORING OF AZERBAIJANI MEDIA**

#### **THE MEDIA STUDIED: BRIEF OVERVIEW**

**“ITV”** is the Public Television of Azerbaijan, on air since 2005. The daily duration of air is 24 hours. The broadcasts cover the whole territory of Azerbaijan. The programs of the channel can be received abroad via satellite. The research focused at: the main newscasts of the evening news program “Jarci” (“Herald”) (Monday-Saturday, at 20.00-20.45), current affairs program “Yekun” (“Sum-up”) (on Sundays at 22.00-23.00), as well as other political discussion programs, aired at 19.00-24.00. Throughout the monitoring period for “ITV” (May 17-30, 2010) a total of 436 TV pieces was studied. Of these, 117 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 85 - in full, 26 - in part, 6 - contained references to it. This constituted 26.8% of all the pieces of the channel studied.

**“ATV”** is a private TV and radio company, on air since 2000. The daily duration of air is 24 hours. The broadcasts cover Apsheron peninsula, Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic, Baku - from Shamakha region in north-west and Alyat city in the south. The programs of the channel can also be received abroad by satellite. The research focused at: the main newscasts of the evening news program “Son Xabar” (“Recent News”) (Monday-Saturday, at 20.30-21.00), “Hafta Sonu” (“Week-End”) current affairs program (on Sundays, at 20.30-21.00), as well as other political discussion programs that were aired at 19.00-24.00. Throughout the monitoring period for “ATV” (May 17-30, 2010) a total of 235 was studied. Of these, 41 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 26 - in full, 13 - in part, 2 - contained references to it. This constituted 17.4% of all the pieces of the channel studied.

**“ANS”** is the first private TV and radio company of the country, on air since 1992. The daily duration of air is 19-21 hours. The channel broadcasts all over the territory of Azerbaijan. The programs of the channel are transmitted abroad via satellite. The research focused at: the main newscasts of the evening news program “Habarci” (“Herald”) (Monday - Saturday, 21.00-22.00), “Hesabat” (“Report”) current affairs program (on Sundays at 21.00-21.30), as well as other political discussion programs, aired at 19.00-24.00. Throughout the monitoring period for “ANS” (June 2-15, 2010) a total 305 TV pieces were studied. Of these, 48 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 31 - in full, 13 - in part, 4 - contained references to it. This constituted 15.7% of all TV channel pieces studied.

**“LIDER”** is a private TV company, broadcasting since 1998. The daily duration of air is 24 hours. The broadcasts cover the whole territory of Azerbaijan. The programs of the channel can also be received abroad via satellite. The research focused at: the main newscasts of the evening news program “Seda” (“Voice”) (Monday-Saturday, at 19.00-19.30), current affairs programs “Seda+” (“Voice +”) (Monday-Friday, at 19.30-20.00) and “Seda Hafta” (“Voice-Week”) (on Sundays, at 21.00-22.00), as well as other political discussion programs, aired at 19.00-24.00. Throughout the monitoring period for “Lider” (June 2-15, 2010) a total of 216 pieces was studied. Of these, 44 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 27 - in full, 16 - in part, 1 contained a reference to it. This constituted 20.4% of all the pieces of the channel studied.

**“AzTV”** is the former state TV company, established in 1956. Since 2006 it was transformed into a close joint-stock company, with all the stock owned by the state. The daily duration of air is 24 hours. The broadcasts cover the whole territory of Azerbaijan. The programs of the channel can also be received abroad via satellite. The research focused at: the main newscasts of the evening news program “Habarlar” (“News”) (Monday-Saturday, at 20.00-20.50), current affair programs “Gunun Nabzi” (“Day Pulse”) (Tuesday-Friday, 20.50-21.15), “Hafta” (“Week”) (Sundays, at 20.00-21.30), as well as other political discussion programs, aired at 19.00-24.00. Throughout the monitoring period for “AzTV” (June 17-30, 2010) a total of 370 TV pieces was studied. Of these, 64 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 21 - in full, 41 - in part, 2 - contained references to it. This constituted 17.3% of all the pieces of the channel studied.

**“XAZAR”** is a private TV and radio company, on air since 2007 on the basis and frequency of STV channel, the local branch of Turkish “Samanyolu” that broadcasted its programs in Azerbaijan in 2000-2007. The daily duration of air is 18 hours. The broadcasts cover the whole territory of Azerbaijan. The programs of the channel can be received abroad via satellite. The research focused at: the main newscasts of the evening news program “Khazar Khabar” (“Khazar news”) (Monday-Sunday at 20.30-21.30), as well as other political discussion programs, aired at 19.00-24.00. Throughout the monitoring period for “Xazar” (June 17-30, 2010) a total of 364 pieces was studied. Of these, 36 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 22 - in full, 12 - in part, 2 - contained references to it. This constituted 9.9% of all pieces of the channel studied.

**“AZERBAIJAN”** is an official newspaper, print organ of the country’s parliament. The newspaper was founded in 1919, is issued six times a week (except Monday) on 8-16/A2 pp. The stated print run is 8,737 copies. Throughout the monitoring period for “Azerbaijan” (May 17-30, 2010) a total of 587 pieces was studied. Of these, 107 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 46 - in full, 53 - in part, 8 - contained references to it. This constituted 18.2% of all the pieces studied in the newspaper.

**“YENI MUSAVAT”** is an opposition newspaper, founded in 1989 by Rauf Arifoglu, the Chief Editor of the newspaper. The newspaper is issued 7 times a week on 16/A3 pp. The stated print run is 11,000-11,650 copies. Throughout the monitoring period for “Yeni Musavat” (May 17-30, 2010), a total of 878 pieces was studied. Of these, 104 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 51 - in full, 45 - in part, 8 - contained references to it. This constituted 11.8% of all the pieces studied in the newspaper.

**“AZADLYG”** is an opposition newspaper, founded in 1989 by journalistic staff. The newspaper is issued six times a week (Tuesday-Sunday) on 16/A3 pp. The stated print run is 7,556 copies. Throughout the monitoring period for “Azadlyg” (June 2-15, 2010) a total of 635 pieces was studied. Of these, 59 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 16 - in full, 35 - in part, 8 - contained references to it. This constituted 9.3% of all the pieces studied in the newspaper.

**“525ci GAZET”** is an independent newspaper, founded in 1992 by “525” company. The newspaper is issued five times a week: four times, on Tuesday-Friday on 8/A2 pp., with a stated print run of 2,025 copies, and on Saturdays on 32/A3 pp., with the stated print run of 3,525 copies. Throughout the monitoring period for “525ci Gazet” (June 2-15, 2010) a total of 443 pieces was studied. Of these, 80 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 26 - in full, 36 - in part, 18 - contained references to it. This constituted 18.1% of all the pieces studied in the newspaper.

**“YENI AZERBAIJAN”** is an official newspaper, founded in 1993 by “Yeni Azerbaijan” party. The newspaper is issued five times a week, Tuesday-Saturday, on 12/A2 pp. The stated print run is 6,074 copies. Throughout the monitoring period for “Yeni Azerbaijan” (June 17-30, 2010) a total of 435 pieces was studied. Of these, 85 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 48 - in full, 35 - in part, 2 - contained references to it. This constituted 19.5% of all the pieces studied in the newspaper.

**“ZERKALO”** is an independent newspaper, founded in 1990 by the journalistic staff. The newspaper is published in the Russian language, is issued five times a week: four times, on Tuesday-Friday on 8/A2 pp., with a stated print run of 5,000 copies, and on Saturday - on 48/A3 pp., with a stated print run of 10,000 copies. Throughout the monitoring period for “Zerkalo” (June 17-30, 2010) a total of 458 pieces was studied. Of these, 42 pieces were dealing with the monitoring subject: 15 - in full, 24 - in part, 3 - contained references to it. This constituted 9.2% of all the pieces studied in the newspaper.

## **ANALYSIS OF AZERBAIJANI MEDIA MONITORING FINDINGS**

### **CONTENT CATEGORIES**

Throughout the monitoring period (May 17 - June 30, 2010) in six print and six broadcast media of Azerbaijan a total of 5,362 pieces was studied. Of these, 1,926 were on TV, and 3,436 are the newspaper pieces.

May-June 2010 in Azerbaijan was eventful and called on media to display both timely reporting and profound analysis. The opposition parties insistently sought to organize mass protest actions, and the law enforcement bodies with the same consistency dispersed their rallies and detained their activists. Loud litigations on journalistic cases took place. Thousands of families who found themselves homeless after destructive floods demanded that their problems be solved, while authorities were in a hurry to re-route rivers, to resettle whole villages, seeking to prevent the calamity and to reduce the wave of dissatisfaction. Corruption in using the budget funding to purify rivers and artificial foals was disclosed. The extraordinary heat intensified the environmental, hygiene and social condensations, the agricultural sector made alarm signals, saying a food crisis was possible. Meanwhile the parliament was reconsidering the budget of the country, introducing serious amendments to the Electoral Code, received with strong criticism by opposition and international organizations ahead of elections to Milli Meclis. The Government engaged in negotiations regarding energy prices, made deals, the terms of which largely condition the future of Azerbaijan. And the world developments sometimes fully caught the media attention, causing the many domestic issues to step to the background. One of such events of May 2010 was the attack of Israel on the Turkish humanitarian ship “Mavi Marmara”. The main event of June 2010 was the World Football Championship. During the first three days of the Championship, “Lider” TV company even cancelled its main newscast to enable the viewers follow the matches in real time mode.

Yet, with all this redundancy of new subjects and issues, the old problem of “Azerbaijani-Armenian relations” was, if not the first, but still on the top of media agenda. 18.2% of TV channels and 13.9% of newspaper pieces studied were dealing with it. This proves the importance of the subject for both the media of Azerbaijan and the society in general.

In terms of intensiveness of reference to Azerbaijani-Armenian issues the leader among the TV companies is “ITV” that devoted to the monitoring subject 26.8% of all pieces studied on the channel. This is primarily due to the fact that every newscast of the Public

Television starts with a reel on Azerbaijani-Armenian conflict and the losses in Karabagh's war. Besides, when covering the developments related to the monitoring subject, "ITV" includes in its newscasts separate pieces with MPs and political analysts stating their views on the influence of these developments on the resolution of Karabagh issue. "Xazar" TV company is also distinguished from others, having devoted to the subject in question only 9.9% of its pieces. This is explained by the social emphasis that the TV company has in most of its programs, including newscasts. The indicators of other four TV companies vary within 15.7%-20.4%.

The governmental and progovernmental newspapers ("Azerbaijan", "Yeni Azerbaijan", "525ci Gazet") devoted to the Azerbaijani-Armenian relations 18.1% - 19.5% of their pieces. The independent and opposition newspapers had almost twice less coverage, from 9.2% to 11.8%. This is certainly the influence of the official policy, controlling the governmental and pro-governmental media. There were three national holidays in May-June 2010 in Azerbaijan, the head of the state had a number of meetings of leaders of foreign countries, including the official representatives of the USA, Turkey, Russia. Ahead of every holiday and after every meeting President Ilham Aliyev made statements, placing a particular emphasis on Karabagh issue. These statements were published in this or that forms by all newspapers. Yet the pro-governmental publications gave them a much broader coverage, repeating and intercepting the appropriate statements by the President day in and day out.

Nearly two thirds (60.6%) of TV pieces on Azerbaijani-Armenian relations (these made 350 during the monitoring period) were fully dealing with the subject. In 34.6% of such pieces of broadcast media the subject in question is present in part. That is, it is either considered in the overall political context in the country and region, or, while speaking about other developments, the program participants refer to their influence on various aspects of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, too. The subject is mentioned in a total of 4.9% of TV pieces.

Throughout the monitoring period the research subject was recorded in 477 pieces in six national newspapers. Over 90% of these are fully or partly devoted to the discussion of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, a pure reference to the subject is made only in 9.9% of similar pieces.

These data come to confirm again that the monitoring subject is quite urgent and topical for the media of the country, it is very seldom that the subject appears in the pieces "incidentally". The pure reference to a subject almost never conveys new information or meaning. For this reasons in our further analysis we shall only consider the pieces that are dealing with Azerbaijani-Armenian relations in full or in part.

In 333 TV pieces, both on every TV individually, and overall for all broadcast media, the news stories are prevalent - 81.7%. On most of the TV channels throughout the monitoring period only 3-7 analytical programs dealing with Azerbaijani-Armenian subject were recorded. An exception here is made only by "ITV" and "ANS" (26 and 14 programs, respectively), that account for almost two thirds of analytical pieces on all six TV companies, dealing with the monitoring subject. This is explained by the fact that the channels specified have a greater diversity of current affairs programs than the others, they are thematically more diverse.

Of the 430 newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject, 62.3% are news. The big proportion of analytical pieces (37.7%) catches attention, being quite characteristic for newspapers. Yet, even taking into account the inclination of newspapers

to make a more profound consideration of facts and developments, it should be noted that the indicators of two newspapers are particularly outstanding: “Yeni Musavat” has an almost equal proportion of news and analysis (49 versus 47), and in “Zerkalo” the news reports are twice less numerous than analytical pieces (13 versus 26). The thing is “Yeni Musavat” runs many columns, in which almost every day well-known journalists comment on urgent political issues, with the Karabagh problem being a priority. “Zerkalo” newspaper is known for its analytical “weight”.

As to information sources, using in the pieces, fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject, this indicator is important in terms of answering the question of how pluralistic the media of the country are, when covering issues of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, whether they introduce the readers to the stance of the opposition party, independent experts, the participants and observers in the process that represent “third parties”?

In the TV pieces, fully or partly dealing with the research subject throughout monitoring period 403 information sources were used. Their majority (67%) are local (journalists, political analysts, public figures, state leadership of Azerbaijan). The statements by President Ilham Aliyev are particularly often quoted as they concern the Karabagh conflict resolution, the fate of Azerbaijani refugees. The second most popular are “other foreign sources” (19.1%). These include officials of different countries, representatives of international organizations, such as the Council of Europe, UNESCO, Organization of Islamic Conference, OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairmen, Azerbaijani guests. Sometimes TV companies quoted opinions of foreign political analysts and NGOs. It is somewhat unexpected to see the Turkish sources by frequency of use to take the place before last (7.2%) in the pieces of broadcast media of Azerbaijan, dealing with Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, being far behind the other foreign sources. This is apparently due to the fact that during the research period the Turkish diplomacy was not very active in this sphere, and the “threats” of Turkish-Armenian reconciliation before the solution of Karabagh issue no longer existed. Finally, the least often were Armenian information sources used (6.7%). The statements of officials and opposition leaders of the neighbor countries were mostly quoted, with no direct references to Armenian media.

