Coverage of the EU ‘Eastern Partnership’ (EaP) program in Armenian and Russian media.

MA thesis
Global Journalism
Supervisor: Anna Roosvall
Author: Hayk Torosyan
Abstract

The Eastern Partnership program was inaugurated on 7 May 2009 in Prague. The Eastern Partnership project was presented by the foreign minister of Poland with assistance from Sweden at the EU’s General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels on 26 May 2008. Its aim is to enhance EU relationship with six former Soviet countries involved in the program: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus.

The aim of this study is to explore the tendencies of the coverage of the European Union Eastern Partnership program in Armenian and Russian media.

The study is based on the content analysis of 144 news items sampled from four online media within the period of one year. The research is based on theories of globalization, media globalization as the Eastern Partnership is seen by the author of this thesis as a part of a broader event, than just simple regional cooperation.

The program was launched recently; and the issue of Eastern Partnership was not studied widely by scientists from the point of view of media. However, it was analyzed by different political scholars from different countries. The aim of this thesis was to fill this gap.

The results of the content analysis partly proved the hypothesis put forward. It showed that there are relations between use of sources and the mood that prevails in the article.

Author states that this study can be developed by other research methods and can serve as a good foundation for future investigations.
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1. Introduction

The first chapter consists of the purpose of the research where the research questions and hypothesis are presented. As well as background information about Armenia, Armenian and Russian media systems, Armenia and EU relations and Eastern Partnership itself. In addition, the chapter ends with the statement of the scientific problem of the study and its relevance and the summary of the chapter.

1.1. Scientific problem and its relevance

During the last few years the issue of the European Union Eastern Partnership program has been widely discussed and covered not just by different media both in Europe and in six former Soviet countries involved in this program (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus), but also in Russia, which is the leading political actor of the region of Eastern Europe. Countries that are involved in this program are in the immediate sphere of its influence and interest, thus Russia is concerned about the program developing in its neighborhood. At the same time, as the program was launched recently, this issue of Eastern Partnership was not studied widely by scientists from the point of view of media. Nevertheless, there are some scientific works, which have political and economic orientation. My thesis aims to fill this gap and open new perspectives for the further researches in media field.

1.2. Purpose and Research questions

The aim of this study is to explore the coverage of the European Union Eastern Partnership program in Armenian and Russian media, and more particularly to analyze similarities and differences between media from the different countries in relation to the diverse contemporary political and cultural contexts. The study is centered on whether the coverage is mainly positive or
negative to the program and how these tendencies relate to the use of different sources. The main research question is:

**What are the main tendencies towards the Eastern Partnership program in Armenian and Russian online media?**

Operationalized research questions are further:

- Is coverage more positive or more negative towards the program and how do these tendencies relate to media from different nations?
- How do tendencies to the program relate to the use of sources of different national or international belonging?
- What is the importance of other media as sources to the coverage?
- How salient is the Eastern Partnership program in the selected media?

European Union Eastern Partnership program has not been widely discussed and studied yet. The majority of the scientific works, which refer to this subject, are covering political and economic aspects of the program. Russian scientists are more skeptical about the EaP, than for example Armenian or European. They see the Eastern Partnership as a treat for Russian security. Author of the study assumes that the same mood prevails in the Russian media. The research questions, that have been put forward, are intended to prove or disprove this hypothesis.

**1.3. Outline of the thesis**

The thesis is divided into four main chapters.

The first is the Introduction chapter, which provides the main background information, research questions, hypothesis and outline of the thesis.
The second chapter is the Previous research and the theoretical framework where there is presented the review of Eastern Partnership related literature, globalization theory and, globalization and the media are presented.

The third chapter presents the information about the method used in this study, sampling strategy, code book and the limitations of the study.

Finally, the fourth chapter consists of the presentation of the content analysis and analysis of the findings.

1.4. Background

1.4.1. Armenia and Armenian media system

Republic of Armenia is a landlocked mountainous country in the South Caucasus region of Eurasia with the area: 29,743 sq. km. and population: (2011 est.) 3,100,000. The capital is Yerevan. Religion is Christianity (Armenian Apostolic Church). Armenia is the first to adopt Christianity as a state religion in 301 A.D. (Britannica, 2012).

For around 70 years, Armenia was a part of Soviet Union but in 1991, the USSR broke apart and Armenia has re-established its independence. In 1992, a war started in the Artsakh (Nagorno-Karabakh) region, the Armenian enclave in Azerbaijan. Armenia, that supported the people of Artsakh in their self-determination movement, became a party in the conflict. The war led to the disastrous consequences such as poverty, a huge number of injured and dead soldiers, enormous flow of refugees, paralyzed industry and economy, fail of social and moral ideals, huge emigration etc. With the recent changes in the history of Armenia, the Armenian media system has been modified as well.

Over the past two decades, major changes took place in the Armenian media system. Like other post-soviet republics in Armenia “in fact, the period of the decline of the communist regimes was… the golden age of freedom and independence for journalists” (Curran & Park, 2000, p. 39).
“The Armenian media landscape was quite simple in the recent past: two national channels broadcast for a few hours a day. In 1995 private TV channels began their operations; since then the number of different media outlets has risen” (Melikyan, 2010).

The TV companies were mostly of general nature, and the radio stations mostly worked in news and music format. Serious competition between the broadcasters unfolded for both the audience and advertising revenues. This competition became particularly strong in 2000-2001, when the number of broadcasters in Yerevan only exceeded ten. There are dozens of TV channels in Armenia, but the majority of them broadcast in Yerevan and the nearby territories.

Print media in Armenia are not as popular as for example TV or Online news channels. Average circulation of newspapers varies between 3000-5000 copies per day. People are using papers as a second or third source of information. Newspapers in Armenia are either pro-government or in opposition.

“Due to a lack of financial independence, newspapers continue to be controlled by political parties or wealthy individuals. Newspaper coverage typically reflects funder’s expectations. “Ordered articles,” also called indirect advertising, as well as strong criticism for the opposition, are clearly noticeable in Armenian print media. This has a negative impact on domestic journalism and is one of the main reasons why Armenians don’t concentrate on print media. Many Armenians find newspapers arrogant, aggressive and out of touch” (Melikyan, 2010)

Despite the fact that the law “On the dissemination of mass information”, which was adopted in 2003, “regulates relations pertaining to the implementation of media activities, defines the guarantees of ensuring the right of freedom of speech in the sphere of the media…” (Parliament.am, 2003), state tries to keep media under control, and firstly the TV as the most popular media with the biggest number of consumers. State's intervention can be well seen on the example of the Public TV of Armenia (H1 - The first channel of Armenia). Today H1 is a channel with the largest broadcast area in Armenia. Outside of Armenia, the channel can be viewed in CIS, Europe, Middle East and North Africa, USA and Canada, Siberia, the Far East and Australia. The channel’s news program “Haylur (lit. Armnews)” broadcasts only in positive, pro-government manner, though it is a Public TV and should first and foremost serve the interests of society.

While TV continues to be the main source for news in Armenia, Internet consumption has dramatically increased during the last few years. The first media to use the Internet in Armenia were the news agencies. “In early 1995 on the server of “Arminco” ISP the textual site of “Noyan Tapan”
news agency was placed. Later “SNARK”, “Armenpress” and others had websites of their own too” (Poghosbekian & al, 2011).

According to Internet World Stats (2012) the number of Internet users in Armenia has grown from 30,000 in 2000 to 1,396,550 users in 2010, which is 47.1 % of whole population of the country! Today, internet is the main source for getting in touch and getting information for many people in Armenia. And unlike TV or press Internet media in Armenia are the only independent media. Thus, according to the representative of the international Reporters Without Borders press freedom organization in Armenia Shushan Doydoyan online media in Armenia are not censored. “Maybe there are topics the editors avoid, or provide little coverage about; however, I think there is no direct classic censorship by the authorities” (PanARMENIAN.Net, 2012). According to the results of the study conducted by the Armenian branch of the Eurasia Partnership Foundation’s (EPF) Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC), online media are the most trustworthy in Armenia where 13% of the surveyed fully trusts in online media outlets, while only 7-8% trusts in traditional media resources (Vasilyan, 2011).

According to the web information company Alexa (2012), the most popular online media in Armenia are:

- News.am
- Tert.am
- 1in.am
- Mamul.am
- Lragir.am
- A1+ online
- Slaq.am
- Lurer.com
- Armenianow.com
- Armtoday.info
- Hetq.am
- Internews.am
- Panarmenian.net
- Panorama.am

From this list of media News.am and 1in.am were chosen for the research, as they are the most popular online media in Armenia and, as my previous observations showed, they covered Eastern Partnership more intensive than the others.
According to the News.am website information, “NEWS.am is an independent Armenian information-analytic agency, delivering the regular coverage of analyzed current information about policy, life and culture to the public. It has been launched in 2009 and as by August 2012 it is ranked as 11th most popular website in Armenia (Alexa, 2012).

NEWS.am provides:

- Breaking news from Armenia, Nagorno Karabakh and all Armenian communities all over the world
- On-line news in English, Russian Armenian and Turkish
- Monitoring of Press- and e-Media of Armenia, Georgia, Turkey, Russia, Iran, Azerbaijan, and world leading publications
- Interviews, analytics, comments, reports and photo spreads
- Topical bulletins
- Organization of press conferences, round tables and seminars” (News.am, 2012)

1in.am (i.e. First) is Armenian News and Analyses website which was founded in 2004 and delivers political, business, sport news from Armenia, South Caucasus region and the rest of the world. 1in.am has Armenian, Russian and English versions. According to Alexa it ranks 16th most popular website in Armenia (Alexa, 2012).

1.4.2. Russia and Russian Media

Russia - the largest country in the world that “stretches over a vast expanse of Eastern Europe and northern Asia. Once the preeminent republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.; commonly known as the Soviet Union), Russia became an independent country after the dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991” (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2012).
It is worth noting that after the collapse of Soviet Union, Russian media system, like media systems in all former Soviet Republics underwent dramatic changes. Despite the fact that circulation of print media decreased rapidly “several newspapers popular in the Soviet era survived post-Soviet transitions and continue to be popular today” (Krasnoboka, 2010). Krasnoboka says that there are nearly 35,500 registered newspapers in Russia. «According to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, there were 1.7 daily newspapers per 1 million inhabitants in Russia in 2004. The total average circulation of daily newspapers per 1,000 inhabitants was 91.8 in 2004. The share of non-daily newspapers was 50.2 per 1 million inhabitants» (2010).

Today TV is the main source for information in Russia.

«Russia’s identity as a nation of readers peaked during the Soviet Union period, when the communist government achieved virtually 100 per cent literacy nationwide through its education reforms. But with the introduction of the free market in the 1990s this began to change as more and more Russians began to get their news, entertainment and information from television. And while this change had been noticed for decades in the West, in Russia – where it was more pronounced, more sudden, and more drastic – the change occurred virtually overnight» (Arutunyan, 2009, p. 15).

There are three main federal channels that broadcast throughout the whole country: Rossiya, Perviy Kanal, NTV.

In 2005 the English language satellite channel Russia Today has launched. Nowadays, the RT network consists of three global news channels broadcasting in English, Spanish and Arabic, RT America broadcasting from RT’s Washington studio and a documentary Channel RTDoc. With a global reach of over 430 million people, or 22% of all cable subscribers worldwide…” (Corporate profile, 2012).

In regards to online media, it should be mentioned that according to Internet World Stats (2012) the number of Internet users in Russia as of Dec.31 2011, was 61,472,011, which was 44.3% of population. Thus, the internet penetration rate in Russia and Armenia is nearly the same. However Russia has nearly 46 times bigger population than Armenia!

Arutunyan states that “while newspapers are struggling to find a way to capitalize on this just to stay alive, online media are already finding new, original ways of engaging the reader. Primary news portals and secondary sites like Kommersant.ru are doing this not just by providing original
news, but by joining forces with bloggers, introducing cross-posting options and allowing bloggers to shape the news agenda more and more” (Arutunyan, 2009, p. 159).

