

ABSTRACT

The current study aims at looking at the mass media activities of Armenian political parties. Mass media activities not related to elections are analyzed. How the management of these activities is organized, what kinds of resources are used and what are the various goals of those activities are discussed. Through interviewing media managers of the main political parties the study tries to find out the current stage of affairs.

Through interviews with the officials of ten of Armenia's most important political parties, their self-assessments of the results of media activities is identified. As the findings show Armenian political parties' media experts are doing a poor job. They are not professionals in media relations and they have no means of self education because of the lack of appropriate Armenian literature and because of lack of concern with media activities by high level party officials.

The communist past of the country also carries some burden of responsibility for the current situation of media affairs of Armenian political parties. People who are in charge of media affairs in political parties do not understand the power of mass media to set public agendas and to transform voter preferences into public policy. Consequently they cannot use mass media in the best interest of their parties.

The media themselves are politicized. This further complicates the matter, making it more difficult access mass media for different political parties who have non-professionals in charge of media affairs. Not all political parties have equal access to the public media financed from the state budget.

Almost all political parties mention in their party goals the achievement of democratic values in Armenia. However, with the current limited understanding of the role of mass media in a democratic system it seems that we as a country have a long way to go before the establishment of democratic systems of governance and public opinion formation and participation in Armenia.

INTRODUCTION

It is almost ten years that Armenia has moved from a one party system to multi-party one. Unquestionably, it is hard to imagine democracy without the normal functioning of a multi-party political system. From this vantage point the current state of the political party system in the country is one of utmost importance. Particularly interesting is the accessibility of political parties to political communication processes. The current paper examines media management affairs of Armenian political parties, their resources and strategies used in dealing with mass media, and their goals and purposes of different media related activities.

Political parties serve multiple functions: for example, organizing and mobilizing campaigns, connecting civil and political society, and articulating and aggregating disparate interests. In a representative democracy the role of the mass media becomes extremely important. In an age of “mass society,” political parties need highly professional skills and strategies in dealing with mass media in order to reach members of mass society and to properly exert their functions. It is much easier to reach people through television channels, newspapers or radio than to develop a huge party organization for mobilizing voters and persuading or simply informing them about a party’s activities. Mancini (1999) goes even so far as to call modern political parties “communication machines” for getting more votes, influencing political decision-making and using communication specialists to achieve political ends. The changing nature of political parties brings to decline of importance of party organization and increase of role of communication specialists. The decline in the strength of party organizations and increased role of media specialists and political reporters is noticed also by Karbel (1995) as one of the factors contributing to the changing nature of political coverage over time.

After independence Armenia was not prepared for the problems of statehood. However there was a strong base for a multi-party system in Armenia. The Communist Party of Armenia (CPA) continued to function. In 1991, the Democratic Party of Armenia was created, which was a separated part of the CPA. In 1997 another splinter group of CPA formed called the United Progressive Communist Party of Armenia. Furthermore, Armenian Diaspora parties such as the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), the Ramkavar-Azatakan party and the Hnchakian party set up branches in Armenia. Also, the “Karabagh” Committee and Karabagh movement gave rise to Pan-Armenian Movement (HHSh), which took power as the ruling regime from 1990 through 1998 when it was forced to step down and later divided into smaller parties.

However in post-communist Armenia political parties only marginally fulfill their functions. Parties do not straggle for ultimate political power. After any election political life almost dies and parties disappear from political arena. As a consequence none of the political parties has support of majority of Armenian electorate. There is no powerful political party supporting the President, and there is no party or block that has majority of votes in the National Assembly. Although some parties clime that they have up to 50 thousand members, these numbers is difficult to check. Furthermore, low support of electorate in 1999 NA election makes one to doubt the credibility of these figures.