In newspaper publications, dealing with the monitoring subject, the local information sources were used even more often than in broadcast media. Out of 566 sources, recorded in such pieces, 71.7% are Azerbaijani. The second most frequently used are “other foreign sources” - 17.5%. Yet the Armenian sources are more often addressed by Azerbaijani publications more than Turkish ones (6.7% versus 4.1%). The quantitative prevalence of Armenian sources of information as compared to Turkish ones is ensured mostly by the analytical pieces in “Yeni Musavat” and “Zerkalo”, in which the statements of Armenian leaders were broadly quoted and commented. These two newspapers account for 25 out of 38 cases of Armenian source use by the Azerbaijani newspapers. The most frequently referenced were web-sites “PanARMENIAN.Net” and “Armenia Today”, or the generic “Armenian media” source.

## **THE COVERAGE OF THEMATIC SECTIONS IN THE AZERBAIJANI MEDIA STUDIED**

Overall, the 8 thematic sections in pieces fully or partly dealing with the research subject were addressed by the TV companies 372 times. The newspapers addressed them in 518 cases. (Frequently, under the same research the media raised issues that could be classed into several thematic sections.)

## 1. Karabagh Conflict Resolution Issue

The vast majority of references noted above account for these very thematic sections, and this, as the previous studies show, is traditional for Azerbaijani media. The Karabagh conflict resolution received 83.1% of the total number of references made by TV companies to all thematic sections. There is no significant difference for this section among the TV channels.

The newspapers devoted to Karabagh issue 72% of the total number of references to all thematic sections. The most concentrated on this aspect of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations is "Azerbaijan" official newspaper (87.4%). The indicators of opposition newspaper "Yeni Musavat" and the newspaper of the ruling coalition "Yeni Azerbaijan" are quite different (51.9% and 84.8%, respectively).

*Azerbaijani media gave broad coverage to the negotiations on Karabagh conflict resolutions, the meeting of Armenian, Azerbaijani and Russian Presidents in Saint-Petersburg on June 17, 2010, commented on Resolution of European Parliament "EU Strategy in South Caucasus" of May 20, 2010, the joint statement of the Presidents of Russia, USA and France on MK issue, made on June 26, 2010.* The meeting of the three presidents in Saint-Petersburg was assessed as futile, even though the media reported that the parties to conflict agreed to continue the negotiations process. At the same time, the media often quoted the Armenian analysts saying that without considering the determination of the status of Mountainous Karabagh the Armenian party has nothing to tell Baku. The newspapers and TV companies saw the principal importance of the "EU Strategy in South Caucasus" Resolution to be in the requirement prescribed in the document about the liberation of occupied Azerbaijani territories. It was particularly noted that "the frozen conflicts" in the Caucasus are mentioned in the Resolution to be the biggest obstacle for the economic and social development of the region. It was reported that the Resolution infuriated Armenia, the leaders of which think the document to be contrary to the EU stance, the Madrid principles and the Moscow Declaration. The media of the country generally supported the joint statement by the President of Russia, US and France, too. "There remains only one step to be taken - to agree on a peace treaty basing on the principles in the statement", many newspapers wrote. At the same time, the media noted the incompliance between the Russian and the English versions of the document. It was repeated that the English version mentioned the return of occupied territories around MK, while in the Russian version the word "occupied" is omitted. Besides, the English version speaks about "the determination of the future final; legal status of MK by a display of will of mandatory force", while in the Russian version is phrase include the words "its population". These principal inconsistencies between the two versions were seen by media to be "produced by the Russian party".

*As it was noted above, throughout the monitoring period all media studied broadcast and published reports on the frequent meetings of the country's leadership with the heads and senior officials of foreign states. Almost every such piece said that the Presidents and Ministers informed the guests about the military conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia, about occupied territories and the problem of refugees and that the guests expressed their support of their country to the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan. The statements of Ilham Aliyev were particularly often quoted with regard to the solutions of Karabagh conflict, with regard to the destructive stance of the Armenian party. Thus, on June 8, in Istanbul, during the Conference on Interaction and Confidence Measures in Asia, when answering the questions of journalists, Ilham Aliyev said: "If things continue like that, Azerbaijan will seriously reconsider its stance. The Armenian President requested two weeks to answer*

the offers made in Sochi, six months have elapsed and there has been no answer yet". These words by Aliyev were commented by local analysts and journalists in almost all media. It was noted also that Azerbaijan accepted they renewed Madrid principles, while Armenia was still procrastinating.

*In June 2010 the parliament of the country adopted the military doctrine of Azerbaijan. The discussion of this doctrine in media was more passionate than in the parliament. Most of the attention was paid by the media to two issues: the possibility of foreign military base being settled in Azerbaijan which could be a response to the presence of Russian bases in Armenia, and the issue of relations with Armenia - as a state that had occupied part of Azerbaijani territories. Many media thought it positive that the doctrine contained an article calling Armenia a hostile country, yet, in their opinion, the document was to include also a clause on the military and strategic partnership with Turkey. Yet one of such articles said that the strategy should not specify either the friends or foes. Because the foes of today can tomorrow become friends, and then the doctrine would have to change - Azerbaijan announces that should Karabagh conflict be resolved the country is ready to cooperate with Armenia in every domain.*

*On a daily basis the TV channels and newspapers published and voiced the communications of the ministry of Defense of Azerbaijan that reported about the violations of ceasefire by Armenian forces. This happened also after the incident that took place in the morning of June 19, when during another shooting at the border four Armenian and one Azerbaijani officers were killed. Media paid attention to the fact that the incident occurred immediately after the completion of the summit of Presidents of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Russia in Saint-Petersburg. They qualified the incident as another provocation by the Armenian party. Opinions were voiced that in this way Armenia wants to confuse the issue even more, to change the course of peace talks that is not to her benefit. "Whenever the negotiations enter an important stage and some solution starts to be seen, Armenians take steps to disrupt the process", one of the newspapers wrote. Other media that expressed the same supposition remembered the shootings in Armenian parliament in October 1999, they also recalled Robert Kocharian suddenly have "stomach ache" and stop the meeting in February 2006 during the most responsible moment of negotiations in Rambouillet. At the same time the statements by Azerbaijani officials were communicated who placed the fault for the clash on the Armenian party, saying that the army of the country is ready to fight back any attack by the enemy and should such provocations repeat, the response would be tougher. But the media reported even more about the attempts of the government and international organizations to get the body of the killed Azerbaijani soldier Mubariz Ibragimov, held by Armenian party.*

*Nevertheless, the biggest number of references to the thematic section "Karabagh conflict resolution" in Azerbaijani media was recorded in the second half of May 2010. These pieces were initiated by various developments. During this period the country commemorated the fall of Lachin on May 18. The stories on TV and newspapers reflected the emotions of Azerbaijani, said about the need to return the district by any method - if impossible by peace talks, then by force. One day before the Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan paid a visit to the country. The media reported about a certain agreement, according to which the Armenian party was to soon return two districts adjacent to Mountainous Karabagh to Azerbaijan, with Turkey accelerating the consideration of opening of the border with Armenia. Yet some media also published the statement of Armenian politicians saying that these allegations are invalid. On May 23 in MK parliamentary elections were held. The media were active in responding to this event, calling the elections a "farce", an illegal and provocative action. The statements of leaders*

of international organizations, the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairmen were quoted, saying that the elections were impeding the Karabagh conflict peaceful resolution. The media reported that the international observers at these elections are announced personae non grata in Azerbaijan, published statements by Azerbaijani leaders to the effect that such actions of the Armenian party narrow down the possibilities of peaceful resolution of the problem.

## **2. Reporting on the Life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the Conflict Context**

During the one month and a half the Azerbaijani media never addressed the thematic category of "Life in MK out of the conflict context". Yet this does not mean that the media do not give news from Mountainous Karabagh. The media reported on the launch of the construction of a Russian orthodox church as well as elections to the MK parliament. Yet any information from MK is always linked to the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, that is, this news is considered only from the viewpoint of their impact on Karabagh conflict resolution process.

## **3. Azerbaijani-Armenian Relations with No Direct Link to Karabagh Issue**

3.2% of references made by TV channels to the monitoring subject deal with the Azerbaijani-Armenian relations without a direct link to Karabagh issue (4th rank among the eight thematic sections). In newspapers, in terms of frequency of reference it is ranked the second (10.2% of the total number of references to all thematic sections). The big number of such pieces in publications is explained by the fact that they repeatedly re-addressed the same issue, discussing new details of events, particularly, the conflict situations.

Numerous pieces classed by the monitors into this section are devoted to the rivalry of Azerbaijani and Armenian sportsmen at various competitions. It was reported that at FIDE tournament in Astrakhan the Azerbaijani chess player won over the Armenian gross master, at the wrestling tournament in Poland two Azerbaijani sportsmen knocked down their Armenian rivals, at the kung fu world championship in Italy the Azerbaijani team won over the Armenian one. The media attention also centered at the incident that occurred at the Europe Junior Weightlifting Championship in Spanish Valencia. It was reported that Azerbaijani sportsman lifted record weight but the judges did not consider the result and announced the Armenian sportsman to be the winner. During the award ceremony the Azerbaijani team turned their backs on the Armenian flag. The Executive Director of Azerbaijani Weightlifting Federation explained this behavior as follows: "(...) The decision was unfair, and we stated our protest." A number of pieces classed in this thematic section were more like criminal chronicle. Thus, the media told about the arrest of Moscow criminal authority that kidnapped Armenian and Azerbaijani businessmen. The media discussed whether Martun Gumashyan, an ethnic Armenian from Georgia, was the accomplice of the Azerbaijani, who committed a terrorist attack in Baku on April 30, 2009. The newspapers wrote that the Russian company that signed another oil contact with Azerbaijan has a share owned by the Armenian ex-President Kocharian. When in Yerevan, the Minister of Agriculture Ismet Abbasov talked to local journalists in Armenian, which was not seen passively by their Azerbaijani colleagues. The statements of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources said the Armenian were polluting the Araz river by household and industrial waste, seeing the tension in Azerbaijan because of the flood, pour water into the Terter river from the reservoir. The majority of the remaining pieces told about the joint participation of Armenian and Azerbaijani delegations at events, held by international organizations.



#### **4. Everything that Relates to Armenia (as a Country, a State, its Institutes) and Armenians (as Individual Representatives of a Nation, of a State)**

This thematic section received only 1.9% of the total number of references to all thematic sections on TV channels - the 5th rank. The newspapers addressed the section more frequently - 5% of references, 4th rank.

The vast majority of such pieces were broadcast with a reference to Armenian sources. The media reported that the former President of Armenia is intriguing to overthrow the incumbent, coordinating these plans with Iran. His task is facilitated by a serious political crisis in the country. The media and NGOs in Armenia are not independent, there is no free entrepreneurship, and the freedom of expression is seriously restricted. The whole population, particularly, the opposition is concerned with the fact that President Serzh Sargsian is seriously ill. Fundamental human rights are violated: the police exceeds its competence, uses torture and the detained often commit suicide. It was noted that the UN Human Rights Rapporteur Margaret Sekaggya, completing her week's visit to Armenia, expressed her concern with regard to the violation of the right to free assembly, facts of violence against journalists, lack of independent judicial in the country.

Judging from the coverage of Azerbaijani media, again with a reference to Armenian sources, the economic and demographic crises in Armenia continue to intensify: the poverty increases, the rapid emigration can result in demographic problems. By unofficial information, only last year the number of those who left Armenia made 400,000 people. In the beginning of 2010 the volume of the country's external debt made 38% of the GDP "making Armenia a puppet in the hands of international forces". The former Chairman of the Central Bank Bagrat Asatrian was quoted as saying that "Armenia today can be called not a working, but a consuming country, and this is a nightmare". "Today's Armenia consists of a state budget of 1,6 billion USD and foreign debt of 4.5 billion USD", the Azerbaijani media reported and concluded: "It is obvious that because of its occupations policy Armenia is stuck in a swamp. (...) Yet there is still a solution and a way to revival: it is the liberation of Azerbaijani occupied territories".

In communications with such content Armenia was often called the "vassal", the "province" of Russia, and quite often - as quoted from Armenian politicians.

The Azerbaijani media discussed the foreign policy of Armenia, its participation in international organizations, the strong ties with Iran and Russia, hostility to Turkey. Several articles told about Armenia trying to use the conflict between Israel and Turkey to its benefit. Yerevan believes that favorable conditions have been set for the recognition of Armenian genocide by Israel. If it goes like that, the Armenian would be able to convince the Israelis to recognize the genocide of 1915: "(...) the fictitious ideas of genocide are and important and serious tool for pressure on Turkey, exerted by Israel and the US".

The pieces, dealing with the individual qualities of Armenians as representatives of the nation, were few during the monitoring period. In one case a scientist from Baku maintained that Armenians were constantly complaining of the adversities of their fate, and they unfortunately, infected Azerbaijanis with it. In another piece a well-known singer said that Armenian were using the Azerbaijani musical instruments, saying they were theirs.

#### **5. Developments in Armenia and/or Related to It**

The developments in Armenia or related to it per se are of little interest to media of Azerbaijan. On TV channels, this thematic section was ranked 6th (1.6% of the total

number of references to all thematic sections), in newspapers it was the 6th, too (0.8%). These extremely low levels must not create an impression that Azerbaijani media and the society are completely unaware of the developments in the neighbor country. It is just in the vast majority of cases, similarly to the news from Mountainous Karabagh such events and facts are considered in the context of Azerbaijani-Armenian conflict (for example, the medical examination of President Serzh Sargsian or the participation of Armenia at the book fair in Iran).

Throughout the monitoring period in the media studied only 10 pieces on Armenia of “pure news nature” were recorded. One of them, quoting from “Aravot” daily said that Armenia started to produce pilotless planes that can be used for investigative purposes. A number of other articles and TV stories reported that the opposition activists after two years’ pause were able to hold a protest action in Yerevan; the Armenian community rallied by the US Senate which did not include the document stipulating a penalty for genocide denial in the agenda; the residents of Yerevan rallied by the parliament against opening of schools with a foreign language of instruction. During the rally on June 10, as Azerbaijani media wrote with a reference to Armenian “A1+” web-site, people shooed at deputies and ministers who were leaving the building after the session.