According to the web information company Alexa the most popular Russian online media are:

- Rbc.ru
- Lenta.ru
- Ria.ru
- Kp.ru
- Gazeta.ru
- Vz.ru
- Newsru.com
- Echo.msk.ru
- Regnum.ru
- Ng.ru

From this list **Ria.ru** and **Vz.ru** were chosen by the same criteria as in case of Armenian media.

The reason for choosing these particular media will be presented in the ‘Method and Material’ chapter.

The Russian News & Information Agency **RIA Novosti** has long history that starts from June 24, 1941.

Present «**The Russian Information Agency Novosti** was created in September 1991 on the basis of IAN and the Russian Information Agency. By a decree of the Russian president dated August 22, 1991, RIA Novosti was placed within the competence of the Press and Information Ministry. RIA Novosti had about 80 bureaus and news offices abroad, over 1,500 subscribers in CIS countries and about a hundred in non-CIS countries» (About RIA NOVOSTI, 2012).

According to the web information company Alexa, Ria.ru ranks 47th most popular website in Russia.

The online business newspaper Vzglyad (lit. The View, Look) has been launched in 2005 and focuses on operative news, publications of actual information and analysis on the Russian and international politics, business and finance, as well as cultural and sports events. Among Russian most popular websites, it takes 250th place.
1.4.3. Armenia-EU relations and Eastern Partnership

Relations between EU and Armenia have been intensively developed since the 1991 when Armenia restored its independence from the USSR. EU relations with Armenia are governed by the EU-Armenia Partnership and Cooperation Agreement signed in 1996 and entered into force in 1999. In Armenian foreign policy EU takes a special place. In the National Security Strategy of the Republic of Armenia (2007) it is stated, “the development and consolidation of Armenia’s relations with the European structures, and with the European Union (EU) above all, is a priority direction for the country’s foreign policy [and] establishment of close relations with the EU serves Armenia’s long-term interests.” Armenia is a member of the European Neighbourhood Policy which was developed in 2004, to avoid the emergence of new dividing lines between the enlarged EU and its neighbours and instead strengthening the prosperity, stability and security of all (European_Commission, 2010).

In 2008-2009 European Union Neighbourhood was divided into two individual EU policies – Union for the Mediterranean, and the Eastern Partnership.

The European Union Eastern Partnership program was inaugurated on 7 May 2009 in Prague. The Eastern Partnership project was presented by the foreign minister of Poland with assistance from Sweden at the EU's General Affairs and External Relations Council in Brussels on 26 May 2008.

According to European Union External Action’s Eastern Partnership information, “The European Commission puts forward concrete ideas for enhancing its relationship with: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus (the latter depending on the development of its relations with the EU). This would imply new association agreements including deep and comprehensive free trade agreements with those countries willing and able to enter into a deeper engagement, gradual integration in the EU economy and allow for easier travel to the EU through gradual visa liberalization, accompanied by measures to tackle illegal immigration. […] All these countries, to varying degrees, are carrying European political, social and economic reforms, and have stated their wish to come closer to the EU” (Eastern Partnership, 2011).
The aim of the Eastern Partnership in the economic plan is the consolidation of preferential trade relations, increasing technical and financial assistance, the gradual involvement of the various EU programs, as well as participation in the EU internal market through the legislative standardization and progressive integration of energy transportation and communication systems. To achieve these goals, neighboring states will have to make active and progressive efforts to implement a series of comprehensive reforms, which will have a positive impact on strengthening democratic institutions and democratic processes in those countries.

Eastern Partnership will not replace the current relations between the EU and neighboring states, and lead to the consolidation of legal and institutional framework within which to build these relationships. Eastern Partnership assumes no accession of neighboring countries to the EU.

The EU has concluded Visa facilitation and Readmission Agreements with three partner countries, including Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine. Preparations for negotiations of similar agreements for Armenia, Azerbaijan and Belarus have also been launched. Agreements are concluded with the states that fulfill the necessary requirements and are able to take on board the resulting obligations. This means that the speed of developments depend on the ambitions of each single partner. Consequently, a special status does not exist.

The definition of the ultimate goal of this EU integration – is a real problem of Eastern Partnership. Now nobody in the EU is able to answer the question whether Eastern Partnership is the maximum what the EU offers to its partner states, whether it is just one step in a broader process of integration. The EU officials try to avoid to answer that question, however for Rafal Sadowski, those states have all conditions which are needed to be granted by membership prospective, however it should be very long process, much longer than in case of Central European countries. “Now, I think, the EU should focus on current offer of Eastern Partnership mainly not only negotiations over Association agreement but also implementation of that and other agreements. This should open possibility for discussion about membership prospective for that states” (Sadowski, 2011).

The participation of former Soviet countries in Eastern partnership fits into broader efforts for European integration of these states. Eastern Partnership opens new perspectives for the development of closer ties with the EU and for the approximation of the Six to the European political and economic model. Participation in the Eastern Partnership will provide several benefits to these countries - participation in the single market and other Community policies, technical and
financial support from the EU, the possibility of granting visa relief measures, etc. However, at present an enlargement perspective is not on the agenda.

The EU-Eastern Partnership states relations should also be analyzed in light of the conflicts solving. Though, at the Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit in Warsaw, 29-30 September 2011 the participants agreed to develop political cooperation and dialogue between the EU and partner countries, including as regards governance reforms, joint efforts to enhance regional security and resolve conflicts, as well as relevant global and regional foreign and security issues of common interest (Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit in Warsaw, 2011), EU cannot take a leading position in solving conflicts in South Caucasus as this region is located at the intersection of interests of US and Russia. “The EU has refused from the outset to make a substantial effort towards conflict resolution in the region. Indeed its political and diplomatic resources are insufficient to influence the peace processes” (Mikhelidze, 2011, p. 10).

1.5. Summary

Thus, in this chapter the research questions and background information were presented. We saw the main points and aims of the Eastern Partnership program, which needs to be researched more as there are no studies about the program in the media field. In addition, the main aspects of Armenia-EU relations were presented. Furthermore, we saw the current position of Armenian and Russian media systems. As well as the general information about the four media that will be analyzed was presented in this chapter.
2. Previous research and theoretical framework

This chapter consists of the review of literature that is relevant for the Eastern Partnership. The literature is presented thematically (Armenian, Russian and European scholars), which will help the reader to follow the logic of the text. In the second part of the chapter, it is presented the theoretical framework of the thesis, that consists of Globalization theory, globalization and media, globalization and the importance of the nation state, globalization and EU enlargement.

2.1. Previous research

As it was mentioned above the European Union Eastern Partnership program was launched recently and has not been studied widely yet. No researches about Eastern Partnership were conducted in media field, neither in EU nor in the other countries. Nevertheless, some studies touch upon political and economic relations between six former Soviet countries and the EU in context of Eastern Partnership. I would like to turn our look on the articles written by Mikhelidze (2011), Sergunin and Tikhonov (2009), Navasardyan (2011), Ghazaryan (2011) Sarukhanyan (2011), Poghosyan (2011), Popescu (2011), Lapczynski (2009), Korosteleva (2011) and others.

It is worth noting that the main focuses of all experts from Armenia, except Poghosyan (2011), are the democratic, economic, political and energetic components of EU-Armenian relations. Thus, Navasardyan (2011) brings an overall analysis of the democratic and judicial reforms made in Armenia during the last decade, the impact of the European Neighbourhood Policy and Eastern Partnership program in democratic transformation in the country and strengths and weaknesses of the EaP instruments in the context of building democratic institutions in Armenia. Navasardyan mentions that in case of the decriminalization of libel and insult in 2010, democratic reforms envisaged by the EU-Armenia cooperation agenda resulted in consequences entirely opposite to those envisaged, which resulted in a real threat to the existence of media critical towards the government. “During previous years there were 1-2 cases of media and journalists being sued for defamation (under Criminal Code provisions) and in none of them journalists were jailed, while during only the first months of 2011 there were more than 10 such cases (but already under Civil Code provisions envisaging financial compensation of moral damage)” (2011, p. 24).
Also, Navasardyan brings another example which shows the degradation of democratic institutions in Armenia: “the digitalization of broadcasting fixed as a priority in the ENP Action Plan, and was used by Armenian authorities as an excuse for a reduction in the number of TV channels and subsequent tightening of their control over them. As a result of tenders conducted in December 2010, licenses were not provided to the companies known as those offering more or less alternative content to the audience” (2011, p. 24). Citing Navasardyan, Popescu (2011) also pays attention on this example and mentions that “Some of the EU-supported policies were diverted by the local governments to undermine democracy” (2011, p. 116).

Expert Vahagn Ghazaryan in his article conducts an overall analysis of economic integration and convergence with the EU policies. He mentions that from the very beginning of the independence from Soviet Union, Armenia declared the relationship with the EU as a high priority, which covers a large number of spheres. Ghazaryan stating that the relations between Armenia and the EU has no alternative in proclamations in foreign policy agenda for all Political Parties presented in the National Assembly and for the Government of the RA, and, even though there have been undertaken reforms aimed to develop business climate in Armenia, “the ranks of the Economy of the RA are consistently decreasing. According to reports from a number of renowned international organizations, the RA has a centralized economy with monopolies, the business climate is unfair, Customs and Tax administration are week, and the Judiciary system is biased” (2011, p. 58). Thus, this is a serious obstacle for Armenia on the way of Euro integration. Nevertheless, author sees some positive aspect of relationship development such as the possibility to raise the issue of the reinforcement of Armenian civil society institutions by the help of EU, though, the civil society of Armenia has no proper involvement in the policy formulation processes.

In its turn “Noravank” Scientific-Educational Foundation deputy-director Sevak Sarukhanyan makes a comprehensive analysis of Armenia’s energy security and the problems, perspectives and the main challenges for the success of the Eastern Partnership program. Answering the question that whether the EU’s Eastern Partnership project can change the reality of energy sector in Armenian and reorient its development to Europe, Sarukhanyan gives negative answer, as Armenian is now too dependent to Russia and Iran, in case of energetic stability, and, unfortunately, the EU’s energy policy through the Eastern Partnership doesn’t take it into account. While EU need
to be more active in geopolitics and security issues which seems to be the only way to be as successful in the region as Russia and the US (2011, pp. 85-86)

Poghosyan, in turn, examines the EU-Armenia relationship through the prism of education and human resources. While Popescu (2011), who represents the view from Europe, provides an overlook of all fields of the relationship between South Caucasian states and the EU.

I would like to notice that Poghosyan seems to be the one who is not blaming the EU for not being passive in relationship with Armenia, though, he is talking about the educational, cultural and ICT (information and communication technologies) spheres. According to him “intensive work is being done within the framework of the Eastern Partnership to serve the aim of improving these spheres” (Poghosyan, 2011, p. 106).

Also, Pogosyan says that the success of Eurointegration depends on the level of Armenian public awareness of the EU, its structures and legislation, and the society’s attitude towards Europe. Pogosyan in this case states that “in order to raise awareness of the Armenian population on the EU and provide necessary information on European educational opportunities and EU in various large projects which are implemented by the Armenian-European Policy and Legal Advice Centre in cooperation with EU Delegation in Armenia” (2011, p. 111). He also mentions that the role of civil society in Armenia is very essential to reach the main goals of the EU-Armenian cooperation and to enhance EaP’s impact on broadening people-to-people contacts.

As I have already mentioned Russia is of particular interest of the EU Eastern Partnership program as Russian authorities see it as a threat to its security and interests in the region. Thus Russian expert A. Sergunin (2010) states: “the Eastern Partnership program that was officially initiated by the EU in May 2009 created a new challenge to Russia’s diplomacy in Eastern Europe. The skeptical and negative assessments stemming from the fear of the rise of new dividing lines in Europe and potential decline of Russia’s geopolitical influence in the post-Soviet space currently prevail in the Russian politico-academic community” (p. 205).