Different reasons contribute to the weakness of Armenian political parties or party organizations. They can be financial, human, technical or other. Almost all parties’ members bear the burden of communist past. They may lack necessary political skills, professionalism in media management, financial or other resources for developing their party organization or pursuing their party goals. For example, Panebianco (1988) suggests that the historical conditions of their birth often influence on the shaping of particular organizational structure of a

party, and there can be a time lag as institutions respond to the changing environment. Strong political parties who “professionally” exert their functions will be strong bases for emerging Armenian democracy. Any research that can help to find out the weaknesses of political parties and propose proper policy recommendations for overcoming them will be a great contribution to democracy- building processes in Armenia. The study’s objective is to identify some of the above-mentioned weaknesses of political parties, and give potential recommendations for overcoming them, and developing strong multi-party system in Armenia.

For the above-mentioned purpose the following research questions are the focus of this study:

1. What are the different goals of Armenian political parties’ media activities?
2. What kind of strategies do they use to achieve their media related goals?
3. To what extent do the media relations specialists of Armenian political parties understand the power of public opinion?
4. What kind of resources do they have for media activities?
5. Is there any relationship between the percent of votes political parties got during 1999 NA elections and their resources for mass media activities?
6. What is the relationship between the media communication resources of political parties and their media related goals?
7. What is the self-assessment of those in charge of media communication activities about the results of their work?
8. What is the relationship of the history of political parties and their media related goals/resources?

9. Is there any relationship between the work done by political parties with mass media and their level of access to mass media?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In recent years developments in different communication technologies combined with the processes of catalyzed social change and new division of the world have fundamentally altered the character of political parties, party organizations and even political systems in general. “Interact or die” is the imperative of party politics according to Dr. Ian Benson (1997), a British computer scientist. Dr. Benson refers only to electronic information and communication systems used by political parties. However, all kind of communication activities of political parties are important for achieving specific party goals and objectives.

New levels of professionalism have become a necessity for political parties. In his analyses of party development in Great Britain, Wring (1996) argues that “professionalism” is an important catalyst for party change. The first person to speak about the professionalization of politics was the prominent sociologist, Max Weber, in 1977. However, the Weberian view or definition of political professionals has changed over time (Mancini, 1999). Now political professionals are the media experts, public relations exports, pollsters and political consultants (Panebianco, 1982).

The changing pattern of political professionals implies another development in the nature of political parties from “mass parties” to “electoral professional party” (Mancini, 1999). When “mass parties” are identified as having strong ideological bases and high level of grassroots participation, the new party has one main function: to collect votes at election time. New forms of communication make the later goal possible with less effort. However, they essentially

supplement rather than replace older ones. For example political parties for modern campaigns use Internet or television for their party election broadcasts or other purposes. Nevertheless, they also use old communication techniques like leafleting or meetings with the electorate.

One recent study shows that the role of party organization is decreasing and the role of campaign professionals and political consultants is increasing in US (Plasser, 2001). The history of political marketing in Britain is difficult to find in official party sources, because the candidates, at least in public, did not believe in the power “marketing man” (Wring, 1996). However, the most informed political commentators now view the “marketing man” as one, able to dictate the likely source of events in modern electoral process. Another cross-national study of election campaigning shows clear similarities in campaign styles across the world (Farrell, 1998). Farrell has come to this conclusion by analyzing the work of American and British campaign consultants in other developed and developing countries. He gives three main reasons for this phenomenon: “Americanization” or “Modernization,” the transnationalization of political parties like the Greens or Socialists, and political aid to developing countries and its consequences. The countries that give political aid want to foster their own political practices in the receiving countries. This implies that the above mentioned trends and developments in some way or another have their reflection in Armenia also. One of the major tasks of this current research is to find out what is the situation in this regard in Armenia.

Campaigns are the highest point of exposure to cross cutting political viewpoints because media provide the opportunity for citizens to know as much conflicting viewpoints about different political forces as possible. In political theory and practice there is almost unanimous agreement among social scientists that exposure to different political views is good for democracy (Mutz, 2001). As Mutz argues, media surpasses interpersonal communication and

provides more opportunities for people to be exposed to cross cutting political perspectives. She claims that people are more willing to expose themselves to conflicting opinions through media to avoid social pressure or discomfort because of public disagreement. In contrast, the research presented later in this study indicates that Armenian political parties' media experts put more stress on personal communications and influence without understanding that using that strategy will force many people to stay indifferent in politics.