All other news was dealing with the activities of the parliament and the President of the country. It was reported that the commission on foreign relations of the Armenian parliament had not adopted the draft law “On Recognition of MKR Independence”, developed by the opposition “Heritage” party. The President of Armenia Serzh Sargsian met in Rostov region his Russian colleague Dmitriy Medvedev, made an official visit to Germany and spoke at Conrad Adenauer Foundation.

## **6. Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey**

While the rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey is no longer very urgent for Azerbaijani media which is confirmed by the comparison with the findings of previous mentions, this section, in terms of frequency of reference by both TV and newspapers is ranked the third (4.8% and 7.7%, respectively). It is also important to note that in the majority of pieces the rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey was not considered in isolation, but was linked to the Karabagh conflict resolution process instead.

When studying the pieces in this thematic section, the monitors paid attention to the assessment given by media to the rapprochement itself, whether it is in or contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan.

44.4% of TV pieces and 67.5% newspaper pieces have no assessment whatsoever. They mostly quote the statements by officials of Turkey and Azerbaijan saying that these two processes, the normalization of Turkish-Armenian relations and regulation of Azerbaijani-Armenian conflict must go hand in hand. It was noted that Turkey is subjected to significant pressure from the West, from such superpowers as USA and Russia who want the Zurich protocols ratified as soon as possible. Yet it was stressed that due to the enhanced roles of Turkey and Azerbaijan in the region, the international community is changing its strategy. From this perspective, the interview of Azerbaijan’s Permanent Representative in EU, the Ambassador to Belgium Emin Eubov to “AzerTAJ” agency. He is stating that in the course of the discussion of the draft Resolution “EU Strategy on South Caucasus” most of the European Parliament deputies noted: they previously advocated the traditional stance, saying that the opening of the Turkish-Armenian border would create conditions to resolve the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. Now the European

politicians increasingly understand - if there is progress in resolution of MK conflict, it will influence the opening of Turkish-Armenian border positively, too. The media also quoted the Armenian politicians, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, President Sargsian saying that Turkey had signed the Zurich protocols without pre-conditions, and the insistence with which Turkey now proposes conditions leaves Yerevan no choice but to freeze the ratification of the protocols.

In 55.6% of the total number of TV references to this thematic section of and in 30% of references by the newspapers it was maintained that Turkey must not support the rapprochement with Armenia without any progress in MK conflict resolution, as it is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan. If the opening of the borders occurs before the occupation is lifted, these pieces say, it will enable Armenians to postpone the conflict resolution endlessly, which is exactly what they want to do. "The Armenian party does hope that the Armenian-Turkish border opens, with a new route opening for them, and the resolution of Karabagh issue will be postponed". "In response to the good will of Turkey Armenia did not even try to refuse its territorial claims, (...) and while this abnormal situation continues, the opening of borders cannot be discussed at all".

Only one newspaper piece (2.5% of the total number of references of six newspapers to this thematic section) noted that the process is to the benefit of Azerbaijan. This piece quoted the stance of the US President Barak Obama saying that the border opening can accelerate the resolution of MK conflict.

## **7. Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh Conflict Resolution Process**

This thematic section holds the second rank on the air of TV companies (5.4% of the total number of references to all thematic sections) and fifth rank in newspapers (3.9%).

In 30% of TV and 45% of newspapers pieces, classed in this section, the media display no attitude towards whether Turkey should be involved in Karabagh conflict resolution process or not. They simply present the diplomatic efforts of that country to resolve the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, noting that Turkey is also interested in the final dissolution of Karabagh's "bottleneck". Some of the pieces quoted statements by various sources "for" and "against" the involvement of Turkey in the MK conflict resolution. One of the articles stresses that the meeting of leaders of Armenia, Turkey and Russia can become a serious step on the way of conflict resolution. In some pieces quotes "for" and "against" the involvement of Turkey in the process of MK resolution are presented. In one of the articles it is stressed that the meeting of leaders of Armenia, Turkey and Russia, can become a serious step in the conflict resolution.

In 50% of TV pieces and 40% of newspaper pieces in this section the media maintain that Turkey must take part in the process of resolution: this would accelerate the resolution bring peace to the region. It was stressed that neither USA nor France are not as interested in the resolution of MK conflict as Turkey. Statements by Turkish and Azerbaijani officials were quoted saying that Turkey from the very first days is an OSCE Minsk Group member, hence it has very right to take part in the process.

Finally, 20% of the TV pieces and 15% of newspapers publications say that Turkey must stay aside from the MK conflict resolution. These are exclusively statements of Armenian sources (members of the government, politicians, diplomats, President), quoted by Azerbaijani source: "Sargsian stated that Armenia will never give Turkey a chance to interfere in MK conflict resolution", "Nalbandian noted that he had never discussed

Karabagh issue with the Turkish party: Turkish party tried to do this, but we openly declared that there can be no talks with Turkey”.

## **8. Regional Initiatives/Projects with the Involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under Current Circumstances**

The phrase “under current circumstances” in the title of the section was of key importance. The thesis that the future lies in cooperation and the solution to the current political, economic, humanitarian crisis is in this is often used by media. But can cooperation be launched with the status quo, does Karabagh conflict leave any option for joint plans and actions in other domains?

Monitoring shows that Azerbaijani media practically do not consider such an opportunity. During the month and a half the broadcast media had no reference to this thematic section. The newspapers addressed it twice, which makes only 0.4% of the total number of references to all thematic sections.

One of these articles with the headline “Turkey is getting increasingly active in the region” was dealing with the involvement of the countries of the region in joint economic projects. It says that “every time when a new major economic project is developed, in which Azerbaijan, Turkey and other countries take part. Armenia gets hysterical, trying to prevent it. When these efforts fall flat, it starts counting its losses from isolation. Yerevan will undoubtedly have every reason to continue these calculations, if it remains on the same stance”. Thus, the author expresses negative attitude towards the involvement of Armenia in regional projects under the circumstances.

The second article tells about the Union of Central Asia States, its activities are analyzed. It further says that similar projects are necessary for us, saying that the unification of Azerbaijan, Turkey, Russia, Georgia and Armenia in a Union of Caucasus States could not only stimulate the economic processes, but also the political ones, including the resolution of MK conflict.

## **Appendix**

### **TABLES WITH QUANTITATIVE DATA OF ARMENIAN AND AZERBAIJANI MEDIA MONITORING (May 17 - June 30, 2010)**

TABLE No. 1.1

Country **Armenia**

TV channel name: **Public Television of Armenia, "Kentron", "Yerkir Media", "Shant", "ALM", Second Armenian TV Channel**

Monitoring period **May 17 - June 30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		1575			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		316			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	181			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	122			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	13			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	234			
	Analysis/Comment	69			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	292			
	Azerbaijani sources	7			
	Turkish sources	7			
	Other foreign sources	15			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	234			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	54			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	5			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	28			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	10			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	53	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			5	14	34
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	23	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	19	4
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>407</b>			

TABLE No. 1.2

Country **Armenia**Newspaper name: **“Aravot”, “Golos Armenii”, “Hayastani Hanrapetutiun”, “Haykakan Zhamanak”, “Azg”, “168 Zham”**Monitoring period **May 17 - June 30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		2193			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		455			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	317			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	127			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	11			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	308			
	Analysis/Comment	136			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	397			
	Azerbaijani sources	50			
	Turkish sources	12			
	Other foreign sources	63			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	316			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	76			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	15			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	83			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	12			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	76	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			4	29	44
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	32	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	29	3
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>610</b>			

TABLE No. 1.3

Country **Armenia**

TV channel name **Public Television of Armenia**

Monitoring period **May 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		315			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		57			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	27			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	25			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	5			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	31			
	Analysis/Comment	21			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	50			
	Azerbaijani sources	1			
	Turkish sources	1			
	Other foreign sources	3			
Thematic sections		Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	37			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	15			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	2			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	9			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	4			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey		is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
		7	1	0	6
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process		must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
		4	0	4	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances		are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
		0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>78</b>			



TABLE No. 1.4

Country **Armenia**  
 TV channel name "**Kentron**"  
 Monitoring period **May 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		229			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		43			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	20			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	19			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	4			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	31			
	Analysis/Comment	8			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	37			
	Azerbaijani sources	1			
	Turkish sources	5			
	Other foreign sources	6			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	28			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	8			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	0			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	5			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	0			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	10	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			1	5	4
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	10	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	8	2
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>61</b>			

TABLE No. 1.5

Country **Armenia**

TV channel name **“Yerkir Media”**

Monitoring period **June 2-15, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		229			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		38			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	15			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	22			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	1			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	34			
	Analysis/Comment	3			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	35			
	Azerbaijani sources	2			
	Turkish sources	0			
	Other foreign sources	1			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	24			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	8			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	1			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	1			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	2			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	8	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			0	2	6
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	1	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	1	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>45</b>			

TABLE No. 1.6

Country **Armenia**TV channel name "**Shant**"Monitoring period **June 2-15, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		132			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		22			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	7			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	14			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	1			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	17			
	Analysis/Comment	4			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	21			
	Azerbaijani sources	0			
	Turkish sources	0			
	Other foreign sources	1			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	14			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	6			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	0			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	2			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	1			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	6	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			0	1	5
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	2	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	1	1
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>31</b>			

TABLE No. 1.7

Country **Armenia**TV channel name "**ALM**"Monitoring period **June 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		416			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		95			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	74			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	19			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	2			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	66			
	Analysis/Comment	27			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	90			
	Azerbaijani sources	3			
	Turkish sources	1			
	Other foreign sources	2			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	82			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	6			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	1			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	7			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	1			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	16	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			1	4	11
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	3	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	3	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>116</b>			

TABLE No. 1.8

Country **Armenia**

TV channel name **Second Armenian TV Channel**

Monitoring period **June 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		254			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		61			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	38			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	23			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	0			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	55			
	Analysis/Comment	6			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	59			
	Azerbaijani sources	0			
	Turkish sources	0			
	Other foreign sources	2			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	49			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	11			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	1			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	4			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	2			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	6	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			2	2	2
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	3	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	2	1
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>76</b>			

TABLE No. 1.9

Country **Armenia**  
 Newspaper name "**Aravot**"  
 Monitoring period **May 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		641			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		106			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	78			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	22			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	6			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	66			
	Analysis/Comment	34			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	89			
	Azerbaijani sources	7			
	Turkish sources	3			
	Other foreign sources	12			
Thematic sections		Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	74			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	15			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	6			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	13			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	6			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	16	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			0	7	9
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	11	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	11	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>141</b>			

TABLE No. 1.10

Country **Armenia**

Newspaper name **“Golos Armenii”**

Monitoring period **May 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		284			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		73			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	56			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	13			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	4			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	42			
	Analysis/Comment	27			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	58			
	Azerbaijani sources	7			
	Turkish sources	2			
	Other foreign sources	13			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	44			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	15			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	2			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	16			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	1			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	12	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			0	2	10
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	9	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	8	1
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>99</b>			

TABLE No. 1.11

Country **Armenia**

Newspaper name "**Hayastani Hanrapetutiu**n"

Monitoring period **June 2-15, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		355			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		89			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	49			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	40			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	0			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	80			
	Analysis/Comment	9			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	76			
	Azerbaijani sources	8			
	Turkish sources	1			
	Other foreign sources	6			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	53			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	26			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	4			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	17			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	2			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	21	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			2	5	14
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	5	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	4	1
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>128</b>			



TABLE No. 1.12

Country **Armenia**

Newspaper name "**Haykakan Zhamanak**"

Monitoring period **June 2-15, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		345			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		42			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	26			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	16			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	0			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	31			
	Analysis/Comment	11			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	37			
	Azerbaijani sources	7			
	Turkish sources	1			
	Other foreign sources	8			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	30			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	6			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	2			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	5			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	1			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	5	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			0	1	4
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	3	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	2	1
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>52</b>			

TABLE No. 1.13

Country **Armenia**

Newspaper name "**Azg**"

Monitoring period **June 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		341			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		86			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	66			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	19			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	1			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	50			
	Analysis/Comment	35			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	84			
	Azerbaijani sources	14			
	Turkish sources	3			
	Other foreign sources	15			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	67			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	12			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	0			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	23			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	1			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	12	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			2	8	3
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	3	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	3	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>118</b>			

TABLE No. 1.14

Country **Armenia**

Newspaper name **“168 Zham”**

Monitoring period **June 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		227			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		59			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	42			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	17			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	0			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	39			
	Analysis/Comment	20			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Armenian sources	53			
	Azerbaijani sources	7			
	Turkish sources	2			
	Other foreign sources	9			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	48			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	2			
3.	Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	1			
4.	Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	9			
5.	Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it	1			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	10	is in the interest of Armenia	is contrary to the interest of Armenia	unspecified
			0	6	4
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	1	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	1	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Armenia	are unnecessary for Armenia	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>72</b>			

TABLE No. 1.1

Country **Azerbaijan**

TV channel name: **"ITV", "ATV", "ANS", "Lider", "AzTV", "Xazar"**

Monitoring period **May 17 - June 30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		1926			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		350			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	212			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	121			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	17			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	272			
	Analysis/Comment	61			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	270			
	Armenian sources	27			
	Turkish sources	29			
	Other foreign sources	77			
Thematic sections		Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	309			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	12			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	7			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	6			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	18	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	10	8
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	20	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			10	4	6
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>372</b>			

TABLE No. 1.2

Country **Azerbaijan**Newspaper name: **“Azerbaijan”, “Yeni Musavat”, “Azadlyg”, “525ci Gazet”, “Yeni Azerbaijan”, “Zerkalo”**Monitoring period **May 17 - June 30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		3436			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		477			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	202			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	228			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	47			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	268			
	Analysis/Comment	162			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	406			
	Armenian sources	38			
	Turkish sources	23			
	Other foreign sources	99			
Thematic sections		Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	373			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	53			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	26			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	4			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey		is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
		40	1	12	27
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process		must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
		20	8	3	9
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances		are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
		2	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>518</b>			

TABLE No. 1.3

Country **Azerbaijan**

TV channel name **"ITV"**

Monitoring period **May 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		436			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		117			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	85			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	26			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	6			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	85			
	Analysis/Comment	26			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	94			
	Armenian sources	7			
	Turkish sources	13			
	Other foreign sources	24			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	102			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	4			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	4			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	2			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	8	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	5	3
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	8	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			2	3	3
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>128</b>			