According to Sergunin a recent initiative of EU and a number of post-Soviet states to establish "Eastern Partnership", has caused a lot of questions in Moscow about its objectives, contents and consequences for Russia itself and its relations with the EU and CIS countries. In his piece, Sergunin also mentions that Russian experts believe that the EaP real priorities are quite
different from the officially declared. Russian analysts believe that the most important component of the EaP is its energy component, in particular, the creation of alternative ways of energy supply to Europe. In this case, motives of the EU are the desire to avoid energy dependence on Russia (uncertainty in the reliability of Ukraine as a transit country) and the fear that Russia may use energy diplomacy to pressure on EU countries.

Sergunin says that there are substantial differences between EU and Russian estimates of the EaP. The first are mostly positive. Their essence is to ensure that with proper use of the program capacity EU can get significant benefits in both economic and socio-political terms. In Russian political and expert-analytical environment, positive assessments of the EaP are almost entirely absent. At best, there is skepticism about the prospects for effective implementation of this project, and the Partnership itself is presented as the next EU bureaucracy product.

Sergunin, in cooperation with Tikhonov (2009) while analyzing the EaP from Russian perspective are paying their attention to the Greater Caspian Region where they also see the EaP as a threat for Russian security. Thus, they mention, “The Eastern Partnership program that has been officially initiated by the EU in May 2009 has created a new challenge to Russia’s diplomacy in the Greater Caspian region. The skeptical and negative assessments stemming from the fear of the rise of new dividing lines in Eurasia and potential decline of Russia’s geopolitical influence in the post-Soviet space currently prevail in the Russian politico-academic community” (p. 31).

I would like to pay attention to another Russian scholar Andrei Zagorski (2010) who analyzes Eastern Partnership from Russian Perspective as well. In his study, Zagorski makes a comprehensive analysis of Eastern Partnership program, its aim and priorities. He looks at the program from Russian perspective and, as above-mentioned scholars, he is also sees EaP as a treat for Russia. He says, “Although Russia is not an addressee of the Eastern Partnership (EaP), neither the Russian government nor the political class expect to see any direct benefits flow from this policy framework of the European Union” (Zagorski, 2010, p. 1). According to him, the EU, by offering an association to its eastern neighbours, aims to lead those countries towards progressive disassociation from the Russia; and developing a new trade agreement and visa liberalization with six EaP countries EU establishes new obstacles for commerce and could complicate the free movement of people between the Russian Federation and those countries. (Zagorski, 2010, pp. 1-3).
Zagorsky says that Russia in the main is skeptical towards the idea of the multilateralism of any sort suggested by the EU.

Firstly, all these six countries’ regimes have changed in a different way from authoritarian to more pluralistic ones; they have different economic development and modernization level, thus it is unlikely that those countries can come together based on democracy, rule of law, and good governance agenda.

Secondly, Eastern Partnership countries are very fragmented in case of regions they represent. Thus, Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine are from Eastern Europe, whereas Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan represent South Caucasus. Moreover, all previous attempts to develop closer cross-regional relations with these countries failed and no regional cooperation is possible in this region if it does not involve Russia. And last but not the least, Russia role in the solving the regional frozen conflicts (Transnistria, Nagorno-Karabakh, South Ossetia and Abkhazia) can’t be ignored or belittled (Zagorski, 2010, pp. 3-19). According to Mikhelidze (2011) EU cannot take a leading position in solving conflicts in South Caucasus as this region is located at the intersection of interests of US and Russia. “The EU has refused from the outset to make a substantial effort towards conflict resolution in the region. Indeed, its political and diplomatic resources are insufficient to influence the peace processes” (p. 10).

Also, it is very interesting to have a look at Polish expert Marcin Lapczynski’s (2009), analyzes of the chances and perspectives of the European Union’s Eastern Partnership. In his article Lapczynski brings an overview of the program, indications about European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), based on which the program originated. Lapczynski mentions about reactions, positions and critique towards the program as well as implications.

It is worth noting that ENP includes countries such as to the south - Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Syria and Tunisia, and to the east – Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. And while talking about European Neighbourhood Policy Lapczynski says, “Since the beginning, the ENP has found itself under strong criticism. One of the main points raised by experts and politicians was that it is not possible and desirable to treat the southern and eastern neighbours equally due to strong geographical and identity differences between them” (2009, p. 144). In this case, Lapczynski quotes Polish minister
Sikorski, who during the presentation of EaP initiative said: “To the South, we have neighbours of Europe. To the East, we have European neighbours...They all have the right one day to apply [for EU membership]” (2009, p. 145).

According to Lapczynski Some think that Polish and Swedish proposal can be seen as “a part of “power struggle between Sarkozy and Tusk”, or rather “Old Europe” versus “New Europe” as the project is supposed to be a Polish answer to Sarkozy’s Mediterranean Union and his plans to move more funds towards the Union’s southern neighbours” (2009, p. 145).

While talking about Eastern Partnership’s content and proposals, Lapczynski (2009, p. 147) says that the cooperation between EU and EaP countries would include the following

1. Co-operation in migration issues;
2. Free trade area;
3. Providing EU support for sector reforms, intensifying students’ exchange, promoting civil society, local and regional co-operation etc.;
4. drafting and signing a new generation of Action Plans;
5. ensuring a distribution of assistance funds to the partner countries in a way that would reflect the progress in implementing reforms and according to the principle of differentiation;

Lapczynski suggests that Poland and Sweden should promote and implement EaP by co-operating with other EU members, especially with Germany. Finally, what is very interesting for the main subject of the thesis, he encourages EU to stress that Eastern Partnership is not directed against Russia etc. (2009, p. 155).

Senior Lecturer in European Politics at Aberystwyth University Elena Korosteleva in her article ‘The Eastern Partnership Initiative: A New Opportunity for Neighbours?’ supplements aforesaid by Lapczynski by saying that EU has entered to the traditional Russian sphere of interests. But, while Lapczynski calls Brussels to stress that EaP is not against Russia, Korosteleva (2011) states that Eastern neighbours of EU, “sandwiched between the EU and Russia, sooner or later will have to make a choice, which of necessity is totally unacknowledged by the Brussels officials” (p. 9). She adds that this choice, whichever way it goes will cause serious problems for all Eastern neighbours. She opposes EU and Russia and mentions that EaP countries, being neighbours of
Russia, “struggle to balance their relations with these two competitive powers” (Korosteleva, 2011, p. 6)

In her work, Korosteleva mainly pays her attention to Moldova, Belarus, Ukraine and Russia, which have direct borders with EU. Korosteleva, like Lapczynski studies the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and EaP. She mentions that ENP got “a mixed and de-legitimizing response from the eastern neighbours who were either hesitant or indeed rejective from the outset. To respond to the policy’s unintended consequences, the Eastern Partnership initiative (EaP) was launched” (Korosteleva, 2011, p. 2). She calls ENP ambitious but at the same time ambiguous and says that EaP “intended to offer a more regional focus – to learn more about partners – and more differentiation – to attend correspondingly to the partners’ individual needs” (2011, p. 11)

While speaking about the conceptual and practical limitations of the ENP/EaP She brings a very interesting point, she says that EU does not treat its Eastern Partnership neighbours as sovereign subjects but as EU ‘objects of governance’, thus risking to lose them as ‘friends’ (Korosteleva, 2011, p. 7).

In addition, Korosteleva rises, from my point of view, very sore issue for Europe, namely she states that EaP “acquires low-level legitimation and appreciation by the general public across the border” (2011, p. 13). She says that the population of the EU is mainly unaware of the Neighbourhood policy and has limited knowledge about EU neighbours and even often failing to answer primitive questions about the EU itself. Tuomo Mora who says that EU issues are not ‘sexy’ also raises this problem. She sees the reason in lack of EU key officials’ elections. Mora says, “the top EU figures come from nowhere, influence EU decision-making for few years, and then disappear from European forums” (2009, p. 93).
2.2. Theoretical framework

2.2.1. Globalization. Globalization and the nation state

Author of this study used globalization theory as predominant for the research because he strongly believes that the ongoing process of Europeanization and Eurointegration of the six former Soviet countries, which are involved in Eastern Partnership, must be seen as an integral part of the bigger process of world’s globalization.

The process of globalization is one of the important problems of modern world development. It starts with the formation stage of a fundamentally different type of world community and today it has a decisive influence on the course of world history.

The issue of globalization has been studied by scientists from different fields of knowledge, which allows us to consider the appearance of its processes almost in all parts of our life. Globalization cannot be interpreted as a unilateral process, referring to only one of the spheres of human society, that is, in principle, is impossible. According to Rosamond (1999) “Globalization is something that poses a challenge and to which there should be fashioned an effective response. The challenge is economic liberalization and the response appears to be further economic liberalization” (p. 664). At the same time, Rantanen, after bringing some other scholars’ definition, in turn, defines globalization in a following way, “Globalization is a process in which worldwide economic, political, cultural and social relations have become increasingly mediated across time and space” (2004, p. 8). She is pointing out that one of the main futures of globalization is that it is taking place through the media and communication.

As Sparks (2007) and Chan (2005) say, today everyone talks about globalization and it has become a hot topic in discourse and it is on the tongues of politicians, media professionals, businesspersons and academics. According to them globalization is cited in the business pages in the context of the flows of investment and employment around the world and phrases such as ‘global vision’, ‘global brands’, and ‘global networks’ ‘have acquired common currency’. As Sparks points out, for students some courses became very popular just because of the presence of a word
‘globalization’ in the titles. “Common sense has it that it is the defining characteristic of contemporary society” (Sparks, 2007, p. 133).

Today there are plentiful globalization theories that are competing with each other but at the same time there is no unified theory of globalization that would satisfy all the requirements. As Held and his collaborators put in: ‘no single coherent theory of globalization exists although there are a variety of accounts which seek to identify its underlying causal dynamics’ (Held et al., 1999)

According to Sparks (2007) there are ‘weak’ and ‘strong’ theories of globalization from which he separates five strong by such scholars as Giddens, Held, Appadurai, Thompson, Hannerz, Waters, Bauman, Lull, Beck, Held and McGrew (pp. 135-138). Sparks mentions that in ‘weak’ theories of globalization “the work of some writers employs the vocabulary of globalization but in fact operates within a different intellectual framework” and “in weak theories [the obvious example from the field of media is the work by Herman and McChesney (Sparks, 2007, p. 135)], it may well be the case that there have been modifications to the concepts used and the conclusions drawn, but the system of thought, the underlying paradigm, remains the same as in the preceding period” (Sparks, 2007, p. 128).

As it is mentioned above, Sparks’s concern is with ‘strong’ theories of globalization, which:
- Recognize the radical novelty of the current epoch. In these theories, both the object of social thought and the theories and methods appropriate to its study differ from those of earlier times (p. 128)
- Argue that the world in which we exist today has radically different parameters from that of preceding epochs (p. 128)
- Argue that globalization has a distinctive and new social dynamic in that it places considerable emphasis upon media and communication as central to contemporary social reality (p. 132)
- Claim that the powers of the contemporary state are much reduced (p. 134)
- Claim that they are radically new theories developed to understand a radically new world situation (p. 147)
Talking about reduction of powers of contemporary state, Held and McGrew (2007) mention “Political space for the development and pursuit of effective government and the accountability of power is no longer coterminous with a delimited political territory. Contemporary global change is associated with a transformation of state power as the roles and functions of states are rearticulated, reconstituted and re-embedded at the intersection of regionalizing and globalizing networks and systems” (p. 221).

In this case Bartelson (2000) states that “when it comes to the modern state and its future, […] it will be more or less radically transformed, and its capacity for action is severely circumscribed by global structures and processes” (p. 188). And to Sassen (1997 cited in Bartelson, 2000, p.188), “while sovereignty and territory ‘remain key features of the international system’, they have ‘been reconstituted and partly displaced onto other institutional arenas outside the state and outside the framework of nationalized territory’.”

We should also point out the role of supranational political forms like the United Nations, WTO, European Union, NGOs etc. in the erosion of state powers. According to Sparks (2007, p. 147), development of such supranational political forms is undermined the collapse of state system that dominated world affairs for the last four centuries. In this case, Sparks states that “Transnational political organizations like the UN and the EU have eroded its power to act independently. Multinational corporations are so large and powerful, and the capital they command so mobile, that the state can no longer subordinate them to its regulatory regime” (2007, pp. 136-137). States belonging to the European Union are no longer the only centers of power within their own borders. Political processes taking place in the EU can be characterized as a ‘supranational’.