METODOLOGY

The purpose of the current paper is to look at the mass media activities of Armenian political parties. The focus of this research is media activities of political parties not related to elections. Mass media activities are defined as all work with television, print media (specifically daily newspapers), radio, and the Internet.

The following study employs descriptive research. The units of analysis in this research study are information/communication units of Armenian political parties. The study sample is purposefully selected to include all political parties or blocks that got at least 5% support of the electorate during the 1999 National Assembly elections. However, it also includes two parties that did not pass the 5% barrier because they have been represented both in the previous parliament (1995-1999) and even before that in the Supreme Soviet of Republic of Armenia during independence (1990-1995).

Following is the list of political parties used as the sample for this study:

Political parties that are represented in current Armenian Parliament

1. Orinats Erkir (OE)- Rule of Law Country

2. Hay Heghapokhakan Dashnaktsutjun (ARF)- Armenian Revolutionary Federation
3. Hayastani Komunistakan Kusaktsutjun (other CPA)- Communist Party of Armenia
4. Hajastani Zhoghvordakan Kusaktsutjun (HZhK)- Popular Party of Armenia
5. Hajastani Hanrapetakan Kusaktsutjun (RPA)- Republican Party of Armenia
6. Sahmanadrakan Iravunki Miutjun (SIM)- Union of “Constitutional Rights”
7. Azgajin Zhoghovrdavarakan Miutjun (AZhM)- National Democratic Union
8. Azgajin Miabanutjun (NU)- National Unity political organization

Political parties that are NOT represented in current Armenian Parliament

9. Azgajin Inknoroshum Miavorum (AIM)- Union of Self-determination
10. Haiots Hamazgain Sharzhum (HSH)- Pan-Armenian Movement

In each political party the person directly responsible for media related activities was interviewed. However in four parties ((NU, CPA, SIM, and RPA) there was nobody responsible for media activities. In CPA and SIM the editors of their newspapers were interviewed. In the case of these two parties printing newspaper was the only media activity exerted. In NU the vice-chairman of the party and in case of RPA the leader of their fraction in National Assembly were interviewed. In-depth interviews are used for collecting the data. The questions were open ended. Both Armenian and English versions of questionnaires are available in appendices.

FINDINGS

The OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights in its final report on the 1999 Armenian National Assembly elections divides Armenian political parties into four subfields: Traditional parties, Post-independence parties, Splits from the Communist Party of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, and Newly created parties.

Traditional parties with historical ideologies, one of which is the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), emerged in Armenia at the end of the nineteenth century and played an important role during the period of pre-Soviet independence of the country (1918-1920). After the inclusion of Armenia in the Soviet Union, the activities of traditional parties were prohibited in the country. However, they continued to work throughout Diasporan communities abroad on the Armenian Cause and community building and after the declaration of independence in 1991 resumed their activities in Armenia.

From the Post-independence parties the study sample includes the Pan-Armenian Movement (HhSh), Republican Party of Armenia (RPA), National Democratic Union (AZhM), Union of Self-Determination (AIM), and Union of "Constitutional Rights" (SIM). The vast majority of the post-independence (1991) parties in Armenia emerged from human rights and environmentalist, informal and dissident movements, as well as from the " Karabakh Committee" set up in 1988. From these parties HhSh was the ruling party in the government regime up to 1998. Currently the party is in the opposition.

From the Splits from the Communist Party of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic (CPASSR) the study sample includes only CPA. The CPA views itself as the successor of the Communist Party of the former USSR in Armenia. Such parties were also set up after independence in 1991 and refer to Marxist ideology. The National Unity (NU) political

organization also may be labeled in some sense a split from CPASSR. Almost all of the officials of this party as they said in the interviews conducted for this study, were former officials of CPASSR. In many cases, Armenian political parties' platforms do not differ in substance, making it impossible to draw a clear dividing line between opposition and pro-Government parties based on policy preferences. Also, in many cases, the public credibility of a particular political party appeared to depend on the personal credibility of its leaders. Usually this is the case with newly created parties like Hajastani Zhoghvordakan Kusaktsutjun (HZhK), Orinats Erkir (OE) and National Unity political organization (NU). All of these parties/alliances were created relatively recently, during the preparations for the 30 May 1999 elections. Some of them were closely linked to members of the outgoing ruling regime in government and were openly supported by prominent figures from the political establishment. The "Unity" block, which consists of RPA and HZhK forms the current government. Nevertheless, according to the media coordinator of HZhK, their positions were weakened after the shootings in the National Assembly on 27 of October, 1999. Leaders of both parties were assassinated and naturally the positions of the parties weakened because the main power was in the charm of the leaders but not in parties themselves. The consequence of this turmoil is that there is no party that can sharply called ruling party and there is no party that can be identified as the power base of the president.