TABLE No. 1.4

Country **Azerbaijan**

TV channel name **"ATV"**

Monitoring period **May 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		235			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		41			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	26			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	13			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	2			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	32			
	Analysis/Comment	7			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	29			
	Armenian sources	4			
	Turkish sources	10			
	Other foreign sources	6			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	35			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	1			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	1			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	0			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	1	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	0
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	8	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			5	1	2
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>46</b>			

TABLE No. 1.5

Country **Azerbaijan**

TV channel name **“ANS”**

Monitoring period **June 2-15, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		305			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		48			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	31			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	13			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	4			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	30			
	Analysis/Comment	14			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	36			
	Armenian sources	1			
	Turkish sources	1			
	Other foreign sources	9			
Thematic sections		Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	40			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	4			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	0			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	0			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	2	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	1
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	1	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			1	0	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>47</b>			



TABLE No. 1.6

Country **Azerbaijan**TV channel name "**Lider**"Monitoring period **June 2-15, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		216			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		44			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	27			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	16			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	1			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	36			
	Analysis/Comment	7			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	35			
	Armenian sources	6			
	Turkish sources	1			
	Other foreign sources	10			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	41			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	1			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	1			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	1			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	4	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	3
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	0	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	0	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>48</b>			

TABLE No. 1.7

Country **Azerbaijan**TV channel name "**AzTV**"Monitoring period **June 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		370			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		64			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	21			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	41			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	2			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	58			
	Analysis/Comment	4			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	50			
	Armenian sources	3			
	Turkish sources	3			
	Other foreign sources	15			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	58			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	2			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	0			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	2			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	2	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	1
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	2	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			1	0	1
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>66</b>			

TABLE No. 1.8

Country **Azerbaijan**TV channel name "**Xazar**"Monitoring period **June 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		364			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		36			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	22			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	12			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	2			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	31			
	Analysis/Comment	3			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	26			
	Armenian sources	6			
	Turkish sources	1			
	Other foreign sources	13			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	33			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	0			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	1			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	1			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	1	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	0
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	1	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			1	0	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>37</b>			

TABLE No. 1.9

Country **Azerbaijan**  
 Newspaper name "**Azerbaijan**"  
 Monitoring period **May 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		587			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		107			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	46			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	53			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	8			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	74			
	Analysis/Comment	25			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	95			
	Armenian sources	2			
	Turkish sources	6			
	Other foreign sources	29			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	97			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	2			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	0			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	0			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	7	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	6
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	4	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			3	0	1
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	1	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>111</b>			

TABLE No. 1.10

Country **Azerbaijan**

Newspaper name "**Yeni Musavat**"

Monitoring period **May 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		878			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		104			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	51			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	45			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	8			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	49			
	Analysis/Comment	47			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	88			
	Armenian sources	16			
	Turkish sources	7			
	Other foreign sources	12			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	70			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	21			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	12			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	2			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	20	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			1	8	11
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	10	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			3	2	5
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>135</b>			

TABLE No. 1.11

Country **Azerbaijan**  
 Newspaper name "**Azadlyg**"  
 Monitoring period **June 2-15, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		635			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		59			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	16			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	35			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	8			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	30			
	Analysis/Comment	21			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	48			
	Armenian sources	2			
	Turkish sources	3			
	Other foreign sources	10			
Thematic sections		Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	42			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	8			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	4			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	0			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	4	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	3
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	1	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			1	0	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>59</b>			

TABLE No. 1.12

Country **Azerbaijan**

Newspaper name **"525ci Gazet"**

Monitoring period **June 2-15, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		443			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		80			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	26			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	36			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	18			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	42			
	Analysis/Comment	20			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	63			
	Armenian sources	3			
	Turkish sources	0			
	Other foreign sources	14			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	57			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	9			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	1			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	2			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	4	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	3
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	3	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			1	0	2
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	1	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			1	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>77</b>			

TABLE No. 1.13

Country **Azerbaijan**  
 Newspaper name **“Yeni Azerbaijan”**  
 Monitoring period **June 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		435			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		85			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	48			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	35			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	2			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	60			
	Analysis/Comment	23			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	75			
	Armenian sources	6			
	Turkish sources	5			
	Other foreign sources	19			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	78			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	4			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	7			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	0			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	3	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	1	2
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	0	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	0	0
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>92</b>			



TABLE No. 1.14

Country **Azerbaijan**

Newspaper name "**Zerkalo**"

Monitoring period **June 17-30, 2010**

Content categories		Total (in units)			
Total number of TV/newspaper pieces		458			
Number of TV/newspaper pieces dealing with the monitoring subject or containing references to it		42			
Subject presence form in TV/newspaper pieces	Pieces, fully dealing with the subject	15			
	Pieces, partly dealing with the subject	24			
	Pieces containing a reference to the subject	3			
Type of TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	News/Events	13			
	Analysis/Comment	26			
Information sources, used in the TV/newspaper pieces, fully or partly dealing with the subject	Self-produced information/Other Azerbaijani sources	37			
	Armenian sources	9			
	Turkish sources	2			
	Other foreign sources	15			
<b>Thematic sections</b>		<b>Number of references to thematic sections in TV/newspaper pieces (in units)</b>			
1.	Karabagh conflict resolution issue	29			
2.	Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context	0			
3.	Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue	9			
4.	Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)	2			
5.	Developments in Armenia and/or related to it	0			
6.	Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey	2	is in the interest of Azerbaijan	is contrary to the interest of Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	2
7.	Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process	2	must be involved	must not be involved	unspecified
			0	1	1
8.	Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances	0	are necessary for Azerbaijan	are unnecessary for Azerbaijan	unspecified
			0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>44</b>			

## SECTION II.

# REPORT ON ROUND TABLES ON THE COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM

## CHAPTER II.1.

### GENERAL INFORMATION ON ROUND TABLES

ROUND TABLES were organized and conducted by Yerevan Press Club and “Yeni Nesil” Journalists Union of Azerbaijan under “Ensuring Public Awareness on Regional Developments” project supported by Friedrich Ebert Foundation.

**They aimed to** determine the opinions of Armenian and Azerbaijani experts regarding the media coverage in the two countries of the various aspects of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, including the influence of Armenian-Turkish rapprochement on these relations.

### ROUND TABLE IN ARMENIA

The round table in Yerevan was held on June 18, 2010. It brought together 15 participants: journalists, public figures, representatives of journalistic NGOs, thinktanks.

The discussion evolved on the basis of a questionnaire developed in advance:

- 1. What is your assessment of the coverage of Karabagh conflict resolution issue in Armenian media?*
- 2. What factors influence the quality and the completeness of the coverage of Karabagh conflict resolution issue in Armenian media?*
- 3. Is Azerbaijani subject matter covered in Armenian media out of the Karabagh conflict context? If so, how?*
- 4. How is the life in Mountainous Karabagh covered in Armenian media out of the conflict context?*
- 5. How are Turkey-related subjects covered in Armenian media?*
- 6. How did the Armenian-Turkish protocols signed influence the coverage of Turkish subject matter in Armenian media?*
- 7. What is the coverage given by Armenian media to the possibility of regional cooperation with the participation of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey, as well as the involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process?*

The opinions and stances of experts taking part in the round table on the issues discussed

were analyzed and summarized.

The discussion at the round table was recorded. To ensure confidentiality, the names of the experts in analysis and referencing of opinions were not specified.

The duration of the round table came to two hours.

## **ROUND TABLE IN AZERBAIJAN**

The round table in Baku was held on June 29, 2010. It brought together 20 participants: representatives of state structures and NGO leaders, staff of thinktanks and academic institutions, publicists and journalists.

In the beginning of the discussion the participants of the round table were offered to speak out on the main developments in the region after the Russian-Georgian war, to assess their influence on the resolution of Karabagh conflict and Azerbaijani-Armenian relations in other domains.

The discussion followed the questionnaire below:

- 1. What is your assessment of the coverage of Karabagh conflict resolution issue in Azerbaijani media? What factors influence the quality of information on this subject?*
- 2. In your opinion, how do media cover the Azerbaijani-Armenian relations without a direct link to Karabagh conflict? How exact and exhaustive the media coverage of developments in Armenia and life in Mountainous Karabagh is - out of Karabagh conflict context?*
- 3. How do Azerbaijani media characterize Armenia as a state and Armenians as individual representatives of the nation?*
- 4. How is the rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey covered in Azerbaijani media, what is the assessment of the role and degree of Turkey's involvement in the process of Karabagh conflict resolution?*
- 5. Are regional initiatives/projects with the participation of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Turkey covered in Azerbaijani media? What do media think of the possibility of such projects under present circumstances?*

The opinions and stances of experts taking part in the round table on the issues discussed were analyzed and summarized.

The discussion at the round table was recorded. To ensure confidentiality, the names of the experts in analysis and referencing of opinions were not specified.

The duration of the round table came to two hours.

## **CHAPTER II.2.**

# **ROUND TABLE ON THE ARMENIAN MEDIA COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM**

AS NOTED above (see Chapter II.1. General Information on Round Tables), the round table in Armenia was held on June 18, 2010, with the involvement of 15 journalists, public figures, representatives of journalistic NGOs, academic institutions and thinktanks.

In the beginning of the discussion the participants of the round table spoke in general about the coverage of Karabagh conflict resolution in Armenian media. Attention was paid to the factors, influencing this coverage. Particular subjects for discussion were the nature and frequency of media addressing subjects related to Azerbaijan as well as the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of conflict context. Proceeding from the objectives of the research the participants of the round table shared their observations regarding the reposting of Turkey-related subjects by Armenian media and the way it was influenced by the rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey. In the conclusive part of the round table discussion its participants spoke about the regional cooperation opportunities that would involve Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey, as well as the role of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict.

Below the round table discussion is analyzed, substantiated by several quotes from its participants.

### **1. What is your assessment of the coverage of Karabagh conflict resolution issue in Armenian media?**

In the opinion of the majority of experts, the Karabagh conflict takes a significant place in Armenian media, yet it is covered in a one-sided and incomplete manner. Hence, the part of the media audience that is seriously interested by the developments need to address additional, in particular, foreign information sources. Some experts, taking part in the round table noted the importance of the coverage of the other party's stand. In their opinion, this stand is absent from Armenian media. The few attempts to present it took place only under grant projects.

In the opinion of experts, information about Karabagh conflict is fragmentary, the opinions of those groups in the society, whose life was directly affected by the conflict, such as Karabagh public, refugees, residents of borderline villages. Media also overlook the attitude that people in different regions of Armenia have towards the problem. The information of Armenian media is often “reactive”, that is, in many cases it is prompted by pieces that appeared earlier in media of third countries and Azerbaijan. The attention is focused at the reporting of events and not of the processes. The experts also note the lack of tolerance and the tradition of labeling.

*“In our press I see little tolerance. Old terms are used, betrayal and patriotism. This is a very irrational phenomenon, we have a problem here”,* one of the round table participants noted.

## **2. What factors influence the quality and the completeness of the coverage of Karabagh conflict resolution issue in Armenian media?**

In the list of factors, influencing the quality and completeness of information, the experts noted the dependence of media. In the opinion of experts, today the Armenian TV channels are controlled by the authorities.

*“If we have a completely controlled television field, naturally, it will be covering the conflict in accordance with the approaches of the authorities. That is, if the government sees no ways for the resolution, the television will be reflecting only the “protocol reality.”*

In the print media the pluralism of opinion is more enhanced, yet the number of print media is quite restricted. Most of the publications are controlled either by authorities or by opposition and are hence politically biased.

*“There even was a case when a newspaper refused to increase its print run, even though it had such chance. Because it is paid for the publication of 3,000 copies, and not of 3,200. Clearly, such a newspaper would not seek to present diverse opinions.”*

In the opinion of experts, such a situation influences the professional qualities of journalists, too.

*“People are not encouraged to improve their work, to improve what they are doing. If they depend on the opinion of authorities or the opposition leaders, they need attributes different from professionalism.”*

Online resources (some experts include the blogs here) are relatively independent and present more diverse information.

Experts noted, too, that there is a lack of journalists specialized on the coverage of Karabagh conflict. Media often used unverified information.

*“Sometimes our press is too quick in giving out information, without verifying its accuracy, probably, out of sensationalism, from purely commercial intentions.”*

An opinion was expressed that Armenian media, mostly those in opposition, when covering Karabagh conflict, often use unverified information from Azerbaijani sources. Some experts noted that this trend is stimulated by the official policy, aimed at restricting public debate, related to the current stage of Karabagh resolution.

*“In this country no press conferences are held either by the Deputy Minister or heads of departments of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, or even the Ministry spokesman.”*

Influence of such a big number of factors on covering the Karabagh conflict results in distorted and confused information. To be able to adequately perceive the information on Karabagh conflict provided by media one must have certain analytical skills. As a result, the mass consumer is mostly deprived of objective information, is influenced by propaganda, political bias in the reporting on Karabagh problem.

*“I seek to clean the information out of “noise”, because there is often too much “clutter”,*

*starting with translation mistakes and ending with domestic politics.”*

*“It is a problem of methodology of information processing, that is, the difficulties are faced not by those who provide information, but by the end consumer.”*

With regard to freedom of expression and self-censorship in the coverage of Karabagh conflict experts voiced several opinions. For some, the issue is still open: *“Frankly speaking, I cannot answer the question whether everything should be presented in the open, even though I am an experienced journalist.”*

Even experts who coincide in their definition of freedom of expression and think that the free expression in the coverage of Karabagh conflict must only be restricted by journalistic ethics, non-disclosure of military and state secrets, have varying perceptions of various aspects of Karabagh conflict reporting.

*“Initiatives receive their names, yet their true content remains a mystery to the public. Of course, this is natural, the problem is very serious and delicate, and some things can remain unknown at a certain stage.”*

*“It remains unclear to me why these negotiations are kept in secret, if this is a democratic world, how can there be secret negotiations?”*

### **3. Is Azerbaijani subject matter covered in Armenian media out of the Karabagh conflict context? If so, how?**

Experts noted the bias and negative direction of coverage of Azerbaijan-related subjects, while in the opinion of some experts it is very demanded in Armenia.

*“As to the question of whether we are interested in what is happening in Azerbaijan, I can say unequivocally: yes, we are. But if there is a semi-official policy of restricting debate on Karabagh issue, naturally, other Azerbaijan-related subjects will have quiet scare presentation, too.”*

Armenian-Azerbaijani contacts are given selective coverage, mostly limited to sports.