According to David Machin and Theo van Leuween mention that today, “we live in a period of transition. Two worlds coexist uneasily: the world of nation states, with their national languages and cultures, and the global world with the emerging global language and culture carried, not by nation states, but by global corporations and international organizations” (2007, p. 2). From my point of view nation states do not exist separately from the second ‘global world’, that Machin and van Leuween offered. Nation states are the part of that global world and today they are challenged by global processes, NGOs, etc. In today’s world it’s becoming extremely hard to keep the national language and culture ‘safe’ from the external influence. Small countries, for instance Armenia, where dominates traditional way of thinking, are more sensitive to everything new that can affect
something which is just their – culture, language etc. However, no single nation can exist in isolation, without the cultural contacts and mutual enrichment of different cultures. Anna Roosvall states that we must consider the role of the nation when we are dealing with globalisation and explore for instance how traditional ways of thinking are challenged and how these challenges are met (2010, p. 220). This point of view suits best for the six EaP countries mostly for South Caucasus republics, where traditional way of thinking can be met almost everywhere – everyday relations between people, business, politics, etc.

Talking about the media and the nation state, we must point out that media depends on nation and national. In the world of media and communication evidence for both globalisation and the nation as ruling principles can be found (Roosvall, 2010, p. 220). In this case, Hillel Nossek mentions, “One should not totally ignore the role of the nation state, which, although it has lost its status, still affects the environment in which the media institutions function – either through legislation or on a social and cultural level” (2004, p. 345). Both scholars agree that nation-states still have effect on the media and communication. I do agree with both opinions and strongly believe that there is no media system in the world, which is not affected by the governments, societies, businesses. Nossek continues, “Critical theory researchers, like their professional theory colleagues, believe that one cannot separate professional considerations from the domestic/national climate in which the journalist functions” (2004, p. 347). In our case, while analyzing the coverage of the EaP by Russian and Armenian media we need to consider it.

Anna Roosvall and Inka Salovaara-Moring say, “Globalising processes do offer an alternative to the primacy of the nation, but have so far been unable to overcome its dominance” (2010, p. 9).

Now, I would like to turn our look to the Norman Fairclough’s (2006) book’, where author examines the connection between language and globalization, gives a literature review of academic literature in globalization. Fairclough is differentiating four positions within the literature in globalization discourse: objectivist, rhetoricist, ideologist and social constructivist. Thus, objectivists are adopting globalization as simply objective processes in the real world. While rhetoricists are concerned with how representations of globalization are used to support and
legitimize actions and policies within particular arguments. Ideologists, in turn, are concerned with how discourses contribute to achieving and sustaining the dominance or hegemony of particular strategies and practices. And finally social constructivists position “places a more explicit emphasis on the socially constructed character of social realities, and the significance of discourse in their social construction” (Fairclough, 2006, pp. 14-19)

Fairclough sees as the actual, real processes of globalization - what is actually happening. Moreover, he is opposing it to what is represented as happening, which “are highly complex, diverse, uneven and multidimensional (economic, political, social, cultural, ecological and so forth)” (2006, p. 28). Fairclough continues with the very interesting statement, which says that there are different groups of people which are trying to influence and control these real processes of globalization and when their strategies are successful these people can inflect and partly redirect the trajectory of actual globalization. Also, Fairclough is paying attention to the discourses of globalization associated with strategies for globalization, mostly to the globalist discourse of globalization, which he describes as a discourse which represents globalization in reductive neoliberal economic terms within a strategy to inflect and re-direct actual processes of globalization in that direction. In addition, Fairclough brings six core claims of ‘globalism’ by Steger (2005, cited in Fairclough, 2006, p. 40):

- Globalization is about the liberalization and global integration of markets
- Globalization is inevitable and irreversible
- Nobody is in charge of globalization
- Globalization benefits everyone
- Globalization furthers the spread of democracy in the world
- Globalization requires a war on terror

Fairclough is paying particular attention to the first claim, by calling it the most crucial and central (Eastern Partnership’s aim is to liberate and integrate the markets). But in his conclusion Fairclough is arguing with the claim that ‘globalization’ benefits everyone, as despite the fact that globalization has brought new opportunities and gains for some people, it has made the lives of many others more difficult (2006, p. 162).
2.2.2. Globalization and Media

I would like to come back to the globalization and media, as media is one of the main driving forces of globalization. As Terhi Rantanen states: “Most theorists agree that there is practically no globalization without media and communications” (2004, p. 4). Thus, as it was already mentioned above, she is highlighting the role of media and communication in the modern globalization. At the same time, she is mentioning that people and globalization should be brought together, because when people use media and communication, they contribute to globalization.

Today media are becoming more and more global. Nowadays, all around the globe we can watch the same news programs, movies and shows, listen to the same music. While some theorists argue that global media products are not necessarily everywhere ‘read’ in the same way. People from different cultures will interpret and experience them differently, they say, thereby ‘indigenising’ the global media (Machin & Leuween, 2007). “Western media, when confronted with sociopolitical complexities they could not understand in the Caucasus and former Yugoslavia simply produced a reductionist explanation based upon religious differences and irrationality” (Louw, 2008, p. 156).

Sparks (2007) says that “the products of the world’s media industries often had a liberating effect, breaking down the habits and routines of obsolete social orders and promoting change and development” (p. 5). Norman Fairclough, when he is talking about ‘mediation’ represents media as ‘a crucial element of contemporary processes of globalization’, as major changes in information and communication technologies have expanded the possibilities for overcoming distance and making over unlimited distances a little cost (2006, p. 98).

As popular American journalist Thomas L. Friedman (1999) states, globalization is “the inexorable integration of markets, nation-states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before-in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before” (p. 7). The same opinion has Hamelink who is saying that the globalization of modern information and communication technologies and new media is an important part of contemporary globalization (1994, cited in Fairclough, 2006, p. 199).
In first part of the book ‘Global media discourse: a critical introduction’, to which I have particularly focused on, Machin & Leuween present a history of media globalisation, an overview and the main themes of globalisation theory. Authors look at the media globalization through the Western media, US dominance and promotion of Western values. They turn their look to the history if first news agencies which became the first examples of global media. Also, Machin & Leuween are considering in particular the globalization of American media, which, according to them, in the mid of twentieth century took a lead I provision not only of news, but also in other media. Thus, according to Tunstall, “in the 1970s, a study of the political economy of the mass media could be called The Media Are American” (1977 cited in Machin & Leuween, 2007, p.11). As Byron T. Scott mentions in Western Europe, again, many film companies are owned and operated by multinational firms such as Bertelson, Disney and etc. (2008, p. 188). He is also mentioning about Eurovision song contest which is, according to him, is ‘an irreplaceable part of European culture’, from my point of view is also a very good example of globalization as this competition promotes European values and popular music all around the world and “has become a kind of World Cup final for European popular music groups” (Scott, 2008, p. 189). Also, to this series can be attributed Euronews channel, which is broadcasting in seven languages and has subsidized by the EU since late 1990s (Scott, 2008, p. 190).

Continuing talking about American media hegemony in the world, authors also mention that as more new countries enter the global trade networks, large American corporations such as Disney, Viacom, General electric move in, “simply introducing their own products buying up local media, or creating trading relationship with existing large media organizations to bring them into the global system” (Machin & Leuween, 2007, p. 16). Though, Machin & Leuween are also arguing that there are countries which succeed in promoting and delivering their media products in a global market> For example Australia, Netherlands, India and Latin American countries.

Machin & Leuween in their book bring some examples from all around the world about Disney’s influence. For example in Scandinavian countries (Norway, Denmark and Sweden) some students even have never thought that Disney is American and Donald Duck could be Swedish, Norwegian or Danish. Machin & Leuween state that “the idea of homogeneity, finally, is, in the context of globalisation theory, closely associated with the idea that cultural differences are disappearing as a result of globalisation” (2007, p. 26).
In contrast to this Chan (2005) argues that “In spite of all the globalizing tendency, the world will not become a unified whole; neither will its culture reach a singularity. States, economies and cultures will continue to strive for survival and domination as they come into contact with one another, resulting in tensions that may be reflected in the media world” (p. 27). Sparks (2007) is also disagreeing that in the modern world the production of media products takes place in very different places where no one player dominates. He continues, “In this new epoch, the mass media are particularly important since they are among the agents that embody the transcendence of the limitations of space that is a characteristic feature of globalization” (p. 147). French researcher Divina Frau-Meigs (2007) is also talking about cultural diversity and global media. She notices that “In the case of the cultural diversity treaty, the US lost the rhetorical battle, but maybe not the economic one. Conversely the European Union won the rhetorical battle but not necessarily the commercial one” (p. 261).

As Allen W. Palmer is stating: “Development of mass media in Eastern Europe, Eurasia, and Russia has remained turbulent and chaotic throughout the first decade of 2000 (Palmer, 2008). In the article ‘Eastern Europe, Eurasia, and Russia: A Tenuous Road for Media Development’ he examines media developments in Eastern Europe, Russia and Eurasia, while I would like to pay attention to Eastern European countries which are a part of EU Eastern Partnership program, namely Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus. From these three countries, Palmer sees Belarus as the most authoritarian and mentions that despite the fact that the constitution is guarantying freedom of speech and free access to information, situation in practice is completely. Even in 2005 people had to provide and ID card for accessing Internet in Internet cafés and “by May 2007, bloggers and independent media on the Internet were opened to criminal prosecution for slander and defamation” (p. 220). Moreover, it is worth noting that by 2007 most of the major printing outlets in Belarus were controlled by the government.

Despite Palmer mentions that Moldova has a robust press, he also brings some examples of negative signs in Moldavian media. Thus, there are still attacks on journalist, states owns the two major newspapers and does not let to circulate papers from ones side of the country to another. As a background of these problems Palmers sees the collapse of Moldavian economic after Soviet Union.

In Ukraine, laws are also guaranteeing the freedom of speech, but like in previous two countries, ‘the law and practice diverge’. Nevertheless, unlike Belarus and Moldova, where state
owns major media, in Ukraine, as of 2004, oligarchs controlled much of media. Government to protect national security restricted internet freedom.

As European Union is of my particular interest, I would like to pay more attention on Globalization and European Integration, which will be analyzed, in the next part of this paper.

### 2.2.3. Globalization and European Integration/Enlargement

Globalization is the process that did not appear in a single day, but it is a development, which has its objective reasons. The formation and gradual development and enlargement of the European Union had its own economic and political preconditions. From my point of view, such processes as globalization and European integration/enlargement should be seen in the same context. Since 1957 when EU was founded in, the quantity of the member states has grown from 6 to 27. The crucial for the EU enlargement was the year of 2004, when Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia joined the European Union which from a club of ‘rich’ Western European states was transformed into a supranational political organism (Krzyzanowski, 2010, p. 135). For all new member states there are several political and economic criteria written just in three pages long document, adopted in June 1993 by European Council in Copenhagen, which Ralf Dahrendorf calls ‘one of the most important resolutions ever adopted by the EU’ (2006, p. 191)

Even though, Gerard Delanty mentions that there is relatively little theoretical literature which would explore wider significance of the Eastern enlargement (2006, p. 125), according to Rosamond (2005), there have been registered different claims among European-level policy actors about the relationship between globalization and the EU. For example, Europe is challenged by globalization or the ‘European social model’ is threatened by globalization, the EU has a responsibility to help ‘set globalization within a moral frameworks’ etc. Unfortunately, I was not able to find much literature about the Eastern enlargement of the EU in recent years. However, the processes of the EU enlargement that were taking place a decade, from my point of view, are still relevant today, as all the countries that would express a will to become a part of the European family
will have to go through the same procedures as those countries of Eastern Europe that are now members that supranational organization.