Work with mass media

Four parties (NU, CPA, SIM, and RPA) have no media department or even a person directly and specifically responsible for such activities. Three others (ARF, HSH and OE) had an information/communication department. In each of the remaining three parties there was one person responsible for media related activities. In four of the six parties the department had been established with the opening of the party. In the case of AZhM the position existed from 1995

while the party was established in 1991. In case of HZhK the position has existed for almost one year. One of the party members was fired from “H1” for her party affiliation, and the chairman of their party invited her to work as press secretary for the party.

“H1” is the Armenian Public Television. It is one of two television channels that is financed from the state budget. The second state financed television channel “Prometevs.” These television channels are the only ones that are broadcasted in all the territory of the Republic of Armenia. The overwhelming majority of Armenian media organizations are private. There are many other television stations across the country besides the mentioned two that are state financed. The largest ones are “A1+,” “Ar,” “Armenia TV,” in Yerevan and “Shant” in Gyumri (the country's second largest city). All of them were established after 1997. However, all of them have restricted areas of broadcasting. None of them is nation-wide. “A1+” is known for its objective and unbiased news reporting, while “Ar” and “Armenia TV” attract viewers with different entertainment programs (Nations in Transit, 2001 at www.freedomhouse.org). Almost all parties' officials claimed that “A1+” is sponsored by opposition party- HSh. In their turn HSh media relation's manager said, “they are in a good relationship with “A1+.”

Seven out of ten political parties do not initiate any work or relations with television and radio channels or make very small initiatives. Yet they say that the media are interested in their activities and that they welcome initiatives when they are made from different media. The only activity these parties do as a political party is to invite media to press conferences. At least four of these seven parties believe that the initiative should be made by the media since they are the ones who make money on news. They believe that it is the function of media to initiate relations or try to work with political parties and not the function of parties themselves. Four of these seven parties do not have anybody responsible for mass media activities to publicize their party.

Four political parties complained that they have no access to “H1” and “PROMETEVS”, which are considered to be pro-governmental television stations.

Four of the political parties sampled in this study have nobody responsible for media relations. In three of the parties, NU, SIM and CPA, media related activities were described as spontaneous. The fourth party’s officials, RPA believe that coordination of media related activities should be done only in state agencies and not in political parties. Of the remaining six parties only two had full time media coordinators, with all the others using volunteers only. Interestingly, five of these people were specialists of some language (Armenian, Russian or Turkish) who had work experience in some kind of media. The sixth person who was the media coordinator of OE party had a Ph.D. in political science and was a lecturer. It is important to note here that Armenian universities provide no opportunities for learning the ins and outs of public or media relations.

Print media In Armenia are mostly unprofitable. An exception is official newspaper of SIM party, Iravunk, which as the editor of that newspaper claims, is one of the main sources of financing for their party. Four of the ten parties have official newspapers. They are the Republican Party, SIM, Communist Party, and ARF. The first three do not initiate any work with other newspapers. Two out of the ten parties, NU and OE, neither have a newspaper nor initiate any work with other newspapers. The other four parties, HSh, AZhM, AIM and HZhK work with newspapers “as much as possible.” All ten parties, even those parties with official newspapers, mentioned that the media are very politicized.

Interviewees mentioned three main radio channels that were used and they are “RADIO LIBERTY,” The Voice of America and Armenian National Radio. Seven out of ten parties said that initiative is taken by the radio stations, and that “RADIO LIBERTY” is the most interested.