*“They show Levon Aronyan defeating an Azerbaijani chess player, but they say almost nothing about our wrestlers being defeated.”*

In the opinion of experts, the Armenian media are equally selective in covering the social and economic life of Azerbaijan, even though certain changes can be noted in this issue.

*“Until recently the Armenian media had more negligent attitude. Big oil revenues, huge military budget - no big deal, they have horrible corruption, everything is being stolen, and we have such strong morals in our army that there is nothing to fear. As the information is still being provided selectively, media prefer not to speak about the development of Azerbaijan. Today, there is no negligence; the development of Azerbaijan is seen as a threat to take into account and to respond to.”*

Overall, the media activities in this direction are assessed as propaganda and “information warfare”. Some experts noted that both the authorities of Armenia and of Azerbaijan intentionally stimulate the “enemy image” of the neighbor country - for domestic political

purposes, to keep power.

*“I believe there is an approach of the following kind: creation of an enemy image, an absolute evil, and this is used to keep power, to weaken the opposition. The authorities allege that the instability in the country would result in the loss of Karabagh.”*

Similar coverage can be seen by some of the experts as fully understandable.

*“If Azerbaijan has complete armenophobia, and we indulge in utopical pacifism, this cannot be natural or normal.”*

In the opinion of round table participants, the quality of coverage of Azerbaijan-related subjects is largely dependent on Karabagh problem and is in very many ways conditioned by it.

*“Until there is no free, open dialogue on the essence of the conflict, other issues would not be adequately covered.”*

#### **4. How is the life in Mountainous Karabagh covered in Armenian media out of the conflict context?**

Most experts expressed their discontent with the coverage of public life in Karabagh. In the opinion, this is primarily due to the overall “Yerevan-centrism” of Armenian media, which are just as inattentive towards the life of Armenian regions. The attention of Armenian media is attracted by events in Karabagh that have a certain propaganda coloring in the context of Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict.

*“Public life in MK, similarly to the life of regions of Armenia, is covered very stingily. An exception is made for the events that can be used for propaganda purposes. For example, if anyone decided to build a hotel in Karabagh, this information will be presented on all TV channels, by all news agencies.”*

In the opinion of experts, Karabagh authorities seek to influence the information, coming from Karabagh and adjacent territories.

*“Say, if there is something in the newspaper about Karabagh that was not liked by MK authorities, a phone call to the editor follows immediately, discontent is expressed with any word.”*

At the same time, experts noted that situation somewhat improved in this domain.

*“Nevertheless, I believe it is possible to have a correspondent there. It is another issue that a local correspondent would be more restricted in what he writes about Karabagh than a journalist who came from Yerevan.”*

*“The voice of Karabagh recently is increasingly heard in Armenian press, in particular, in the stories of news agencies. One can always read on web-sites about simple people of Karabagh and about people in the power, too.”*

#### **5. How are Turkey-related subjects covered in Armenian media?**

In the opinion of experts, the Turkey-related subjects in Armenian media even before the Armenian-Turkish protocols were signed were given broader and more unbiased coverage than Azerbaijan-related ones. As one of the experts noted, Armenian media try to diminish the capacities of Azerbaijan, whereas in the case of Turkey there is no need to behave so. Yet here, too, the news, information component is prevailing. Armenia is mostly aware of political issues; other domains of life in Turkey are insufficiently presented.

*“Analysis shows that 80-85% of media agenda is politics. There is little diversity of opinion about this country. If anything is discussed in media, it is Armenians talking to Armenians about Turkey. The opinion of Turks themselves is rare.”*

In the opinion of experts, the Turkey-related subjects are given irregular coverage.

*“As soon as anything happens, the experts on Turkey become frequent guests on Public Television. Afterwards, they are forgotten.”*

Experts noted also the relatively big number of articles about Turkey, reprinted from third sources; this often results in distortion of information. The lack of knowledge about Turkish realities, and use of Articles from Turkish tabloids contributes to this, too.

*“They (journalists - **Ed. Note**) do not know Turkey, are unaware of specifics, the structure of Turkish media.”*

## **6. How did the Armenian-Turkish protocols signed influence the coverage of Turkish subject matter in Armenian media?**

Most experts noted the high degree of media self-censorship during the discussion of Armenian-Turkish protocols. Less attention was given to subjects, important for the society (in particular, the Armenian Genocide in Ottoman Empire); instead there were pieces of little interest to most of Armenian public (say, about the mixed Armenian-Turkish marriages).

*“The self-censorship was obvious. The media were inclined to present the process very positively. Only the Dashnak press had an alternative approach and covered everything in a reverse way.”*

As experts noted, some opposition media described the resolution process as artificial, launched by the authorities to distract the Armenian society from domestic problems.

*“Of course, the Armenian-Turkish relations are important. Yet the way domestic problems were silenced against the background of this process created a feeling of everything being artificial.”*

In the opinion of experts, the coverage of Armenian-Turkish protocols was quite polarized, opinions, other than sticking to one of the extreme stance, were almost extinct:

*“There were different opinions with regard to whether the problem of Mountainous Karabagh was reflected in protocols, but if the specific media seeks to prove that there is a commitment, regarding Karabagh, it will be addressing only those experts who present the respective opinion, and vice versa.”*



*“The web-site of IRI (International Republic Institute, an American NGO - Ed. Note) published opinion polls from Armenia, albeit somewhat old, dating 2003-2007. The ‘pro’ and ‘con’ attitude distribution with regard to the opening of the Armenian-Turkish border was averagely equal, 40% to 40%, yet notably, the existence of such a balance in the society was almost never presented by media: some of them maintained that everyone is ‘for’, others - that everyone is ‘against’.”*

Generally, the experts assessed the situation around the Armenian-Turkish protocols as “interesting experience” for Armenian media.

*“This was an interesting experience, as there has probably never been such intensive information about the foreign policy of Armenia, the foreign media had never been so actively covering these processes.”*

Yet the process also revealed certain shortcomings of Armenian media. In particular, the lack of journalists, specialized in Turkey-related subjects became obvious. As one of the experts noted, “we were not ready for that”. The process also demonstrated the lack of initiative of Armenian media.

*“Armenian media do not operate independently, that is, there is no wish to write an article of one’s own initiative. There should always be something to respond to.”*

Protocols were also an indicator of information vulnerability of Armenia.

*“Turkey was successful in influencing Armenia and its public opinion through its propaganda and other pieces. Publications of the kind “Sabah” daily ran that was presented as the secret agenda of the protocols - to this day many people believe this was true.”*

At the same time the process of normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations resulted in certain positive shifts in the coverage of Turkey-related subjects:

- *“The number of reprints from third sources reduced. That is, previously we did not address the Turkish sources, but instead used the often distorted Azerbaijani or Russian versions.”*

- *“The professionalism of journalists increased, and the quality of pieces published improved. Our press became more competent in the coverage of Armenian-Turkish relations, the spectrum expanded, there appeared journalists who specialize on the subject. If five years ago it did not matter much as to which of the journalists is sent to the press-conference on Armenian-Turkish relations, today, the news agencies have special correspondents.”*

- *“The process of the coverage of this subject contributed to the open discussion of the Turkey-related subjects, previously closed and not discussed. It also resulted in the highlighting of issues, related to the development of the country. For a long time this subject was silenced. The coverage was far from ideal now, too, but still, this was an example of public, open discussion of an issue that has public importance. What is it our society seeks, how we see our future?”*

## **7. What is the coverage given by Armenian media to the possibility of regional cooperation with the participation of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey, as well as the involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process?**

As some experts noted, most of Armenian media still mean the countries of South Caucasus when they speak about the region - Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, sometimes Russia, but never Turkey.

*“How can one see his country and the country with which one has a closed border for almost one hundred years as a community named “region”? This is artificial.”*

Overall, in the opinion of experts, the issue of trilateral cooperation is given little discussion. In Armenian media, particularly the press, this format of regional cooperation is mostly seen not from the perspective of potential benefit for Armenia, but from the perspective of the risks and dangers that this cooperation may entail.

*“The trilateral cooperation is seen as a threat, and even the Armenian-Turkish cooperation only is seen as a threat to national identity: firstly, the Turkish demographic and, secondly, economic expansion. The Turkish culture is also seen as a threat.”*

Experts noted that in this regard an exception is made by articles, dealing with European integration.

*“The pieces on European integration noted that if the two countries cooperate in this issue, instead of hindering each other, this may contribute to the effective discussion of other issues, the integration of the two countries into the European structures can become a good basis for their resolution.”*

In the opinion of experts, the possible involvement of Turkey into the Karabagh conflict resolution process is seen by Armenian media as very negative. The main reasons for that are the close strategic relations between Turkey and Azerbaijan, and therefore, Turkey cannot be an objective mediator. At the same time, the experts noted that when the Zurich protocols were signed, Armenian media considered the possible involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process.

*“First there were publications that noted Turkey’s own interest in the issue, different from that of Azerbaijan, and that after the opening of the border that would strengthen the position of Armenia, the involvement of Turkey may become more acceptable. This would increase the trust of Azerbaijan to the resolution process, which will thus become more dynamic and promising.”*

Yet as the process of Armenia-Turkish rapprochement started to procrastinate, publication of such articles stopped.

## **CHAPTER II.3.**

### **ROUND TABLE ON THE AZERBAIJANI MEDIA COVERAGE OF AZERBAIJANI-ARMENIAN RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM**

AS NOTED above (see *Chapter II.1. General Information on Round Tables*), the round table in Azerbaijan was held on June 29, 2010, bringing together 20 representatives of state structures, heads of NGOs, staff of thinktanks, academic institutions, publicists and journalists.

In the beginning of the discussion the participants of the round table were offered to speak out with regard to the main developments in the region after the Russian-Georgian war, to assess their influence on the resolution of Karabagh conflict and Azerbaijani-Armenian relations in other domains. Experts were also asked to share their ideas regarding the rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey, considering the issue in the context of its influence on Azerbaijani-Armenian relations. Further, the round table participants were asked to evaluate and comment on how, in their opinion, Azerbaijani media report on these developments and relations.

Below the results of the discussion at the round table are analyzed, with a substantiation through direct quotes from the participants.

#### **1. What is your assessment of the coverage of Karabagh conflict resolution issue in Azerbaijani media? What factors influence the quality of information on this subject?**

The discussion of how the Mountainous Karabagh conflict is covered by Azerbaijani media was where most activeness was displayed by the round table participants. They were almost unanimous in noting the urgency of the issue, agreeing that the conflict is the subject on the top of the media agenda of the country. Therefore, almost every day the public receives a lot of information about the course of negotiations process, on the situation at the frontline, etc. At the same time, when speaking about the quality of this information, experts noted the high dependence of national media, particularly TV and radio, on the leadership of the country, a fact, which, in their opinion, does greatly affect the coverage of Karabagh issue. In this regard, the participants of the round table noted also the fact that in 2010 the media ran much more pieces, expressing distrust towards peaceful resolution of the Karabagh conflict by the effort of the Minsk Group, and appeals to liberate the Azerbaijani territories by force became more frequent.

Experts believe that the majority of journalists, reporting on Karabagh problem, cannot distance themselves from their own civic stand, and the permanent control by the authorities and the pressure of the public opinion results in a high degree of self-censorship. This results in a situation when media sometimes deliberately conceal part of the truth from their audiences, using only the sources that produce on-sided comment on facts and developments. They give few new ideas and approaches that can cause public discussions.

Many round table participants spoke about the insufficient professionalism of journalists wiring about Karabagh conflict. When informing the public about important developments, they not only do not disclose the meaning of the terms used but often do not completely understand their meaning themselves. No distinction is made between fact and opinion, which, as experts said, is misleading not only for ordinary readers and viewers, but even for experts themselves.

*“Dependence of most print and all broadcast media on the authorities results in a situation, when they speak from only one stand - they give out restricted information. It is also notable that today the governmental and pro-governmental media pay more attention to the issue of Armenian-Azerbaijani, Armenian-Turkish relations and particularly, the Mountainous Karabagh conflict more attention than even the independent and opposition publications. I had never seen such trend before”.*

*“The media lack plurality on the problem of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations and Karabagh conflict. The official media sometimes allow themselves publishing statements of Armenian politicians on the main issues of Karabagh conflict resolution yet they never give floor to our opposition”.*

*“An important question for journalists is what to write and how? So as not to hide the truth and not to damage the national interest. Thus, sometimes one gets such facts about the clashes at the frontline, about violations of the ceasefire that one does not know how to deal with them: should one write what she/he knows for sure or should one stick to the official version? Probably, both kinds of journalists should exist, for the thinking reader to choose between them”.*

*“I was being interviewed by a journalist from a leading medium of the country. During the conversation I understood that the journalist is unaware of what is meant by “Madrid Principles”, what is meant by “compromise”, even though he writes two stories a week about Karabagh issue. I simply interrupted the interview because I could imagine the story he would produce after the conversation”.*

*“Journalists do not always correctly and adequately understand and use the phrases and cliches common for media. Many of them keep speaking about “highest status” or mutual compromise but do not actually think deeper of the content of these terms”.*

The discussion participants spoke not only about how media of the country cover the Azerbaijani-Armenian conflict, but also about the media role in Karabagh conflict resolution, in general. In their opinion, international organizations and civil society structures that advocate the peaceful resolution of this problem must work more actively with media, give them permanent direction. For, in this issue in practice the media of our country play rather a negative role, following thoughtlessly the journalistic principle of “the best news is the worst news”. Sensationalism, wish to please the audience, manipulating its feelings, trying to gain scores with it, to contribute not to the solution, but rather to the complication of the conflict.

*“There is a stereotype, according to which the role of civil society and media in the context of Karabagh conflict resolution is seen positively, while the authorities seemingly misuse the conflict and procrastinate in resolving it. Yet this is far from being true. At the early stage the Karabagh war was almost exclusively waged by the civil societies represented by self-organized radical groups. Media most actively took part in inciting unhealthy sentiment”.*

*“Co-chairmen of Minsk Group are right in their appeals to prepare people for compromise. But in essence, nobody is speaking about possible compromise except them and the President. Neither the journalists nor the politicians do”.*

*“The main direction of the peacemaking initiatives of Azerbaijani and Armenian NGOs must be not each other but the people within their countries. This task cannot be accomplished without media”.*

## **2. In your opinion, how do media cover the Azerbaijani-Armenian relations without a direct link to Karabagh conflict? How exact and exhaustive the media coverage of developments in Armenia and life in Mountainous Karabagh is - out of Karabagh conflict context?**

Azerbaijani-Armenian relations without a direct link to Karabagh conflict, in the opinion of round table participants are covered predominantly in confrontational tone. There are not many pieces of this kind, but almost each of them, whether telling about sports competitions or participating together in some events, the reporting is emotionally colored; the negative feelings of the authors towards the other party can be felt.