Although, Ben Rosamond (2005, p. 31) analyzing the ‘abandonment of the Concept of Globalization’ comes to the conclusion that the EU neither economically nor in institutional form is a case of globalization, rather it is an example of regionalization, another researcher of globalization and European integration Stylianos Papathanassopoulos (2005) states that Europe continues to offer the best place for examining global processes. He mentions that comprehensive political and social changes took place in continent after the collapse of Soviet Union, which brought to extension of “the boundaries of the ‘Europeanization of media’. One way or another, the European Union (EU) has attempted since the mid-1980s to initiate a policy aiming to ‘Europeanize’ the whole communication sector of its member states, if not the European continent” (p. 47). At the same time Ben Rosamond agrees with Papathanassopoulos by saying that “the EU should be understood as a natural arena for competing conceptions of globalization” (2005, p. 26)

Hay and Rosamond (2002) think that “the discourse of globalization as cultural threat tends to be associated with a pervasive cynicism and skepticism about all transnational political and economic initiatives (whether regional or genuinely global) which “tends to promote the process of European integration as a bulwark against the undesirable consequences of globalization” (p. 14). Hay and Rosamond continue their thought with citing Vivien Schmidt: “in place of an overall legitimating discourse of the left or the right, successive governments continued to use the rhetoric about the need to rise to the challenge of Europeanisation as a guard against the threat of globalization to justify continued industrial reform” (2000 cited in Hay & Rosamond, 2002, p. 14).

Rosamond (2005, p. 24) states that the EU may be read in two ways:

- The first see the EU as a collective response to the onset of a range of transnational economic challenges.
- The second considers the EU as an example of globalization as it treats the EU as an agent for the unravelling of (Westphalian) European space.

Talking about the construction of Europe as a valid space in the light of external challenge, Ben Rosamond (1999) offers a discursive pattern in which three perceptions need to be embedded:
1. the recognition of a particular problem, challenge or threat;
2. the perception of the need and/or right for there to be European level solutions (as opposed to separate national level strategies) and/or for the existing European level governance structure to undergo change to address the problem; and
3. the emergence of a consensus about a particular conception of a regional space in the minds of key actors (p. 662).

Rosamond (1999) continues that different conversions of the EU’s external policy aim to illuminate ‘Europe’ as a significant competitive political formation which should gain support and meet the expectations of other weighty political actors. “The idea is a social construction increasingly reliant on ideas about a globalized/globalizing external context, used to draw actors into the European arena” (p. 662).

Talking about globalization and the EU, Rosamond (2005, pp. 26-27) offers a table (see Table 1) which shows possible relationship between globalization and the EU. He compares internal and external role ascribed to the EU and positive, ambivalent and negative views of globalization. However, Rosamond calls it “a very simple attempt to plot putative roles for the EU that follow logically from three stylized normative views of globalization.”

Table 1. Possible relationship between globalization and the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative view of globalization</th>
<th>Role ascribed to the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive</td>
<td>Promotion of deregulation and liberalization in European states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ambivalent</td>
<td>Filtering of the benefits of liberalization, while preserving the distinctive qualities of European capitalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosamond (forthcoming, ch. 1, table 1.1).
At the same time Hay and Rosamond offer another attempt to illustrate schematically the use made of such rhetorical strategies as “globalization and European integration as external constraints and as contingent political projects in Britain, France, Germany and Italy” (see Table 2) (2002, p. 17). Analyzing the table authors mention that even though the British case is the one about which most has been written, it is, in many respects, the least interesting. British politics has tended to characterize European integration as something external, as work of others, thus fairly strictly counterpoising them to the rest Europe, which leads to the establishment of a negative picture of European British politics in media and the public. It is worth noted that the EU enlargement has never been entirely easy, and the British example shows in particular, however, enlargement is deeping (Dahrendorf, 2006, p. 191).

Table 2: Rhetorics of Globalisation and European Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Globalisation</th>
<th>As inexorable external constraint</th>
<th>As contingent political project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, in almost all respects, the French case is completely different. According to researchers in France “globalization is presented as a choice which French can and must resist” (p. 18), where the price of resistance is the process of European integration. According to the polling data, presented in the analysis of the French case, “73 percent seeing European integration as a
means to fight against the (assumed!) ill effects of globalisation” (Meunier 2000: 114, cited in Hay & Rosamond, 2002).

Authors call the German case the most complex. Hay and Rosamond mention that despite the fact that to the discourses of globalization have not been given special attention in Germany, globalization has been represented as an unresisting and unstoppable process, which must be internalized both domestically and at a European level (Hay & Rosamond, 2002, p. 19). Researchers comparing German and British cases mention that although there are some clear similarities between those two public debates, the differences are dominating. For example, “given Germany’s influence over the integration process, much of the more recent appeal to discourses of globalisation in German debate has not been focused directly on the German economy, but on the character of the process of European integration” (p. 20).

Coming up to the Italian case, from the analysis we can notice that here there has been an attempt of enlisting support of social and economic institutions for mobilization and subsequent galvanization behind the process of European integration. As Vivian Schmidt observes: “in no other country has the discourse of European integration played such a central and sustained role in promoting acceptance of change” (2000: 72, cited in Hay & Rosamond, 2002, p. 20). In addition Hay and Rosamond mention that “until recently, then, it was not globalisation but European integration…”

In the context of the of the EU enlargement Gerard Delanty (2006) examines different perspectives and approaches related to Europeanization by Derrida, Gadamer, Touraine, Habermas, Luhmann, Castells and Bauman. He considers five following approaches (pp. 125-127):

— Europeanization entails post national developments of a cosmopolitan nature
— Until now Europeanization has been largely achieved through system integration which refers to integration achieved through the institutional imperatives of money and power
— Europeanization can be seen as an autopoietic process in a system that reproduces itself by internal and highly differentiated logics of development
— Europeanization is now being shaped by wider global processes and takes the form of a network society, thus Europeanization cannot be attributed exclusively to European developments. Europeanization can be reproductive and it can be transformative,
working through social and systematic forms of integration and creating new logics of differentiation

— Europeanization can be seen as generating symbolic discourses in which new realities are cognitively defined in cultural conflicts

According to Delanty “the modernist project of European integration is reaching its historical limits, and the other projects are beginning” (2006, p. 127).

2.3. Summary

In this chapter, we analyzed the works by different scholars related to Eastern Partnership. The analysis was presented in thematic way, so the reader could clearly see what was written about the Eastern Partnership program so far by the scholars from different nations and political systems. We developed the main globalization theories, its relevance to the media and EU enlargement. Though, some scholars do not see the EU enlargement as an example of globalization, rather than regionalization. However, they agree that the EU should be understood as a natural arena for competing conceptions of globalization.

3. Method and Material

This Method and Material chapter consist of several subheadings that contain the information about the way the material have been collected and selected i.e, sampling strategy, and the way in which I have analysed and explored the material. I will present SPSS variables, limitations of the study as well as the generalizability, validity and reliability of the study.

3.1. Content analysis

The method used in this study is content analysis, which purpose is “to quantify salient and manifest features of a large number of texts and the statistics are used to make broader inferences about the process and politics of representation” (Deacon & al, 1999, p. 116). Though, it does not
give an opportunity to go deeper into the context and explore a latent content of the text (Deacon & al, 1999, p. 117), this method totally suits to my analysis and enough to answer the research questions as they are dealing with the tendencies towards the Eastern Partnership program in Armenian and Russian online media. Moreover, a large number of articles needed to unveil tendencies towards the program, and that is why content analysis is suitable for the research.

There is another reason which has no less significance for the method’s choice – it is its objectivity and being systematic. These two qualities of content analysis are presented in the definitions of this method, offered by Berelson in 1952 and by Hosli in 1969 (Bryman, 2012, p. 289). According to Bryman, objectivity “resides in the fact that there is transparency in the procedures for assigning the raw material to categories, so that the analyst’s personal biases intrude as little as possible in the process”. And the advantage of being systematic is that “the application of the rules is done in a consistent manner so that bias is again supressed” (p. 289).

This is very important for me as the subject of my thesis is referred to the program where Armenia is included, and I, being an Armenian citizen, could be bias in conducting such an analysis. But, two aforementioned qualities of content analysis minimises this concern as anyone could make this analysis and come to the same results as I did. Though, Deacon doubts about total objectivity of the content analysis. He questions, whether the systematic process of content analysis – “even if it is achieved effectively – deliver a truly ‘objective’, value-free perspective, as some have claimed?” (1999, p. 131). His answer is ‘not’ as everything is depended in researcher’s subjective judgement. I agree with Deacon’s statement and I think that it is impossible to reach one hundred percent objectivity at all.

3.2. Sampling strategy and Material

As it was noted before, for my research I have chosen two online media from Armenia and two from Russia. However, in the very beginning of the study, I was thinking about sampling the material from European media, but then, after looking at the leading European English language online media I decided to choose sources from Russia, as EU media are not interested in this program. From my point of view, this can be explained, the following way: many times it was stated
that Eastern Partnership does not give an opportunity to those six countries, involved in the program, to become a part of the European Union in the near future, thus, some politicians think that without the prospect of EU membership the program is not serious. Whereas, as the head of the Eastern Partnership Department of the Centre for Eastern Studies Rafal Sadowski (2011) from Poland mentions that EaP is Polish national interest, I can assume that Poland is more interested and enthusiastic about the Eastern Partnership program than Western European Countries, but in Poland there is not any national English language online media which could be analyzed. Thus, there is kind of skepticism among western politicians, which, I think, influences media as well and makes the Eastern Partnership program not attractive for the European mass media. This is the reason why I decided not to choose media from European Union.

Moving forward, one can raise the question why online but not print media was chosen. The reason for choosing online media is simple:

1. As I have already mentioned, in Armenia, unlike Russia, traditional print media are experiencing difficult times. At the same time, online media, with the increasing number of Internet users, gains more and more popularity. While daily print newspapers have a circulation of 5000-6000 copies, popular news websites have 30000-75000 viewers per day, from which about 50% are from Armenia (Circle.am, 2012).

2. It is easier to access archives of online media than to go through the archives of printed newspapers. Especially, when you are doing a research on the media from another country.

From the big number of online news media both in Armenia and in Russia I chose News.am, 1in.am, Ria.ru and Vz.ru. There are several reasons for choosing exactly those four:

1. As it is stated earlier I used the most popular web traffic generator Alexa to find out the most popular online media in Armenia and Russia.

2. I went through the archives of the websites presented in the list of the most popular media in these countries to find out which news website covered the Eastern Partnership more.

Thus, while in case of Armenia it was easier as News.am and 1in.am in the list of the most popular websites in Armenian rank the 1 and 2 places and the have the biggest number of articles about Eastern Partnership, with Russian media it was harder as Ria.ru and Vz.ru are not on the first or second place among the most popular news sites of Russian internet. I had to go through archives
of several media and finally to found out that the Russian News & Information Agency RIA Novosti (ria.ru) and online business newspapers Vzglyad (vz.ru) has covered Eastern Partnership more intensive than other more popular Russian online media and have the biggest amount of articles related to this issue.

The analysis was made on the Russian version of those media, as:

In case of Russia,

1. The target audience of Russian version of Ria.ru is bigger than English and I needed to analyze the articles designed specifically for domestic audience. Moreover, Russian and, for instance, English versions of Ria Novosti are different.
2. Vz.ru does not have any other versions except Russian.

And in case of Armenia,

1. Russian language is the most popular language in the country after Armenian and nearly 70% of population speaks Russian (Russian language in the World). Moreover, for me, Russian is the first language as I graduated from Russian school and Russian University.
2. Unlike Ria Novosti, Russian versions of both News.am and 1in.am are nearly the same as Armenian as after appearing of the article in one language it is being immediately translated into another, thus the target audience of both versions are the same.

The sampling strategy of the material consists of several steps:

First, there was chosen a period for the analysis. In the very beginning, it was decided to make an analysis of the coverage of Eastern Partnership within two month, namely from 1 of September until 31 of October as at the middle of this period the latest Summit of the Eastern Partnership took place in Warsaw and I thought that it would be interesting to analyze the coverage of that event one month before and one month after it. Thus, 74 articles from four media were sampled which was not enough for the research as content analysis is dealing with large number of texts and the general rule is: “the bigger a content sample is, the better” (Deacon & al, 1999, pp. 119-120). Therefore, the period was extended from two month to one year, i.e. from 01.06.2011 to 31.05.2012. As a result, the quantity of the articles rose from 74 to 144. Thus, the population of the research includes all
articles published in two Armenian and two Russian online media during the period of 01.06.2011 - 31.05.2012.