The other three parties said they work with the mentioned radio channels because they have good news services. The FM stations are not good enough for their purposes. The programs of FM stations are restricted to music and very brief newscasts, which usually include interesting events from all over the world, but no original political reporting due to lack of resources. Daily programs of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and the Voice of America are retransmitted by state radio. Another problem with FM broadcasts is that members of the public must have receivers that can pick up the signals.

Six parties said they have no web page for financial or other reasons. Two others said their web pages are under construction and only two parties had web pages. Interestingly, ARF has two web pages; one the official web page of the party, one for youth and a third one is under the construction. SIM has only the web page of their newspaper.

Goals of political parties PR activities

As to the goals and purposes of media activities, three main kinds of goals were mentioned: Propaganda, to express the position of the party on different issues, and keeping the public informed about the activities of the party. One of the interviewees said “contribute to the development of civil society” and another, said “increase the rating of the party and political involvement of society.” Four parties had no specified goals. The only purpose of mass media activities of two of the parties was “keeping the public informed about the activities of the party.”

SIM and the Republican Party do not initiate any work with mass media. Three parties said they “keep people informed about the activities of their party.” Two of these three, OE and HZhK, mentioned only this one goal. Another party that mentioned only one goal is NU. That

goal was “to give true information to the public.” AIM said they want to give objective information to the public. AIM’s two other goals mentioned were “contribution to the development of civil society” and “delivering their ideas to the people.” CPA said they have no specified goals. However, the goal of their official newspaper is to express their standpoint on different issues and to do propaganda for the international communist movement. Doing propaganda was mentioned also by HSH as its main goal along with “keeping people informed about their standpoint on different issues.” AZhM also named this last goal and also “making public their programs and plans.” ARF named the following goals that nobody else mentioned: Politicization of society (increase of political involvement), public relations activities, and increasing the rating of the party.

Table 1: Goals of Armenian political parties’ media related activities

NU:	We want people get true information.
ARF	Present the activities of the party Politicization of society (increase of political involvement) Public relations activities Increase the rating of the party Spread their viewpoints, approaches and positions on different issues
AZhM	Keeping people informed about their standpoint on different issues Make public their programs and plans
CPA	No specified goal. Their newspapers goal: to keep public informed about their position on different issues, do propaganda for international communist movement.
HSH	Propaganda Keeping people informed about their standpoint on different issues
HZhK	Present the activities of the party

OE	They want people to know what are they doing.
AIM	Contribute to the development of the civil society Give objective info to the public To deliver their ideas to the people
RPA	None
SIM	None

Source: Interviews with political parties

Strategies and resources used

Only one party had a plan for media related activities and that party was the ARF. Its plan includes a timetable of activities, responsible people for each activity, and the budgets. Two other parties do not have any kind of plan, yet recognized its importance. They were AZhM and AIM. The other parties neither have a plan nor consider it important. Three of them consider it not important because of uncertainty for the future. NU and CPA consider it meaningless because they “cannot influence the mass media.”

Three parties could not name any activity that is effective or ineffective in media relations. The answers of the others are as follows:

NU: compensating for “H1” and “PROMETEVS” by working with regional television channels.

ARF: presence of reporters in activities organized by the party.

AZhM: press conferences and interviews for television and newspapers.

CPA: quick response to negative articles or criticism (about their newspapers’ activities).

AIM: personal relations work usually. Moral pressure also helps.

The main daily activities of Orinats Erkir party's information department include only analysis of current news and media. Two other parties, AZhM and HZhK, only provide information to media about their activities. The remaining three parties are engaged in both of the above mentioned activities. Furthermore, one of them, AIM, prepares frequent press conferences and distributes daily information within party. None of the parties had regional media structures located outside of Yerevan, the capital city of Armenia where half of the nation's population resides. Only two parties said that in every region there is somebody responsible for media related activities. Those were ARF and AIM. This implies that the two are doing better job in the regions than others.