As to the life in Armenia and Mountainous Karabagh, the developments there, they are seldom covered and exclusively in a negative context. The pieces about what is happening in Mountainous Karabagh, except the periods of major political actions, almost never appear. Among the few reports on Armenia the stories telling about profound political crisis, economic collapse, increase of other negative tendencies in the country prevail. In other words, they tell how life in Armenia is getting worse and worse. When speaking about this, the experts not so much stressed the issue of inaccuracy of such information, but rather on its ideological component, the special method of fact and information gathering when reporting about life in Armenia to Azerbaijani audience.

*“Media do not show the stereotypical picture, different from myths and stereotypes, formed in the course of confrontation, but are rather prisoners of these myths and stereotypes themselves”.*

*“Armenian and Azerbaijani media, instead of fulfilling their true mission, to inform the society objectively and comprehensively, persistently become tools for propaganda and information warfare. They are much more preoccupied with how to make a tough answer to the opponent”.*

*“Real situation must be described and not what we want to see in Armenia”.*

*“When reporting on the developments in Armenia and Mountainous Karabagh there appears greater need for additional information sources - out of media of third countries, out of Internet that one cannot always trust. Visits of journalists are important for a real-life look at the other side. Regular meetings and contacts between journalists and experts of the two countries are useful, too”.*

## **3. How do Azerbaijani media characterize Armenia as a state and Armenians as individual representatives of the nation?**

Experts believe that media, when characterizing Armenia as a state and its institutes, mostly try to use competent and accurate sources of information. The image of this country, as depicted by Azerbaijani media, mostly coincides with the opinion of experts themselves. Judging by media materials, this is not a democratic state, dependent primarily on Russia, with corrupt power structures that occupied a part of the neighbor country's territory and plays a destabilizing role in the region. At the same time, in the opinion of experts, in a number of analytical articles there is no depth, knowledge of the subject, understanding of the reasons for the developments. These pieces often have propaganda elements: journalists, when telling about a complicated economic and demographic situation in this country, make the colors even darker. An impression is created that if the crisis continues for several years more, the state will collapse. It was also noted that journalists, when analyzing the state policy or the activities of official bodies of Armenia, too often use such epithets as "destructive", "aggressive", "false" etc.

Experts maintain that there are fewer pieces presenting characteristics of Armenians as individual representatives of nation in Azerbaijan now than several years ago. They believe that this is influenced by the personal meetings of the heads of media organizations, the trainings conducted for journalists. The media do still speak only negatively about Armenians, yet, in the opinion of experts two important circumstances should be noted here. Firstly, most of such pieces is related not to the relations of today, but the historical experience and the recent past of our people. Secondly, the language used by journalists in their stories, has become more reticent.

*"The language that journalists and politicians use when they speak about Armenia amend Armenians has become probably more hostile, but there are fewer direct insults and pejorative phrases".*

*"The main characteristics of Armenia for Azerbaijani journalist is this is an occupant country, which is understandable. But what is the point of using this phrase when one speaks about international sports competitions?"*

*"And what do journalists write about Armenia? That it is undemocratic, dependent occupied the land of the neighbor state and has a destructive policy. We do agree with that. But in a number of pieces, when specific issues are discussed, say, the economic or demographic situation, there is little knowledge of the subject or else the colors are deliberately darkened".*

*"If we maintain that we can live together in future, we need to show it already today. Yet, on the other hand, how big is the fault of journalists, when politicians give them few examples of such behavior?"*

#### **4. How is the rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey covered in Azerbaijani media, what is the assessment of the role and degree of Turkey's involvement in the process of Karabagh conflict resolution?**

Participants of round table noted that the urgency of rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey, after in 2009 the government of Gul-Erdogan linked it with the progress in Mountainous Karabagh conflict resolution, decreased, and it resulted in a lower interest towards the problem as displayed by the media. Along with this, in their opinion, the access to media for the few politicians and experts, adhering to an alternative view point on the normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations, is significantly restricted.

The efforts of Turkey in the resolution of Mountainous Karabagh conflict is seen and presented by media only positively. Yet overall, the experts believe, the media speak too much about the role of foreign states in the resolution of Karabagh problem, whereas media should instill in the society the understanding that the conflict resolution depends first of all on Armenia and Azerbaijan, whereas the other countries can only help with this.

*“While Ankara sought to advance the Armenian-Turkish relations, our media covered this initiative predominantly in a negative tone. This was interpreted as political naivety, short-sightedness, and sometime even as direct betrayal of Azerbaijan’s interest. Few of the journalists sought to see in these initiative positive opportunities, also for the Karabagh resolution”.*

*“Our media primarily proceed from the stance of what support and help should come from Turkey to Azerbaijan and seldom speak about Turkey’s own interest or reciprocal support”.*

*“Media consider the prospects of Karabagh resolution in a narrow context, primarily in the context of Russia and certain influence made on the process by the rapprochement between Russia and Turkey. Thus, for example, the influence of the situation in Iran, in Middle East on the process and prospects of Karabagh resolution is not considered by them”.*

*“Media pay excessive attention to the role of freeing countries in the resolution of Mountainous Karabagh conflict, they write that everything depends on them. It is important to reinforce the understanding that it is our job to resolve the conflict, and the external forces can only help”.*

## **5. Are regional initiatives/projects with the participation of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Turkey covered in Azerbaijani media? What do media think of the possibility of such projects under present circumstances?**

The issue of regional projects with the involvement of Armenia, in the opinion of round table participants, is not very topical for Azerbaijani media. The media support the opinion in the society that until the political resolution of the Karabagh issue is reached, no joint projects with Armenia are possible. The sporadic and local projects in which Azerbaijani, Armenian and Turkish NGOs take part do not receive significant coverage in media.

*“There is nothing to write about as the official stance, approved by the absolute majority of population is that no cooperation with Armenians before the liberation of occupied territories is possible”.*

*“Apart from sporadic and local projects of NGOs in all other formats, both under the CIS, or BSEC, ENP, as well as the Eastern Partnership the Azerbaijani authorities make a special reservation that they do not intend to cooperate with Armenia without progress in Karabagh resolution reached”.*

## SECTION III.

# COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS OF MEDIA MONITORING AND ROUND TABLES ON THE COVERAGE OF ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS AND THE IMPACT OF “TURKISH FACTOR” UPON THEM

## CHAPTER III.1.

### COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS OF MEDIA MONITORING AND ROUND TABLE IN ARMENIA

THE COMPARATIVE analysis of findings of Armenian media monitoring, held in May-June 2010, and of the round table in Yerevan, held on June 18, 2010, shows:

Both broadcast and print media, in general, displayed **quite significant interest** towards Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, allocating to 1/5 of the total coverage: 20.7% of the total number of publications in newspapers and 20.1% of the total number of pieces on TV channels studied were dealing with the monitoring subject or contained references to it.

At the same time, the coverage in all 12 media studied was mostly **news**. As experts noted, Armenian media mostly respond to events and not to processes. According to the monitoring findings, 77.2% of the total number of TV pieces and 69.4% of newspaper publications, fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject were purely news reporting. And while the emphasis on current events is quite easy to explain on television, taking into account the extremely small number of discussion programs on most of Armenian TV channels, the newspapers could be expected to give more profound coverage to the publicly important problems, and, primarily, the resolution of Karabagh conflict. Meanwhile, in May-June 2010 the coverage of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations by both broadcast and print media was conditioned, mostly, by the existence of newsworthy occasions (for example, summits, statements of state and political figures of two countries, co-chairmen of OSCE Minsk Group and other events). As it was noted in the monitoring report, there was very little “pure” analysis in TV pieces/publications, fully or partly dealing with the monitoring subject. Opinions, judgments, comment and pieces of a reviewing nature were prevailing. Among the reasons, causing such disproportion, experts noted lack of journalists, specialized, in particular, on the coverage of Karabagh conflict, Turkey-related subjects.

The similarity of broadcast and print media can also be seen when considering **the information sources**, used in TV pieces/publications. When covering the relations of the two countries, media preferred to publish self-produced information or used other Armenian sources: TV channels - 96.4%, newspapers - 89.4%. Very rarely did TV



channels address other foreign sources (5%) and even more rarely - Azerbaijani and Turkish sources (2.3% each). Newspapers are much more active in using other foreign (14.2%) and Azerbaijani (11.3%) sources, yet, similarly to TV channels, they made very little use of Turkish sources (2.7%). In this regard some experts noted that Armenian media, mostly in opposition, when covering Karabagh conflict quite often use unverified information from Azerbaijani sources. Another group of experts noted that this trend is assisted by official policy that seeks to restrict the public debate regarding the current stage of Karabagh conflict resolution. Experts also stressed that the relative majority of reprints about Turkey from third sources adversely affect the objectiveness of the coverage, mostly because these publications are affected by the relations of an appropriate country and Turkey.

**“The Karabagh conflict resolution issue”** was dealt with in more than half of the total of number of pieces referring to the monitoring subject: on TV channels - 57.5%, in newspapers - 51.8%. Similar picture could be observed in previous studies, administered in 2001-2009. Thus, one can speak about a traditionally high interest of Armenian media towards Karabagh issue. Yet most of the experts, taking part in round table stated their discontent with the quality of information received. By their assessment, the Karabagh conflict is covered in Armenian media in a one-sided and incomplete manner, the information about Karabagh problem is often sporadic. The opinions of social groups directly affected by the conflict - Karabagh public, refugees, borderline village residents - are insufficiently presented. Media also overlook the attitudes towards the problem held in various regions of Armenia. Some experts also noted the importance of the coverage of the stand of the other party to the conflict, which experts believe to be absent from Armenian media (a few attempts at this took place only under grant projects).

The experts include the **dependence of media on the opinions of the government and/or opposition** that control the most of the information domain, into the list of the factors, influencing the quality and completeness of information. The findings of this monitoring and its comparison with previous researches confirms the supposition of the round table participants that the policy of the Armenian authorities is directed at restricting the public debate. This trend has resulted in a situation that the coverage of issues related to Karabagh resolution is shallow. As monitoring showed, the Armenian party (politicians, government, public) display passiveness, seldom respond to developments, related to Karabagh conflict.

In terms of **freedom of expression and self-censorship** in the coverage of Karabagh conflict experts stated several opinions. For some, the issue is still open: *“Frankly speaking, I cannot answer the question whether everything should be presented in the open, even though I am an experienced journalist.”*

Even experts who coincide in their definition of freedom of expression and think that the free expression in the coverage of Karabagh conflict must only be restricted by journalistic ethics, non-disclosure of military and state secrets, have varying perceptions of various aspects of Karabagh conflict reporting. *“Initiatives receive their names, yet their true content remains a mystery to the public. Of course, this is natural, the problem is very serious and delicate, and some things can remain unknown at a certain stage.”*

The experts also note the lack of tolerance and the tradition of labeling: *“In our press I see little tolerance. Old terms are used, betrayal and patriotism. This is a very irrational phenomenon, we have a problem here.”*

The frequent use of unverified information often makes a negative impact, too:  
*“Sometimes our press is too quick in giving out information, without verifying its accuracy, probably, out of sensationalism, from purely commercial intentions.”*

The description of the way experts work with Armenian media reports allows inferring that to adequately perceive the presented information about Karabagh conflict special skills and analytics capabilities are necessary. Yet the mass consumer normally does not have these skills and therefore is deprived of an opportunity to have objective information, is influenced by propaganda and politically biased coverage. *“I seek to clean the information out of “noise”, because there is often too much “clutter”, starting with translation mistakes and ending with domestic politics.”*

**“Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context”** thematic section on six TV channels studied took the second rank (13.3% of the total number of references to all thematic sections), in six newspapers studied - 3-4 ranks (12.5%), sharing them with “Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey”.

During the round table, most experts expressed their discontent with the coverage of public life in Karabagh. It was noted that the attention of Armenian media is attracted by events in Karabagh that have a certain propaganda coloring in the context of Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. *“Public life in MK, similarly to the life of regions of Armenia, is covered very stingily. An exception is made for the events that can be used for propaganda purposes. For example, if anyone decided to build a hotel in Karabagh, this information will be presented on all TV channels, by all news agencies.”*

This serves to explain the comparatively big number of pieces on this subject, as shown by the media monitoring. The administration of the monitoring coincided with parliamentary elections in MK. A significant part of stories was related to the coverage of this process as well as to the reaction of Azerbaijan. The idea that the MK elections were democratic was stressed, and this was substantiated by the assessments of international observers - unlike elections in Azerbaijan. This statement was illustrated by different examples of undemocratic election campaigns in Azerbaijan. The propaganda information also includes reports about the response of Azerbaijan to the roaming agreement signed between Tcell company of Tajikistan and Karabagh Telecom. In particular, media quoted the indignation of Azerbaijani media: this agreement meant that a Muslim state recognized Mountainous Karabagh.

Some experts noted the attempts of MK authorities to regulate the information streams from Karabagh and adjacent territories. *“Say, if there is something in the newspaper about Karabagh that was not liked by MK authorities, a phone call to the editor follows immediately, discontent is expressed with any word.”*

At the same time another group of experts noted some improvement in this spheres. *“The voice of Karabagh recently is increasingly heard in Armenian press, in particular, in the stories of news agencies. One can always read on web-sites about simple people of Karabagh and about people in the power, too.”*

**“Armenian-Azerbaijani relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue”** were reflected in 1.2% of the total number of references of broadcast media to all thematic sections (7th rank) and in 2.5% of print media references (6th rank).

Thematic section **“Everything that relates to Azerbaijan (as a country, a state, its**

**institutes) and Azerbaijanis (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)”**

received 6.9% of the total number of references to all thematic sections in broadcast media (4th rank) and 13.6% - in print media (2nd rank).

**“Developments in Azerbaijan and/or related to it”** were covered in 2.5% of the total number of references to all thematic sections (6th rank), in newspapers - 2% (7th rank).