Second, after deciding the population of the research, the key-word strategy was chosen to sample the articles. As all four media have the opportunity to access their archives and search within it without limitations, I entered the key word “Восточное Партнерство” (Eastern Partnership) into search engine directly in the media’s websites, so there was no need to use Google or other searching tools. Two of the four media, i.e. News.am and Ria.ru have an option of searching within the specified time, which made the searching easier. In two other media – lin.am and Vz.ru I had to choose the articles manually.

Third, after searching in the archives there was a need to select articles that would match my criteria, which are the following:

1. The article should not just have the phrase Eastern Partnership mentioned in the text, but also there should be said something about the program.
2. If the article is not about the program itself, it should be related to other similar topics such as EU-Armenia relations, Russia-EU relations, EU-Eastern Partnership countries related or other, but with some information about EaP, etc.

Thus, the sampling unit consists out of all articles published in four media within the period of one year and matches abovementioned requirements.

3.3. Presentation of the results

For analyzing the data retrieved from four Armenian and Russian online media The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was used. As Bryman says, it “is possibly the most widely used computer software for social scientists” (2012, p. 354). As Deacon (1999) mentions, analyzing research data by computers “is one of the most crucial and demanding stages of the research process” (p. 336). He continues by saying that although no computer program exists
that can do the conceptual work for you, computers can deliver the capability to access and interrogate large amounts of data quickly and accurately, and in more complex and sophisticated ways than would be possible manually (ibid.). As it was stated earlier, the aim of the research is to analyze similarities and differences in the coverage of Eastern Partnership program between media from the different countries. Moreover, the study is centered on whether the coverage is mainly positive or negative to the program and how these tendencies relate to the use of different sources. Thus, 35 variables were formulated for answering the research questions. For presenting the results of the analysis I will use tables, diagrams, histograms created through three types of the analysis (univariate analysis, bivariate analysis and multivariate analysis) presented by Bryman (2012, pp. 337-346), to make it easier for a reader to understand the results.

3.3.1. SPSS variables

Variables developed in the coding manual (see appendix 1) can be divided to three main categories, which are the following: general category includes such variables as media origin by country (Armenia, Russia), name of the media (News.am, 1in.am, Ria.ru, Vz.ru), date of publication, type of news article (nard news, soft news, reportage, interview, and analysis) and story relevance (the main topic/focus of the article), which could be Eastern Partnership, EU-Armenia relations, Russia-EU relations, EU-Eastern Partnership countries related or other subject.

The second category is about the representation of the Eastern Partnership in the item related to different countries, which have direct or indirect connection to the program. Thus, I developed the same variable to all the possible cases such as Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for Armenia particularly, for Russia particularly, for EU particularly and for the EaP countries overall. The values for these variables are (positive, negative, neutral, different/contradictory, or nothing mentioned). My criteria for deciding whether there is positive, negative or neutral attitude in the article was the choices of words. For me, as for a native Russian speaker, who have an experience of working with the text during my previous studies, found this not hard. Another criterion was the
context, i.e. every time before coding I was trying to go deeper to the context to understand the discourse of the text. In addition, this coding manual was tested by my Russian colleague Maria Tarasova, who kindly agreed to help me with that. We both got nearly the same results after analyzing 30 articles out of 144 at the end. Thus, it showed that the chosen values work. Also, I would like to clarify what I mean by saying ‘different/contradictory’ or ‘nothing mentioned’. When in the article just one type of opinion or style of the text is presented where you can see the attitude to the program, it is clear that it can be positive, negative, or neutral. But, what to do when in the article there are different opinions by different sources who present different interested parties which are contradicting to each other? Such a value could help to distinguish it. Or, when in the article one cannot find any opinions or attitudes to the program the value ‘nothing mentioned’ is also can help as it still contains information about the relation to the program.

In addition, the third category is the most extensive one. It is about voices sources in the article. This would help to understand the connection between the opinion about EaP and sources used in the article. This category has two subcategories

1. Media quoted/referred to

2. Officials/experts/citizens voices

The first subcategory consists of variables about whether there are any media quoted or referred to (Armenian, Russian, EU, other Eastern Partnership countries, or other countries media). The values are ‘yes’, ‘no’ and ‘can’t be determined’.

The same is with the second subcategory that includes variables about voices in the article (politicians/officials, experts, citizens and business representatives). I created variables for each case separately, i.e. Armenian experts and Russian experts are presented in separate variables etc (see Appendix 1).

Here I was following the idea which Deacon (1999) brings about actors being coded. He mentions that if a person just appears on the context of other people’s comments, she/he should not be counted as an actor in the item. Rather, they need to be active subjects in the content: being quoted, pictured or described independently of other actors (p. 122).
3.4. Limitations of the study

First, after conducting a content analysis and extending time from two to twelve months, I found more material that could be used for the CDA and I could have mixed the methods, which would help my study to have stronger methodological base, the lack of time did not let me do that. However, as Bryman mentions, “mixed method should not be considered as an approach that is universally compliable or as a panacea” (2012, p. 649).

Second, this research is made on online media, which gives an opportunity to read comments after the articles which can give lots of interesting and relevant information for the analysis. But, unfortunately just one media, out of four, had that option. To compensate this I added a unit ‘citizens voices’ in the code book. Though, this is not the same and can’t replace the opinions of the readers.

3.5. Generalizability, validity, and reliability

Generalizability in quantitative research, according to Bryman (2012, p. 176), is the ability to say that the results of the research can be generalized beyond one particular research and be relevant to the whole population.

Nevertheless, the study is based on the material from the archives of the most, or almost the most popular online media in these two countries with the biggest portion of coverage of the Eastern Partnership program (this played crucial role on choosing these particular four websites) and the
sample of 144 articles within the period of 1 year is quite representative to say interesting things about the coverage of EaP. Furthermore, have a totality sample for those newspapers and the time period which let us state that generalizability is not necessary for this study.

At the very beginning of the analysis, a pilot study was conducted. Furthermore, as it was already mentioned, by the end of the study a reliability test was done by involving a native Russian speaker Global Journalism student. During the reliability test, 30 articles were tried, which is 20% of all articles. Furthermore, as there are 34 variables in the coding book it means that during the test 1020 variables were checked. The agreement between my results and Maria’s was almost 91%. Thus, the test-retest method (Bryman, 2012, p. 168) allows us to assert that the results of the study are reliable. Furthermore, as reliability is concerned with issues of consistency of the measures (ibid.), I can state, that anyone else could make this analysis and come to the same results.

Moreover, due to big number of sampling units and the fact that the results were scrupulously retrieved manually from the archives of the websites and were analyzed by the SPSS program which is very reliable, as it has been in existence from the mid-1960s and is possibly the most widely used computer software for the analysis of quantitative data for social scientists (Bryman, 2012, p. 354), the study is reliable as well.

As Bryman says, “The term ‘reliability’ and ‘validity’ seem to be almost synonymous, they have quite different meanings in relation to the evaluation of measures of concepts” and “the issue of measurement validity has to do with whether a measure of concepts really measures that concept”. However, Bryman brings the point that although this two terms are distinguished analytically, validity and reliability are related to each other, as “validity presumes reliability” (2012, pp. 168-173).

Also, as before conducting this study I had some research on the Eastern Partnership from different perspectives, i.e. Armenia, Russia, EU etc. I am aware of the political aspects of the program as well as political and cultural relations between the countries of the Eastern Partnership. As well as choice of the right method and material will also contribute to the validity of the study.
4. Results and Analysis

The chapter consists of two main parts: Results and Analysis of the content analysis. In the first part, I will deal with each section of the codebook separately, and I will start with the more general questions like the date of publication, media name, genres of articles etc.

In addition, in the second part I will analyze these results by the research questions sequence.

4.1. Results of the content analysis

4.1.1. General questions

As it was already mentioned 144 items from two Armenian and two Russian online media were sampled from a period of 1 year, i.e. 01.06.11 – 31.05.12. As the figures show, from the total number of 144 articles, the biggest portion of the articles have News.am – 55, which is 38.19% of all articles, then Ria.ru – 31 articles, which is 21.53%, 1in.am - 30 articles or 20.83% and the least quantity has Vz.ru – 28 articles, which is 19.44% of all the sampled items. Thus, the total amount of items per country is following: Armenia – 85 articles (59.0%) and Russia – 59 articles (41%).
After the quantity of the material, the tendency in dates of publications should be also presented. As the graph shows, there are minor fluctuations in the coverage of the EaP during the chosen period, with the dramatic change at the end of September – beginning of October, the time, when the summit of Eastern Partnership was taking place in Warsaw, Poland.

For me, as a researcher, it was interesting to see what types of news were mostly used to cover the program. As results show the majority of articles are either hard\(^1\) or soft\(^2\) news. Thus,

1. Hard news – 68 or 47,2%
2. Soft news – 52 or 36,1%
3. Reportage – 4 or 2,8%
4. Interview – 8 or 5.6%
5. Analysis – 12 or 8,3%

According to numbers, the main topics of the analyzed articles are: Eastern Partnership 35.4%, EU-Armenia relations – 16.7%, Russia-EU relations – 3.5 %, EU-Eastern Partnership countries related - 19.4%, Mixed – 25.0%.

\(^1\) If the article does not contain any additional information but just some facts – I considered it as Hard news
\(^2\) If the article contains additional information like background but not just facts – I considered it as Soft news
The next variables to be analyzed are those, which show the quantity of the articles according to the question ‘How Eastern Partnership is presented in the articles’ for all possible parties involved directly or indirectly in the program.

If we look at the general picture of all the media, we will see that for Armenia EaP is presented in quite positive way. Although, the big amount of articles has nothing mentioned about whether the program is positive or negative for Armenia particularly. But let’s analyze each media separately:

Thus, according to Figure 5. and Figure 6., in News.am 47.27% of the articles do not show any attitude to the program, while in lin.am this percentage is 50%. At the same time, in News.am 27.27% and in lin.am 26.67% of articles represent the program in a positive way. Furthermore, 23.64% of items in News.am and 16.67% in lin.am demonstrate neutral attitude.

\[ \text{Figure 3. The Eastern Partnership is presented for Armenia particularly. N-144.} \]

\[ \text{Figure 4. The Eastern Partnership is presented for Armenia particularly in News.am. N- 55} \]
towards the program. And, just 1.82% of articles in *News.am* present Eastern Partnership in a negative way. Whereas, this number in *1in.am* is 3.33%. Moreover, while in *News.am* there are no articles with contradictory opinion, in *1in.am*, I found just one article, that is 3.33%.

In Russian media, as one would expect, less articles contain opinions about the EaP, related to Armenia. Thus, as Figure 7. and Figure 8. show, in *Ria.ru*, in 64.52% of articles, there is nothing mentioned about whether the program is good or bad for Armenia. In *Vz.ru* this number is 89.29%.

At the same time, 29.03% of the articles in *Ria.ru* see Eastern Partnership as a positive program for Armenia. While, in *Vz.ru* this proportion is much less, just 7.14%. Neutral are 6.45% of the news items in *Ria.ru* and 3.57% in *Vz.ru*. Moreover, there is no negative or contradictory attitude towards the EaP for Armenia in both media at all.
The next case is about how the Eastern Partnership is presented for Russia particularly. The results of the analysis show that there is the same tendency in coverage of EaP for Russia as for Armenia. Hence, the big majority of articles (88.2%) do not contain any opinion about Eastern Partnership in relation to Russia. Moreover, there is no article, which contains any positive attitude towards the Eastern Partnership and Russia particularly.