ARF was also the only party that had separate budget for media related activities. This party also had two full time employees and as they said "almost everything for media related activities but a television channel." In another party, the HZhK, the media coordinator also gets some pay, but as she said "it is not regular, whenever the party has money she gets some." In all the other parties the work is done on a volunteer bases. One party had a three person standing committee on information and telecommunications issues that is elected for a two-year term. This party was HHSh, the former ruling party. Also, they have a three person executive committee dealing with everyday routine media work. Another party, the OE has four people working with media. However these four people only analyze news for in-party use. They do not work with media for other party purposes such as public outreach. Two parties have one person in charge of media relations. Those were HZhK and AZhM. Four parties had no one directly responsible people for media affairs. They were CPA, SIM, NU and RPA. Those are also the parties with no goals in media relations or very poorly defined goals. CPA's newspapers "may be closed down every minute if there are no donations" said the editor of the party's newspapers.

All the parties said that they use volunteers when they need help. Only three parties said they have technical resources like a TV set, photocopy machine, or computer for media related work. These were HHS, OE and ARF.

In four parties the final word on policy decisions regarding mass media issues belongs to the chairman of the party and not to media experts. Two of these parties, NU and CPA had nobody responsible for media activities and it is natural that the final word belongs to the chairman of the party. The other two parties, namely AIM and AZhM have assigned people for media affairs. However they have not much say in their field, which decreases their importance as media specialists. Two parties said that decisions are made collectively within the information/communication department. In one party, the HHS, the final word in policy issues belong to the chairman of the standing committee who has worked for some time as the director of Armenian Public Television "H1". In HZhK the press secretary alone decides everything that relates to media.

In the 1999 National Assembly elections four parties, NU, RPA, AIM and HZhK had only one person working with the media within the campaign office of the party. In three cases that was the press secretary of the party. In the fourth, which is RPA, usually there is nobody in charge of media relations and someone is appointed only during elections for that task. Yet this last party managed to get most seats in the parliament. According to HZhK party's press secretary, with whom their party had formed a block (Unity) all their media related activities were conducted and managed by Information and Propaganda department of the Ministry of Defense. In Communist Party of Armenia everything was spontaneous and nobody was in charge of that kind of activities. In Orinats Erkir party they had the same staff of their four-member department and two volunteers working on Party Election Broadcasts. Only two parties said that

they get separate budgets, needed specialists and strict divisions of labor during election campaigns. Those were HHS and ARF.

Media access

Two parties, AZhM and OE, said they have almost no problems with access to different television channels. Yet they could not give at least one example, when they tried to do so. All the other parties were dissatisfied with the amount of access to television they receive. Basically two reasons were mentioned for this dissatisfaction and they are financial and ideological. The second factor, ideological, means that every television has its political orientation and usually their political competitors do not have access or have very a restricted one. Fifty percent of parties observed are not satisfied with their access to newspapers and the main cause they give is ideological difference. Two parties are only “partially” satisfied with their access to newspapers because of the same reason. Two parties, RPA and SIM, do not care about media relations. Three parties are not satisfied with their access to radio. One party said they have not even tried to gain access to radio. Four parties believe they have enough access to radio channels. None of the respondents said that they have problems with the Internet related to their web pages.

Three political parties, NU, CPA and OE do not believe that they can influence the agenda of the mass media. The fourth one, HHS, said “directly-no,” but it is possible to influence agendas indirectly via influencing public opinion. The remained parties think they can influence public opinion, however, the ARF reported that setting media agendas is not one of their direct goals.

If the party could not gain access to a particular media, two parties said they would not do anything. OE could not give any answer. Four parties said they would ask another media channel

to cover that event. Only the ARF said that they would consider it in their future work but without engaging into any conflict.

The NU's representative thinks that mass media do not have any influence on the public opinion. Another party's representative said, "Not always, it depends on the circumstances." All the other parties believe that media does influence public opinion. The ARF representative even explained that television and radio influence more than newspapers and Internet. The reason for that is that newspapers are printed in small numbers and Internet users are very few in Armenia.

Results of their work

When the question came to audience being targeted, the answers of five parties who do some work with media were similar: all people. Only two parties had activities aimed at some kind of diversification of population, the ARF and AIM.

The ARF uses television for the general population, newspapers for populations that are already politicized since they are the main readers of newspapers, and radio for the youth and older people who are the main audience for radio programs. AIM uses mass media to reach the public, government, and politicians. Yet they have not clearly specified which media is used for which audience. Their main point was that they understand that different approaches are needed for different audiences. However they have not done anything in this respect.