Experts noted the biased and negative direction of coverage of Azerbaijan-related subjects, while in the opinion of some experts it is very demanded in Armenia. Armenian-Azerbaijani contacts are given selective coverage, mostly limited to sports. *“They show Levon Aronyan defeating an Azerbaijani chess player, but they say almost nothing about our wrestlers being defeated.”*

In the opinion of experts, the Armenian media are equally selective in covering the social and economic life of Azerbaijan, even though certain changes can be noted in this issue. *“Until recently the Armenian media had more negligent attitude. Big oil revenues, huge military budget - no big deal, they have horrible corruption, everything is being stolen, and we have such strong morals in our army that there is nothing to fear. As the information is still being provided selectively, media prefer not to speak about the development of Azerbaijan. Today, there is no negligence; the development of Azerbaijan is seen as a threat to take into account and to respond to.”*

The results of monitoring also showed that Armenian media, mostly, present negative information about Azerbaijan: the undignified behavior of Azerbaijani weight-lifters with regard to Armenian sportsmen, destruction of Shiite mosques in Baku, illegitimacy of election campaigns in Azerbaijan. Critical assessments of Azerbaijan made in reports of various international organizations were voiced. On various occasions media addressed the issue of imprisoned Azerbaijani journalists and bloggers, etc. An exception here was the report that positively assessed the participation of the Azerbaijani delegation in the session of CIS, Caucasus and Black Sea Socintern Committee.

Some experts noted that both the authorities of Armenia and of Azerbaijan intentionally stimulate the “enemy image” of the neighbor country - for domestic political purposes, to keep power. *“I believe there is an approach of the following kind: creation of an enemy image, an absolute evil, and this is used to keep power, to weaken the opposition. The authorities allege that the instability in the country would result in the loss of Karabagh.”*

Overall, the media activities in this direction are assessed as propaganda and “information warfare”. Experts noted that Armenian press in terms of quality has recently become a mirror reflection of Azerbaijani media. *“If Azerbaijan has complete armenophobia, and we indulge in utopical pacifism, this cannot be natural or normal.”*

This phenomenon was reflected in publications of Armenian media in which the need for counter-propaganda from Armenian side is necessary - to reciprocate the anti-Armenian rhetoric of Azerbaijan.

In the opinion of round table participants, the coverage of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations in any domain cannot be non-contingent on Karabagh issue. As one of the experts noted, *“if there is a semi-official policy of restricting debate on Karabagh issue, naturally, other Azerbaijan-related subjects will have quite scare presentation, too”*. Experts also noted that without an open and free dialogue, debate on Karabagh conflict, the coverage of any Azerbaijan-related subject would not be complete.

**“Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey”** received identical interest from all 12 media studied: TV channels - 13% of the total number of references to all thematic sections (3rd rank), newspapers - 12.5% (3-4 ranks, sharing them with “Reporting on the life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context”).

Most experts noted the high degree of media self-censorship at the initial stage of rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey: *“The self-censorship was obvious. The media were inclined to present the process very positively. Only the Dashnak press had an alternative approach and covered everything in a reverse way.”*

As a result, less attention was given to subjects, important for the society (in particular, the Armenian Genocide in 1915); instead there were pieces of little interest to most of Armenian public (say, about the mixed Armenian-Turkish marriages).

As experts noted, some opposition media described the resolution process as artificial, launched by the authorities to distract the Armenian society from domestic problems. *“Of course, the Armenian-Turkish relations are important. Yet the way domestic problems were silenced against the background of this process created a feeling of everything being artificial.”*

In the opinion of experts, the coverage of Armenian-Turkish protocols was quite polarized, opinions, other than sticking to one of the extreme stance, were almost extinct: *“There were different opinions with regard to whether the problem of Mountainous Karabagh was reflected in protocols, but if the specific media seeks to prove that there is a commitment, regarding Karabagh, it will be addressing only those experts who present the respective opinion, and vice versa.”*

Yet already at the point of monitoring one could speak about the disappointment with the Armenian-Turkish rapprochement (on April 22, 2010 the President of Armenia Serzh Sargsian by a decree suspended the ratification of Zurich protocols). Media published statements by the Turkey Prime Minister Erdogan saying that unless progress is attained in Karabagh resolution the progress in normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations is impossible, too. The statement of Armenian President Serzh Sargsian at the meeting with NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen was published. In the statement the President noted that by posing pre-conditions, Turkey depleted the credit of trust. Turkey's digression from the previously reached agreements was explained by the unwillingness or inability of the Turkish leadership to solve the issue, or by the pressure that Azerbaijan exerts on Turkey. In 26.4% of TV pieces in this sections and 38.2% of newspaper publications, it was noted that the Armenian-Turkish process is not to the benefit of Armenia, primarily because Turkey, violating the agreements reached, poses pre-conditions that are unacceptable for Armenia. Linking the issue of the Karabagh resolution with the process of normalization was named to be one of the main reasons that induced Armenia to stop the process. At the same time it was stressed that Yerevan is ready to move ahead and resume the negotiations, if Ankara gives up its preconditions. And only in five TV pieces (9.4% of the total number of references to this section) and four newspaper pieces (5.3%) opinion was expressed that the rapprochement is in the interest of Armenia. Yet all of them expressed the stance of the representatives of foreign states or international structures.

The experts generally qualified the situation around Armenian-Turkish protocols as “interesting experience” for Armenian media. *“This was an interesting experience, as there*

*has probably never been such intensive information about the foreign policy of Armenia, the forging media had never been so actively covering these processes.”*

At the same time, the process of normalization of Armenian-Turkish relations resulted in certain positive shifts in coverage of Turkey-related subjects. *“The number of reprints from third sources reduced. That is, previously we did not address the Turkish sources, but instead used the often distorted Azerbaijani or Russian versions.” “The professionalism of journalists increased, and the quality of pieces published improved. Our press became more competent in the coverage of Armenian-Turkish relations, the spectrum expanded, there appeared journalists who specialize on the subject. If five years ago it did not matter much as to which of the journalists is sent to the press-conference on Armenian-Turkish relations, today, the news agencies have special correspondents.” “The process of the coverage of this subject contributed to the open discussion of the Turkey-related subjects, previously closed and not discussed. It also resulted in the highlighting of issues, related to the development of the country. For a long time this subject was silenced. The coverage was far from ideal now, too, but still, this was an example of public, open discussion of an issue that has public importance. What is it our society seeks, how we see our future?”*

Thematic section **“Involvement of Turkey in the Karabagh conflict resolution process”** ranked the fifth in both broadcast media and print media: on TV channels - 5.7% of the total number of references to all thematic sections, in newspapers - 5.2%.

In the opinion of all 12 media studied, Turkey must not be involved in the MK issue resolution process: 82.6% of the total number of references to this section on TV channels, 90.6% - in newspapers. In a few pieces only (17.4% on TV and 9.4% in newspapers) this aspect was not considered at all.

According to the monitoring results, the conflict resolution is seen as the prerogative and exclusive competence of the OSCE Minsk Group, and Turkey has nothing to do here - that was the bottom line of the vast majority of pieces on this subject. Turkey has nothing to do with the conflict resolution process, and the attempts to manipulate this subject by it, in particular, by the Prime Minister Erdogan resulted in Armenia slamming the door before Turkey and isolating it. This unequivocal reluctance to see Turkey as a mediator in the MK conflict is explained primarily by the fact that it is on the side of Azerbaijan and hence is unable to be unbiased with regard to MK conflict.

In the opinion of experts, *“first there were publications that noted Turkey’s own interest in the issue, different from that of Azerbaijan, and that after the opening of the border that would strengthen the position of Armenia, the involvement of Turkey may become more acceptable. This would increase the trust of Azerbaijan to the resolution process, which will thus become more dynamic and promising”.*

Yet as the process of Armenia-Turkish rapprochement started to procrastinate, publication of such articles stopped.

Addressing the **“Regional initiatives/projects with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Turkey under current circumstances”**, some experts noted, most of Armenian media still mean the countries of South Caucasus when they speak about the region - Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, sometimes Russia, but never Turkey. *“How can one see his country and the country with which one has a closed border for almost one hundred years as a community named “region”? This is artificial.”*

The Armenian media have never addressed this thematic section throughout the monitoring period. Yet, as several experts believe, in Armenian media, particularly the press, this format of regional cooperation is mostly seen not from the perspective of potential benefit for Armenia, but from the perspective of the risks and dangers that this cooperation may entail. *“The trilateral cooperation is seen as a threat, and even the Armenian-Turkish cooperation only is seen as a threat to national identity: firstly, the Turkish demographic and, secondly, economic expansion. The Turkish culture is also seen as a threat.”*

As experts note, in this regard an exception is made by articles, dealing with European integration. *“The pieces on European integration noted that if the two countries cooperate in this issue, instead of hindering each other, this may contribute to the effective discussion of other issues, the integration of the two countries into the European structures can become a good basis for their resolution.”*

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1.** When covering Armenian-Azerbaijani relations the media excessively follow the official political agenda, and their interest, attention to the problem greatly depends on the readiness and willingness of the government to have the problem discussed in public. Meanwhile, the public is entitled to consider media to be an important tool for seeking conflict resolution. Hence, discussions regarding the methods and models of conflict resolution, taking into account different perspectives would have been extremely desirable, regardless of how active and effective the official resolution process is.
- 2.** Mountainous Karabagh is often seen by media as an abstract notion, a symbol of conflict and national dignity, and not as a region where specific people live and certain processes take place. For the future of the region and its population it would be extremely important to have the developments there, the existing problems gain broad media coverage.
- 3.** Over the past years the Armenian media have been displaying an obvious wish to follow the laws of “information warfare”, to respond every propaganda shot of the other side, moreover, to take the lead in initiating verbal shootings. The consistent formation of “enemy image” of Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis in media can hardly contribute to the solution of Armenia’s priority national issues. The one-sided presentation of the neighbor country to Armenian audience hinders the adequate perception of reality and orientation of the society in political processes.
- 4.** The artificial transfer of the conflict climate on other subjects, with no direct relation to it, in particular, the events of culture and sports, affects negatively both these spheres and the professional level of journalists, media. The total polarization of all domains in the context of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, negligence of ethical standards when addressing the spiritual legacy, the national values of each other holds a real threat of racism in newspapers and on the air. Professional norms of journalism must not be applied selectively, they must be remembered when addressing the other side of the conflict, too.
- 5.** The coverage of Armenian-Turkish relations of “football diplomacy” period and signing of Zurich protocols demonstrated the ability of Armenian journalism to display diverse and competent approach to the urgent issues of domestic and foreign policy. This allowed the public to gain quite profound insight into the issue. Yet the freezing of Armenian-Turkish

rapprochement, unfortunately, resulted in the reduction of plurality and quality of debate. The experience of coverage of this subject came to confirm the importance of professional competence in the subject, realization of how important it is. Only in this case one can expect the media to positively influence the solution of complex regional problems.

## CHAPTER III.2.

### COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS OF MEDIA MONITORING AND ROUND TABLE IN AZERBAIJAN

COMPARATIVE analysis of media monitoring in Azerbaijan, administered in May-June 2010, and round table held on June 29, 2010, shows:

**The importance** of the subject of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations in the media of the country remains high. According to the monitoring data, in May-June 2010 these relations were referred to in 18.2% of all pieces studied on TV and 13.9% of all pieces studied in six newspapers. At the round table the experts maintained that in the course of many years this subject is on the top of agenda, which is quite reflective of the public sentiment and therefore, follows the certain social demand. As one of the round table participants stated, *“(...) public opinion polls, regularly administered in the country, show that among the problems that respondents name to be top priority, the first rank (around 50-60%) is always taken by the problem of unresolved Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict”.*

The monitoring showed that the tone in the information policy with regard to Azerbaijani-Armenian relations is currently set by **governmental and progovernmental media**. These are primarily TV channels, as well as “Azerbaijan”, “Yeni Azerbaijan” and “525ci Gazet” newspapers that gave 18.1%-19.5% of their total coverage to his subject. This indicator is almost twice smaller for the independent and opposition publications: ranging from 9.2% to 11.8%. The participants of the round table noted the high degree of dependence of national media, particularly the broadcast media, on the state structures, which largely influences the way they report on the Karabagh issue. From this perspective, the following thesis voiced at the round table and confirmed by the monitoring is of particular interest: the media speak about the ineffectiveness of the OSCE Minsk Group with increasing frequency, thus disseminating the disbelief in the possibility of the peaceful resolution of the Karabagh conflict by the MG; at the same time the media increasingly call on the liberate the occupied territories of Azerbaijan by force.

In the opinion of round table participants, the media that cover the Azerbaijani-Armenian relations and Karabagh conflict in particular lack **diversity of opinion**. The monitoring showed that when discussing these problems the Azerbaijani media indeed rely mostly on local *information sources* (67% - on television, 71.7% - in newspapers). Sources are mostly state officials, political scientists, public figures or journalists themselves. Overall, judging by the monitoring report, in the 333 TV pieces and 430 newspaper publications, fully or partly dealing with the research subject, during the six weeks of research the journalists used 969 information sources (403 and 566, respectively). Of these, only 6.7% are Armenian. The media of the country do not often address Turkish sources, either (4.1% - in media, 7.2% - on television).

Speaking about the problem of plurality in Azerbaijani media, experts noted that when covering political issues, including various aspects of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, every media is only addressing those information sources, whose stances it supports, thus giving unilateral interpretation to facts and events. The monitoring shows that this statement is only partly true: opposition media are quite willing to publish statements by the President of the country, members of the government, leaders of the ruling party with



regard to Mountainous Karabagh issue. Yet throughout the monitoring period the TV channels and governmental newspapers had never quoted the opinions of opposition leaders on the problem, even though the opposition often made corresponding statements at the parliament and at major events.

Many participants of the round table spoke about the lack of **professionalism** among the journalists who report on Karabagh conflict. Experts noted that:

- journalists are little aware about the true essence and the crucial details of negotiations for peaceful resolution of the conflict;
- they do not only disclose the meanings of the terms they use but quite often they do not fully comprehend these meaning, either;
- facts and opinions are not always differentiated, which is misleading for ordinary readers and viewers.

It is quite difficult to judge how true these remarks are, basing on the existing quantitative findings. However, it should be noted that such mistakes in the pieces of Azerbaijani journalists are not rare with regard to other subjects, too. Yet the monitoring reveals some other, more complicated problems, related to the professionalism of journalists who report on Azerbaijani-Armenian relations.

The media, particularly, the press, often publish quite a lot inaccurate information on the course of negotiations on the Karabagh conflict resolution process, on developments in Armenia. Quite questionable information is presented as a fact. Thus, in May 2010 newspapers reported about some agreement “according to which the Armenian party will soon return to Azerbaijani two districts, adjacent to the territory of Mountainous Karabagh, and in return, Turkey would accelerate the consideration of border opening issue”. Or, the newspapers wrote that “only last year around 400 thousand people left Armenia”. The media make practically no effort to verify this information, thinking it sufficient to add on the usual phrases such as “according to unofficial information” or “as anonymous sources report”, etc.