If we look at media separately, the picture will be the following:

In News.am, according to Figure 10., there is nothing mentioned in 92.73% of articles. In lin.am (Figure 11.) – 80%. Furthermore, I could not find any articles with the positive opinion about the program related to Russia. Moreover, 3.64% in...
News.am and 16.67% in lin.am see the EaP as a negative initiative for Russia. While in lam there no articles with neutral opinion, in News.am this category takes 3.64%. Conversely, while there are no contradictory articles in News.am, in lin.am this number is 3.33%.

In Russian media, the picture is similar to Armenian. As I already mentioned there are no articles where one could find any positive opinion about EaP in context of the Russian interests. In addition, like in Armenian case, most of the articles do not contain any opinion or attitude at all; in Ria.ru it is 90.32% of the articles and in Vz.ru it is 85.71%. At the same time, in Ria.ru 9.68% and in Vz.ru 7.14% of articles contain negativism. Moreover, Ria.ru has no neutral or contradictory articles, while Vz.ru contains neutral and contradictory opinions about EaP in relation to Russia in 3.57% of items in each category.
Now, let’s pay our attention to the next case, namely how the Eastern Partnership is represent in Armenian and Russian media in context of EU interests³.

Figure 13. The Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for EU particularly. N - 144

As one can notice from the Figure 14., from the point of view of the EU interests EaP presented in a more positive way, compare to previous two cases. As bar chart shows, there are no negative opinions about the EaP in terms of EU interests in all media, except for one article published in News.am, which is 0.69% of all 144 analyzed articles.

³ I.e. if we look from the EU perspective. Whether the program presented as something good for EU.
More detailed picture looks as follows:
In *News.am*, according to Figure 15., positive are 25.45% of all articles. Negative and contradictory opinions are 1.82% each. Quite high percentage of neutral articles exists as well – 34.55%. In addition, 36.36% of all the articles published in *News.am* contain no attitude toward the program.

At the same time we can find a bit different picture in another Armenian media – *1in.am* where the proportion of positive articles is quite high.

Thus, 50% of articles have positive attitude to the EaP in terms of EU interests. At the same time, there is no single article that would contain any negativism. As it can be seen from the table, 6.67% of articles have contradictory opinion about the program. Moreover, in 33.33% of articles there is nothing mentioned about the program from EU perspective.
Moving to Russian media, we can see that in Ria.ru 50.61% of the articles are neutral. While, 29.03% are positive, there are 3.23% articles that contain negativism in the coverage of the EaP if we look from EU perspective. And, finally, in 16.13% of articles there is no attitude to the program at all.

Finally, in Vz.ru one can see that like in Ria.ru there are no articles with negativism towards the program from the point of EU interests. Moreover, the proportion of positive articles is 28.57%. Neutral – 17.86%. Different (Contradictory) opinion exists in 10.71% of articles and there is no opinion in 42.86%.

And the last but not the least, is the results of the analysis of how the Eastern Partnership is presented in those four media in context of the interests of other countries involved in the EaP, i.e. Georgia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Ukraine and Moldova. Thus, results are the following:
As it can be seen from the Figure 19., there is quite positive attitude to the program from the point of EaP countries interests in all four media.

More precisely in *News.am* positive articles are 21.82%, negative – 1.82% and neutral - 29.09%. At the same time there are 3.64% articles, which contain different opinions about the EaP. And, the big part of the articles do not contain any attitude towards the program from.
In its turn, in *lin.am*, according to Figure 21., the percentage of positive articles is – 46.67%, which is twice more than in *News.am*. Moreover, 3.33% of articles are negative. Neutral articles make 13.33% of the total amount of articles. Different (contradictory) – 6.67%. And Nothing mentioned – 30%

Figure 20. The Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for EaP countries overall in lin.am. N = 30

Now, let us move on to the next two media – *Ria.ru* and *Vz.ru*.

Thus in *Ria.ru*, as it can be seen on the Figure 22., the percentage of positive articles in the context of EaP countries interests is quite high as well – 48.39%. Moreover, *Ria.ru* has no negative articles. At the same time, 25.81% of articles contain neutral opinion. 6.45% - different (contradictory) and 19.35% of all the articles published in *Ria.ru* have no opinion or attitude towards the program.

Figure 21. The Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for EaP countries overall in Ria.ru. N= 31
If we look at Figure 23, we can see that the proportion of the articles with different variables is more or less equal, compare to other media. However, if we compare to other Russian media where the positive attitude was in 48.39%, in Vz.ru positive opinion exists in 25% of all articles, i.e. twice less than in Ria.ru. Negative in 7.14%. Neutral – 21.43%. Different (contradictory opinions) in 17.86%. And the last but not the least, 28.57% of all the articles published in Vz.ru contain no attitude towards the program if we look from the EaP countries perspective.

4.1.2. Voices and Sources in the articles

As it was already mentioned earlier, this is the most extensive part of the analysis. Here I will bring the results of the analysis of such categories as ‘media quoted/referred to’ and ‘officials/experts/citizens voices’.

Media quoted/referred to

According to Table 3., Armenian media were used just in 5 articles out of 144., which is 3.5%. Thus, News.am and l1in.am quoted or referred to another Armenian media in 1 article each, which is 1.8% and 3.3% respectively within the media name and 1.4% of all 144 articles.
At the same time, this number in *Ria.ru* is 9.7% within the media name or 2.08% of all articles. And in *Vz.ru*, there are no articles with the indication of Armenian media at all.

In total, Armenian media sources were used in 3.5% of articles out of 144.

In case of Russian media quoted or referred to the picture is following:

Armenian *News.am* used Russian sources in 3 articles which is 5.5% within the media name or 2.1% of total 144.

At the same time, 1in.am used Russian sources in 5 articles or in 16.7% of its articles (3.5% of total). While, *Ria.ru* has no reference to Russian media at all and in opposite, *Vz.ru* has the highest percentage of items where Russian media used as a source, i.e. 60.7% of all articles, which is 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Armenian media quoted/referred to</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, Russian media were quoted or referred to in 25 articles or in 17.4% of total published articles in those four media.

Unlike to two previous examples, EU media were used as sources for information by all four media. Though, the number of that kind of articles is not high. Thus, the most EU media were mentioned in \textit{1in.am} – 8 articles, which is 26.7% within the media name and 5.6% of total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Russian media quoted/referred to. N - 144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. EU media quoted/referred to. N - 144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the other Armenian informational website News.am used European media sources in 3.6% of its articles. Within the Russian Ria.ru and Vz.ru, this proportion is 16.1% and 17.9% respectively.

In total, EU media were quoted or referred to in 13.9% of 144 articles.

In terms of the usage of other EaP countries media sources in four analyzed media, the picture is following. As the Table 6. shows, the highest rate of it belongs to News.am and 1in.am, which used those sources in 23.6% and 30% cases correspondingly within the media names. At the same time in Ria.ru this proportion is 12.9% and in Vz.ru – 10.7%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>News.am</th>
<th>1in.am</th>
<th>Ria.ru</th>
<th>Vz.ru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. Other EaP country media quoted/referred to. N - 144

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other EaP country media quoted/referred to</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Media name</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In total, in 20.1% of all 144 articles, other Eastern Partnership countries media were quoted or used as sources.

Finally, the last case is about the other countries media.

### Table 7. Other country media quoted/referred to. N - 144

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Other country media quoted/referred to</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the figure 12 shows, the usage of other countries media is very low; however, it appears in all four media. Thus, just 7 articles contain any reference to other countries media, which is 4.9% of all articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Media name</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voices

Now, let us turn the look to the analysis of voices that appear in the analyzed articles. Here, I will not present the results one by one; rather, I will present the general numbers of the voices that exist in all four media. The numbers are based on the Tables 12-19 (see Appendix 3).

Thus, Armenian politicians and officials voices are present in 24.3% of all analyzed items. However, Vz.ru is the only media that does not contain voices of Armenian politicians or officials.

Moreover, nearly the same picture appears to us in case of the existence of Armenian experts voices in those media. Thus, again Vz.ru is the only medium that has 0 articles with aforementioned voices. While, the rest of media presents the voices of Armenian experts in 3.5% cases.

Coming to the voices of citizens and business representatives, I should state the there are no voices of citizens or business representatives in all four media. Moreover, it relates not only to Armenian citizens but to all other cases as well. I.e. there are no Russian, EU, EaP or other countries citizens or business representatives’ voices at all.
Some few numbers of Russian politicians and officials appear in analyzed articles, except for News.am. Thus, the proportion is only in 2.8% of total items.

The same proportion can be seen in the quantity of articles that contain Russian experts’ voices. However, in this occasion 1in.am does not have anything mentioned.

As one can see, European Union officials and politicians are the ones that appeared in the articles more than others did.

Thus, 82 (56.9%), articles from total 144 contain voices of EU officials or politicians. Remember, that in case of Armenians this number was 24.3% and Russians 2.8%. From this number 28 or 19.4% of all articles were published in News.am, 18 (12.5%) in 1in.am, 21 or 14.6% in Ria.ru and 15 (10.4%) in Vz.ru

Figures demonstrate that unlike big number of the EU officials and politicians that have their voices in the articles, the number of EU experts is quite small. Just 5.6% of articles contain EU experts’ voices.

Other EaP countries officials and politicians have their voices in 25.7% of articles. While this number, in case of experts, is just 2.1%.

Other countries politicians/officials appear in 1.4% of articles and experts in 3.5%.
One of the main goals of the study was to observe how the sources and voices used in articles influence the way of coverage of the EaP. As EU officials and politicians present in more than half of the articles let us see how these sources influence the coverage, namely, are the articles with EU officials and politicians more positive or negative?

Table 8., shows how the EaP is presented for Armenia in the articles that contain EU

**Table 8. Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for Armenia particularly * EU politicians/officials Crosstabulation. N - 82**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU politicians/officials</th>
<th>Positve</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Different (contradictory) opinions</th>
<th>Nothing mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media name</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
politicians/officials voices. Thus, as it can be seen, 52.4% of articles contain no opinion about the program. Moreover, while there is no single article with negative attitude towards the program in all 82 selected articles, 30.5% of articles are positive, neutral are 15.9% and just one article have contradictory opinion, which is 1.2% of 82 articles in total.

The next case is how the EaP is presented for Russia in the articles that contain EU politicians/officials voices.

Table 9. *Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for Russia particularly* *EU politicians/officials Crosstabulation. N - 82*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU politicians/officials</th>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Different (contradictory) opinions</th>
<th>Nothing mentioned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>News.am</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table 9. shows that 75 articles (91.5%) from 82 do not have any opinion included in the texts. At the same time there are 7 articles that contain opinion: 6 of which are positive and 1 negative. In addition, there are no articles with neutral or different/contradictory opinion.

The following Table 10. shows the results of crosstabulations, which shows how EaP is presented in the articles that contain EU officials/politicians voices.

Table 10. Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for EU particularly * EU politicians/officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Different (contradictory) opinions</th>
<th>Nothing mentioned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As one can notice, there are no negative articles at all. From 82 articles, 35 are positive, that is 42.7%. Neutral are 28 or 34.1% of articles. 4 articles contain different/contradictory opinion and, unlike previous cases, the number of the articles that do not contain any attitude towards the program is relatively low – 33.3% out of 82 articles. As it can be seen, the highest portion of positive articles has lin.am – 14 or 17.07% of all articles. And the lowest is Ria.ru with 6 articles.

And the last is the analysis of how EaP is presented in the articles that contain EU officials/politicians voices for other EaP countries.

Table 11. Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for EaP countries overall * EU politicians/officials Crosstabulation. N - 144

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU politicians/officials</th>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Different (contradictory) opinions</th>
<th>Nothing mentioned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>News.am</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like in the previous case, here negative articles are absent and there is a big number of positive ones – 35 or 42.7% of all 82 articles. Simultaneously, 20.7% are neutral. 7.3% - different/contradictory and 29.3% - nothing mentioned.
4.2. Discussion of results

As it was stated above, in this section, I will analyze the results of the content analysis by the research questions order.

Is coverage more positive or more negative towards the program and how do these tendencies relate to media from different nations?