Thirty percent of political parties said, "Usually they are not fairly covered in television." One third said that only "H1" (Armenian Public Television) is unfair and that other television stations are quite fair. One party said that usually they have no problems with fairness. Another party, AIM, did not give strict answer yes or no and its press secretary said, "sometimes they are fair sometimes not" and that it depends on who prepares the program or coverage and what the

issue is. She said the same thing about newspapers. It seems that she was not sure what to answer. Four other parties said they are not fairly covered in newspapers. One party said that only their coverage in Hayots Ashkhar is unfair. Two parties think that usually they are covered fairly in newspapers. Four parties believe their radio coverage is fair. Two parties do not even have any idea of their coverage in radio. Two parties said they are not covered in radio. Four parties said they have no problems with accuracy of coverage in any media. The other four said they have “some problems with accuracy.” It is clear that these media experts are not concerned about how their parties are covered and are more focused on the politics and politicization of the overall mass media environment. None of the parties agreed on their assessments of any of the mass media – that is, they all had an axe to grind. Only two parties were dissatisfied with the work done by them with mass media. One of them, the AZhM, assessed the work done by them as incomplete and the second- HHS as “very bad.” Yet the problem with this last one was that the overall assessment of the party’s high-ranking officials is that the media work is “good enough” so they think there is no need to do more. Besides, their press secretary has little much power within party. Two parties think the work done by them is “normal for today’s conditions.” One party said “satisfactory, yet not excellent,” and all the others believe that they are doing good or very good jobs.

Two parties, OE and AIM, believe that with their current resources they can achieve about 90% of their media related goals. Yet from this two only OE has some resources for media related activities. Two parties, and one of them ARF, with both technical and human resources think they can achieve about half of their goals. One party said they could achieve about 30% of their media related goals with current resources. Two parties, HZhK and NU, think they cannot achieve any goal with current resources. Yet one of them the NU political organization, said that

it is not because they have few resources but because they have no access to media. Communist party said that they have neither clearly defined goals nor resources for achieving those goals.

MEDIA POLITICS AND PARTY POLITICS

All telecommunication and mass media in Armenia were nationalized during the communist era. The ruling Communist Party of the Soviet Union always was aware of the important role the mass media play in achieving political ends. Consequently CPA, which continued its life after the collapse of the USSR, should have been one of the political parties that intensely cooperate with mass media. However, it proved to be the opposite. Of the ten political parties interviewed, seven parties take very small or almost no initiative in work with media, and the CPA is one of them. The party even has no person responsible for its media related activities. Press conferences and maintenance of two newspapers are the only media activities of the party. The party has no specified media related goals. For a political party that has been in power for a long time and has used television, radio and newspapers for maintaining of its power, their current work in media relations seem at least strange. The only explanation can be that the party bureaucrats all are gone and new and inexperienced people have replaced them.

The only goal of OE and HZhK parties' media related activities is informing the public about their party's activities. They claim that they do not need media for other purposes. They do not understand that they can reach more people via television, radio or other communication means and channels than by working directly with people. They even cannot deal with this task properly since they do not initiate any activity or cooperation with the mass media. Whatever their goals, they are sitting and waiting for the mass media to come and ask them about their activities. They are constantly cheating themselves thinking that they are "working" with mass

media. The other parties such as RPA or SIM directly answered that they do not work with media as such, and answering the questions of several reporters is not considered as work with media by these parties.

If the majority of Armenian political parties do not have media related goal, which also implies that work with media is very poor, then representative democracy has very small room in Armenian politics. Where are the various ideas, ideologies and programs of political parties going to compete and collide? How is an Armenian citizen going to choose from various candidates and programs the ones that are closest to his/her preferences? One can claim that Armenia is a small country and that the mass media are not very much important. Yet, it is much larger than the largest Greek city-state. Even such a small country, if it wants to become a democracy, has to have well-developed mass communication structures.