Most of the journalists see their mission not to be the honest and impartial reporting but rather act as a tool for propaganda and information wars. They do seek to destroy the stereotypes that were formed in the course of the conflict, on the contrary, they themselves are prisoners of the stereotypes, they reproduce and disseminate them. Any information, dealing with Armenia or something Armenian, even if not directly related to the conflict, is normally presented in a negative manner, is considered confrontationally and ultimately serves to intensify the enemy image. Thus, for example, the Azerbaijani journalists were strongly critical of the fact that on his visit to Yerevan the Minister of Agriculture spoke Armenian to Yerevan journalists, even though one might hardly see anything bad in it, even taking into account the profound conflict between the two parties.

Media seldom make attempts to objectively analyze the stance and the situation of both their own and the opponent part in the context of the developments in the region and the world. On the contrary, they do their best to exaggerate the success, often illusionary, of their country and try to diminish the capacities of the opponent. This picture is distorting of the reality and creates a false vitality that imprisons the journalists, the politicians and the society.

Monitoring shows that most of the media publications, dealing with the Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, are in the thematic section “**Karabagh conflict resolution issue**” (83.1% of the total number of references made by TV companies and 72% of the total number of references made by newspapers to all these thematic sections). The whole negotiations process and the events accompanying this process are within the media attention focus. Every day the public receives information on the border, the violations of the ceasefire by the Armenian troops are reported.

Yet experts believe that many journalists, covering the Karabagh problem, cannot distantiate from their civil stance: *“The constant control by the authorities and the pressure by the public opinion results in a strong self-censorship. This results in a situation when media sometimes deliberately conceal some of the truth from their audience. There are no innovative ideas and approaches, journalistic investigations that could cause public debate to prevent the negative processes and escalation of tension.”*

Substantiating the point by the experts, the monitoring shows lack of thematic diversity of the pieces dealing with the Karabagh conflict resolution. Thus, similarly to Armenian media, those in Azerbaijan regularly disseminate information about daily fire exchange on the front line, initiated by the rival. These pieces follow the same pattern: “The enemy opened fire and was thrown back.” As a result of such shootings annually dozens of young soldiers, civilians from borderline regions die. Yet during the study period not a single attempt was made by the journalists to try and understand who does the shootings and why, how to avoid these casualties that lead to greater tension and hostility between the two nations.

Despite the appeals to liberate the occupied territories by force becoming more frequent, the Azerbaijani media do ran more pieces, giving preference to the peaceful resolution of the problem. Yet the media do not contribute to the preparation of people to such peace. The media sometimes remind that the peace is possible only through compromise, mostly - when reporting on the statements of the intermediary countries of the Presidents of Azerbaijan and Armenia. Yet neither on television nor in newspapers there are almost no pieces to explain to the public the meaning of the word “compromise”, its true content and how it can be achieved. Moreover, as the round table participants noted, many journalists believe that the compromise is the agreement of one party to accept the stance of the other unreservedly. Experts also maintained that *“(…) apart from the President, hardly anyone speaks about the possible compromise - neither the journalists nor the politicians”*. In this context another idea, stated by the experts at the round table in Baku, gains particular significance: *“The main vector of peace-making initiatives of NGOs of Azerbaijan and Armenia must be directed not at each other, but at people in the countries. Yet without the involvement of media this task is impossible to accomplish.”*

Other aspects of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations cause little interest of the media of the country. Throughout the six weeks of the monitoring not a single reference was made by Azerbaijani media to the theme of “**Life in Mountainous Karabagh out of the conflict context**”. There are very few pieces on **developments in Armenia**, too (1.6% of the total number of references made by the TV channels and 0.8% of the total number of references of newspapers to all thematic sections). Yet before drawing a conclusion on these insignificant numbers, one must remember an inference made by the analysts with regard to monitoring findings: this must not leave an impression that Azerbaijani media and public do not get any information about developments in Armenia. Yet in the vast majority of cases similarly to the news from Mountainous Karabagh, such events and facts are presented in the context of Azerbaijani-Armenian conflict. This conclusion is quite

correspondent with the opinion of the round table participants who noted that everything, related to the Mountainous Karabagh are likely to be seen by the media of the solely from the perspective of the Azerbaijani-Armenian conflict. Experts suppose that the change of this situation, the provision of more realistic and diverse information about life in Mountainous Karabagh and Armenia can be influenced by the expansion of information sources to include “*media of third countries, the Internet*”, visit exchanges by the journalists “*so that to see the situation on the other side with their own eyes*”.

The media do not frequently address “**The Azerbaijani-Armenian relations with no direct link to Karabagh issue**”, either. Throughout the study this theme received only 3.2% of the total number of references by the TV channels and 10.2% of the total number of references by newspapers to the monitoring subject. The analysis shows: the experts were right saying that in the communications that refer to aspects of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations that are not linked the Karabagh conflict explicitly display the same spirit of confrontation. Even the reports about the participation of the sportsmen of the two countries in various international competitions is presented not as normal sports rivalry, but as a part of political and news struggle.

The context of stories, classed into “**Everything that relates to Armenia (as a country, a state, its institutes) and Armenians (as individual representatives of a nation, of a state)**” section, is predominantly negative, too. This subject is not popular in Azerbaijani media (1.9% of the total number of references to all sections on TV channels and 5% of the total number of references of newspapers) - apparently because for many of them everything is certain here: the main characteristic of Armenia as a state is that it is an occupant country that put itself in a dead-end by its destructive policy towards the countries of the region. All the pieces in these thematic sections convey this very message. They tell about the aggressiveness and falsehood of the state policy of Armenia, about the economic and demographic crisis in the country, the growth of poverty, the lack of law in the power. The experts at the round table, while adhering to this stance in principle, noted at the same time that the journalists overuse such terms as “destructive”, “occupation regime”, “aggressive” etc. with regard to Armenia. Quite often the information about this country is presented in a distorted manner, the media, when analyzing the situation there; darken the colors, whereas they must “*describe the real situation and not what we want to see in Armenia*”.

The monitoring confirms the opinion of experts that there are fewer pieces in Azerbaijani press describing Armenians as individual representatives of the nation now than a few years ago. The tone of these pieces is still negative which is easy to explain: it is impossible to change the negative perception that was established in the course of decades under the circumstances of continuing conflict. The journalists are constantly influenced by the facts proving the deepening confrontation between the two hostile states - mutual accusations by the Presidents, mutual intimidations by the Ministers of defense, daily fire exchanges on the frontline etc. Yet the indisputable accomplishment can be seen in the fact that in such stories the journalists started to be more reticent, there are fewer outright insults, the “hate speech” seems to become milder. Experts believe that this was influenced by personal contacts between the heads of media organizations of the two countries, meetings, seminars and trainings for journalists.

The Azerbaijani media addressed the subject of “**Rapprochement between Armenia and Turkey**” much more seldom than in 2009 (the frequency of reference to it on TV channels and in newspapers made 4.8% and 7.7%, respectively). The participants of the round table explain this by the fact that the urgency of the subject in question reduced after in 2009 the

government of Gul-Erdogan linked the process to the possible progress in Mountainous Karabagh conflict resolution.

It is only from this perspective, in a direct link to the Karabagh conflict resolution, that Azerbaijani media consider the Armenian-Turkish rapprochement. The opinion that Turkey must not open borders with Armenia without the political solution of Mountainous Karabagh conflict as it does not correspond to the interest of Azerbaijan. Only one of the newspaper pieces presented a reverse opinion, yet this was not the opinion of an Azerbaijani expert, politician or journalist, but rather the US President Barak Obama who believes that the opening of borders can speed up the resolution of Karabagh conflict. Many of round table participants call this approach to the problem shown by media to be simplistic and non-productive: *"(...) during the time when Ankara sought to advance the rapprochement of Armenian-Turkish relations, in our media this (...) was interpreted as political aliveness, shortsightedness and even direct betrayal of Azerbaijan's interest. Few of the journalists try to assess this initiative objectively and to try to see positive opportunities, also for the Karabagh resolution."* It was noted at the same time that *"access to media for the few politicians and experts, adhering to the alternative viewpoint on the issue of Armenian-Turkish relations, were restricted"*.

With regard to the need for **Turkey's involvement in the Karabagh conflict resolution**, enhancement of its role in this process (this problem received 5.4% of references on TV channels and 3.9% in newspapers) the media of the country display more plurality than in the discussion of any other issue. While every second piece in this thematic section says that Turkey must take an active part in the resolution of Karabagh issue, nevertheless, there are quite a lot of TV pieces and publications with the contrary stance advocated (20% of TV and 15% of newspaper pieces). They reflect the opinions of not only foreign, including Armenian, sources, but also local experts.

Notably, the participants of the round table do not complain of the lack of opportunity to publish an alternative position on this issue, as, say, on the Armenain-Turkish. Yet the experts made other comments the validity of which can hardly be questioned basing on the results of monitoring: *"In the context of Turkey our media mostly proceed from the considerations of support and assistance that Azerbaijan must receive from it, and quite seldom consider the Turkish interest proper or reciprocal support". "The media pay excessive attention to the role of foreign countries in the resolution of Mountainous Karabagh conflict; they write that it is the superpowers who decide everything. It is important to instill the understanding that the conflict resolution is our task, with the external powers can do nothing more but help."*

Azerbaijani media do not ever cover the issues of **regional cooperation** with the involvement of Azerbaijan, Turkey and Armenia. Throughout the six weeks of the monitoring the TV channels observed did not have a single reference to the subject. The newspapers referred to it twice, coming to 0.4% of the total number of references to all thematic sections. The participants of round table gave a justification to it in advance, saying that *"(...) there is nothing to write about here as the official stance, approved by the majority of population is that no cooperation can be had with Armenian until they liberate the occupied territories"*.

In covering the subject of influence of "Turkish factor" on Azerbaijani-Armenian relations there are some controversial moments, too. On the one hand, the media are practically unanimous in the opinion that Turkey must not open its borders with Armenia until the political resolution of Karabagh conflict is reached, yet they quite often indulge into

speaking against the involvement of Turkey into the conflict resolution. The reason for this contradiction is that “the involvement into the resolution” term is perceived by the media of Azerbaijan in its narrow meaning, not as various forms of indirect support but rather as direct involvement in the negotiations as a mediator. No matter how strongly the activities of the OSCE Minsk Group are criticized, the media do not consider seriously the change of the negotiations format, even through the country, friendly to Azerbaijan, such as Turkey.

***Thus, the comparative analysis showed that the findings of the media monitoring on Azerbaijani-Armenian relations and the expert round table, dealing with the coverage of this subject matter by the media of the country mostly coincide. This is quite natural, taking into account the close interaction between the media and the experts.***

For media experts are mostly interesting as persons who evaluate and comment on developments in Azerbaijani-Armenian events. On their behalf, media are information sources for the analysts, mostly, news. While the monitoring showed that about one third of media publications on Azerbaijani-Armenian relations can be qualified as analytical, even such pieces are seen by experts to be not the kind of information that improves their understanding of the situation but rather as a report on the judgments of their colleagues worth regard to certain developments, their expectations and predictions.

At the same time, it is necessary to take into account that currently, with the global television and Internet being common all over the world, the national media are no longer the only or main information sources for the expert community. They are more important for experts as a tool for influencing public opinion, gaining public recognition and influence. The media are public forums enabling experts to engage in an indirect conversation with each other as well as to convey their viewpoints to the authorities and public.

The power is more uniform in Azerbaijan than in Armenia. Hence, if one does not stress the style of statements, defined by the nature of the agency that supplies the information (President’s Office, Ministries of Foreign Affairs, of Defense and of National Security), the authorities in Azerbaijan speak in “one voice”. In Armenia, the government is coalition, and the opposition is stronger, yet, as the previous research shows the situation with regard to the coverage of Karabagh conflict is not very different from that in Azerbaijan.

As to other political forces, in both countries the principal political forces support the stance of the authorities on Karabagh issue. Even the opposition criticism focuses on “excessive concessions” and readiness of the incumbent authorities to sacrifice the national interest. This criticism, however strong it may seem, is ultimately directed at strengthening the maximal expectations of each of the conflict parties, as stated during the negotiations.

If one judges by media materials and experts statements, an impression may be formed that Azerbaijan supports the peaceful resolution of the conflict on the basis of “Madrid Principles”, proposed by the OSCE. Yet the public opinion polls show that 70% of the population is against all kind of compromise, and the option of defining the status of Mountainous Karabagh by the display of will of its population - a distinguishing clause in the Madrid Principles - is supported about 10% of the respondents. Such public sentiment is formed by the governmental propaganda, the overall content of media discourse.

The progress in peaceful resolution can certainly change the news and propaganda policy of the conflicting party for the better, too. Yet one needs to realize that for decisive steps towards compromise peace an appropriate public climate needs to be created first of all.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1.** Media, particularly broadcast ones, when covering Azerbaijani-Armenian relations and the influence of “Turkish factor” on them, are not pluralistic and in many ways follow the official policy. The negativism and confrontations are still prevalent there, and recently the calls to refuse negotiations and to turn to restoring the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan by force have intensified.
- 2.** The media, in essence, do not prepare the population for peace on the basis of mutual compromise. They are imprisoned by stereotypes and cliches, common for media and strengthening the enemy image of the neighbor nation. The journalists still use hate speech when covering Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, even through there are fewer unacceptable phrases and direct insults.
- 3.** Journalists are not always correct and adequate in understanding and using terms worth regard to the resolution of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, Turkish-Armenian rapprochement. The frequent and inappropriate use of important notions results in the devaluation of values, denoted by these concepts.
- 4.** The overall awareness of the problem among the journalists is low. On their behalf, their presentation of distorted and inaccurate information on the important processes linked to the Azerbaijani-Armenian relations, facts and developments that take place in the neighbor country, does not contribute to the establishment of mutual trust, on the contrary, increases the hostility between the nations. To overcome the lack of information and enhanced accuracy the journalistic exchanges, meetings, expansion of information channels are crucial.
- 5.** The analytical component in the coverage of Azerbaijani-Armenian relations needs qualitative increase. This can be attained through closer interaction of journalists with experts or think tanks, implementation of joint projects of journalistic investigation, etc.