The analysis of the representation of the Eastern Partnership program was conducted from the different angles. I tried to understand how the EaP was presented in both Armenian and Russian media from Armenian, Russian, EU, EaP and other countries perspective separately.

As the results of the content analysis showed the majority of the articles in both Armenian and Russian media do not express their attitude towards the EaP. However, if in the articles there were any opinions about the Eastern Partnership, they were mostly positive. The exception was the Russian case. Thus, while EaP was seen as something positive for Armenia, EU and other EaP countries, there was no positive attitude towards the program in context of the Russian interests. Moreover, just 25% of all articles where negativism is presented, were published in Russian media. However, as I already mentioned, the main tendency for negative coverage is seen from the Russian perspective.

So, what is the purpose of presenting EaP in the negative way for Russia. From my point of view, the reason is political. Russian official and political scientists repeatedly stated that the Eastern Partnership was seen as a treat for the Russia. As I already mentioned in the theoretical part of the thesis, countries that are involved in this program are in the immediate sphere of its influence and interest, thus Russia is concerned about the program developing in its neighborhood.

Moreover, as during the Eastern Partnership summit, which was held in Warsaw on 29-30 September 2011, the frequency of articles about Eastern Partnership rose rapidly, the results of the summit and events that took place during those days reflected the coverage. Thus, Belarus has refused to participate at the recent summit of Eastern Partnership in Warsaw. By Belarusian side the reason for this demarche was the refusal by organizers to invite Alexander Lukashenko to participate in the summit.
However, in the Warsaw summit's final declaration was expressed deep concern about the deteriorating human rights situation and the lack of freedom of speech in Belarus. The document is a call for the immediate release and rehabilitation of all political prisoners, as well as the beginning of political dialogue with the opposition. Also, was expressed concern over the fact that Belarusian authorities deny access of political prisoners to relatives and lawyers as well as to medical care while being put under psychological and physical pressure (Joint Declaration of the Eastern Partnership Summit in Warsaw, 2011).

It is noteworthy that in the Declaration, criticizing Belarus, stressed that it is adopted by The Heads of State and Government and representatives of the EU and its member states. But it is hushed up the fact that all five former Soviet republics are included in the Eastern Partnership, categorically refused to put their signatures to this document. The presidents of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine, thus expressed solidarity with Aleksandr Lukashenko. Therefore, the document on Belarus was not included in the summit's final declaration as a resolution approved in the format "27 plus 5" (the EU member states and five countries of the former USSR included in Eastern Partnership). And in the end, this paper has been accepted in the form of the Declaration on behalf of the European Union but not of the Eastern Partnership.

During the analysis, I noticed that this problem was presented in many articles. Moreover, Belarus is in a very close relationship with Russian Federation and, for example, Russian Vz.ru, in many cases, was covering the EaP from the Russian-Belarusian perspective.

Thus, in relation to the research question the following conclusion should be done. There is no difference in the way of coverage of the EaP in media from different nations in general. However, there is difference in coverage from the different angles. Thus, while in one article EaP can be presented in a positive way for Armenia, from Russian perspective it could be negative or contradictory.

**How do tendencies to the program relate to the use of sources of different national or international belonging and what is the importance of other media as sources to the coverage?**
Within the number of articles that were analyzed in this study, it was found that many sources from different countries were used for covering the Eastern Partnership issue. But how do they relate to the tendencies of coverage?

As it was seen from the results of the content analysis, the European Union officials and politicians are the ones that appeared in the articles more than others did. As the figures showed, this influenced the way of coverage of the Eastern Partnership program. For instance, EU officials/politicians present in 82 articles or 56.9% of total 144. Moreover, in all four media one could find negativism just when he looks from the Russian perspective. In other cases the coverage was mainly positive. The explanation for that, from my point of view, is that as Eastern Partnership is initiated by the European Union and EU officials in their speeches and comments praise the program and present it as very important issue for the EU and its Eastern partners.

In addition, as the majority of the articles are either hard or soft news items, in many cases the words of sources were not analyzed but were just quoted. Nevertheless, many times I found the same sources to be used in those media. Moreover, in many cases those media were just copying the story from other media and presenting it with the reference to the original article. Thus, from my point of view, this left its mark in the tendencies of the coverage of Eastern Partnership program.

How salient is the Eastern Partnership program in the selected media?

As, for sampling of the articles I used exact phrase search, all articles were somehow related to the Eastern Partnership. In 35.4% of the items, the Eastern Partnership was the main topic of the article. In those cases, the Eastern Partnership was presented in a general way, i.e. its aim, history, general information about the parties involved in the project etc. However, even if the main topic was EU and other countries relationship, one still could find some information about the program itself.

On the other hand, when I was sampling the material for the analysis, I was expecting to find more articles related to the Eastern Partnership. Perhaps, after the EU will solve its internal problems connected to the financial crisis, it would pay more attention to the program and thus, the EaP itself will become more popular issue for media.
To conclude, it should be mentioned that Eastern Partnership does not take the central position in the media both in Armenia and Russia, but as we saw from the results, when something important, like summit in Warsaw, is happening, Eastern Partnership becomes more popular issue for the coverage and analysis.

5. Conclusions

Summing up, it should be mentioned that the hypothesis put forward at the beginning of the thesis was partly proved. Thus, after doing some research on the relevant literature for the Eastern Partnership, I came to conclusion that Russian authorities and political scientists were seeing the Eastern Partnership as a threat to Russian national security. Furthermore, Russians see the territory of former Soviet Union, as a place for their traditional interests and they are not ready to let any other political actors take the leading position in the region. Thus, from the aforementioned conclusions I was assuming that the same mood of skepticism and negativism towards the Eastern Partnership was prevailing in the Russian media.

As the results of the analysis showed, the Eastern Partnership is not presented as a negative program or threat for Russia in general. However, if we look at the results in all four media from the position of ‘How the Eastern Partnership is presented for Russia particularly’, we will not find any positive opinions neither in Russian nor in Armenian media. Moreover, as my observations showed, one of the reasons for this tendency is that the majority of the articles are either hard or soft news, where there are not presented opinions of the author or the experts. However, there are differences in the coverage between two Russian media. I would suggest for the further studies to go deeper into the context of the texts and based on the results of the content analysis to conduct discourse analysis as well. This will give more opportunities to answer research questions more detailed. Moreover, from my point of view, it would be very interesting to analyze the coverage of Eastern Partnership program in all six countries.
Moreover, one very important point should be mentioned. This study is based on the previous researches that have political, economic, cultural orientation and this research opens new perspectives from the point of view of media and communication. There are no previous research in this field, which makes very difficult the results with others, but, in the other hand, it makes the study unique.

The results showed that there is no media system in the world, which is not affected by the governments, societies, businesses. As Nossek states, “Critical theory researchers, like their professional theory colleagues, believe that one cannot separate professional considerations from the domestic/national climate in which the journalist functions” (2004, p. 347). Thus, while in Armenia no one sees the EaP a treat for the Armenian state, moreover, Armenian government chose the way of Eurointegration, Russian politicians claim the EU for being ambitious in the traditional area of Russian interests. This influenced the media that operate in those countries. Yet, for some segments of Armenian society, it will be very hard to overcome traditional way of thinking and keep the path of European integration. However, as it was mentioned, the process of globalization cannot be stopped. And, as Beterson states, “when it comes to the modern state and its future, […] it will be more or less radically transformed, and its capacity for action is severely circumscribed by global structures and processes” (2000, p. 188). Thus, Armenia will have to adopt the rules of the globalizing world.

In addition, I would like to say, that the goal of the study was achieved: I explored the coverage of the European Union Eastern Partnership program in Armenian and Russian media, and more particularly analyzed similarities and differences between media from these two countries in relation to the diverse contemporary political and cultural contexts. As the issue of Eastern Partnership had not been studied by scientists from the point of view of media, my thesis aims was to fill this gap and open new perspectives for the further researches in media field. From my point of view, the goal was achieved.
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Appendix 1: Code book

General questions:

I. Media by country:
   1. Armenia
   2. Russia

II. Media name:
   1. News.am
   2. 1in.am
   3. Ria.ru
   4. Vz.ru

III. Date of publication:

With six digits, day/month/year (01.09.11)

IV. Type of the news article:

   6. Hard news
   7. Soft news
   8. Reportage
   9. Interview
  10. Analysis

V. Story relevance. The main topic/focus of the article:

   1. Eastern Partnership
2. EU-Armenia relations
3. Russia-EU relations
4. EU-Eastern Partnership countries related
5. Other

VI. Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for Armenia particularly
   1. Positive
   2. Negative
   3. Neutral
   4. Different (contradictory) opinions
   5. Nothing mentioned

VII. Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for Russia particularly
    1. Positive
    2. Negative
    3. Neutral
    4. Different (contradictory) opinions
    5. Nothing mentioned

VIII. Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for EU particularly
      1. Positive
      2. Negative
      3. Neutral
      4. Different (contradictory) opinions
      5. Nothing mentioned

IX. Eastern Partnership is presented in the article: for EaP countries overall
    1. Positive
    2. Negative
    3. Neutral
    4. Different (contradictory) opinions
    5. Nothing mentioned
Voices/ Sources in the article:

Media quoted/referred to:

X. Armenian media quoted/referred to
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Can't be determined

XI. Russian media quoted/referred to
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Can't be determined

XII. EU media quoted/referred to
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. Can't be determined

XIII. Other EaP country media quoted/referred to
      1. Yes
      2. No
      3. Can't be determined

XIV. Other country media quoted/referred to
     1. Yes
     2. No
     3. Can't be determined
Officials/experts/citizens voices

XV. Armenian politicians/officials
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Can't be determined

XVI. Armenian expert(s)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Can't be determined

XVII. Armenian citizen(s)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Can't be determined

XVIII. Armenian business representative(s)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Can't be determined

XIX. Russian politicians/officials
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Can't be determined

XX. Russian expert(s)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Can't be determined

XXI. Russian citizen(s)
   1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXII. Russian business representative(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXIII. EU politicians/officials
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXIV. EU expert(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXV. EU citizen(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXVI. EU business representative(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXVII. Other EaP country politicians/officials
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXVIII. Other EaP country expert(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXIX. Other EaP country citizen(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXX. Other EaP country business representative(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXXI. Other country politicians/officials
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXXII. Other country expert(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXXIII. Other country citizen(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined

XXXIV. Other country business representative(s)
1. Yes
2. No
3. Can't be determined
Appendix 2: List of articles

01.06.11 – 31.05.12

News.am


1in.am

56. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_6575.html
57. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_8004.html
60. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_9174.html
63. http://www.1in.am/rus/armenia_apolitics_9823.html
64. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_10032.html
65. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_10093.html
68. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_10148.html
69. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_10218.html
70. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_10288.html
72. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_feopinion_10611.html
73. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_10837.html
74. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_feopinion_11045.html
75. http://www.1in.am/rus/armenia_apolitics_11354.html
76. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_11681.html
77. http://www.1in.am/rus/armenia_interview_11751.html
78. http://www.1in.am/rus/scaucasus_sgeorgia_12260.html
80. http://www.1in.am/rus/armenia_apoliticsworld_14807.html
81. http://www.1in.am/rus/armenia_apoliticsworld_14813.html
82. http://www.1in.am/rus/armenia_apoliticsworld_15189.html
83. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_15461.html
84. http://www.1in.am/rus/scaucasus_sazerbaijan_17313.html
85. http://www.1in.am/rus/foreign_fregion_17686.html

Ria.ru


88

Vz.ru

### Appendix 3. Graphs and tables.

#### Table 12. Armenian politicians/officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Armenian politicians/officials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 13. Armenian expert(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Armenian expert(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media name</td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14. Russian politicians/officials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Russian politicians/officials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15. Russian expert(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Russian expert(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media name</td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. EU politicians/officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>EU politicians/officials</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17. EU expert(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>EU expert(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>can't be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18. Other EaP country politicians/officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Other EaP country politicians/officials</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>can't be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media name</td>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Other EaP country expert(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media name</th>
<th>Other EaP country expert(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News.am</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1in.am</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria.ru</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vz.ru</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Media name</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>