The majority of political parties have in their programs the word democracy, however, for a representative democracy in mass society nobody can escape work with media. Otherwise it will be very hard to deliver their ideas to the people, to collect votes and exert other functions of political parties.

Three parties that take the initiative in work with mass media are ARF, NU and AIM. ARF is an Armenian socialist party with pre-Soviet history and that has been functioning in Diaspora even during Soviet rule. It has long experience in lobbying for the Armenian Cause and in work with Western media. The NU is leaded by former bureaucrats of CPSU and the apparatus of Communist Party is a good place to acquire experience of work with media and to understand its power and importance. However they are working with old methods and without media experts and specialists. They are used to working without competition in a one party environment. Furthermore they lack necessary resources to work better. AIM also has this

problem. Although they do work with media and understand the importance of that work, they are short in money and cannot work properly.

Two parties mentioned "propaganda" as one of the main goals of their media related activities one, HHS and CPA. The latter mentioned "propaganda" as the goal of their newspaper because they have no specified goals of their media related activities. Before the World War II commentators and political organizers called political communications work "propaganda" (Wring, 1996). This term, which now is considered old described a one-way communication process in which passive audiences found themselves subjected to manipulative appeals of political elites, as Shama (1976) puts it, this lack of concern with voters' desires, manifested itself in an electoral strategy (he calls it "candidate orientation") based upon the simple principle: "...increased awareness would increase voter preference. The inputs to the promotion campaign to achieve increased awareness were designed on the basis of guess and intuition" (Shama in Wring, 1996,p. 3). Naturally, a political party like HHS that uses mass media for propaganda would get no more than 1.2% of votes in proportional ballots in 1999 National Assembly (NA) elections. However, it was a real puzzle that the Unity Block received 41.7% of proportional votes. The block consists of two parties: RPA and HZhK, both of which do not have clearly defined goals of media related activities.

In general, the majority of Armenian political parties do not consider media related activities important enough to devote time and resources to those activities. They work with media on day-to-day basis without clearly defining their goals. Guess and intuition are the main means used to achieve their indefinite goals.

Proceeding from the above mentioned, a conclusion can be made that if majority of parties do not have media related goals, they do not plan their future activities. According to the data

collected in the interviews for this study, only one party has plan of media activities. This party, which is ARF, has clearly defined goals and is one of three parties that take the initiative in work with media. Interestingly, seven out of ten political parties do not consider planning of media activities important or even necessary. They argue that the future is uncertain and one cannot guess what will happen in order to plan their activities. This shows that their only strategy is responding in some way to different political or social events and not taking the political initiative. It also shows the weak organizational structure of parties themselves. Considering the importance of work with media in a mass society, one may conclude that if media activities are not planned, the other activities of the party are organized in a similar way.

Two parties said that they cannot influence media in any way. These were CPA and NU. Both of them view media as it was in communist era, that is to say, if the media is not under their control, then it is against them.

Another way of checking the work done with media was asking the parties about their effective or ineffective strategies in dealing with media. Only half of the parties could give examples of past activities with media. Three of them were parties that do initiate work with media. The link between the everyday activities of media units of parties and their goals is very clear. Those parties that only want to inform the media about their activities are not doing much work in their media departments. They only analyze current news for everyday party activities and provide various media with information about their activities.

Those parties who have no specified media goal also have nobody in charge of those relations. The parties with clearly defined goals of media activities have well-organized media/information departments or at a least press secretary, and execute various tasks and activities every day. It is clear that those parties that understand what they want from media and

what they can get from media devote more time and resources to media related activities. For example ARF even has a separate budget for their media department. Yet another obvious point is that only three parties have some kind of media department and only ARF has a separate budget for those activities. Only these three parties said that they have some technical resources in their departments. The three parties who have press secretaries do not supply necessary resources for them to work. This means that in those parties importance of media related activities are understood to a lesser extent.

Although in this study financial differences between parties are not considered because almost all of them lack enough financial resources for their activities, the three parties with more technical resources for mass media activities seem to have more money than parties without such resources. They have better buildings in better situation, HSH was in power for a long time, from that time they have organized their media department, which functions up to date. Many of this party's members like V. Siradegian, have abused their office for their personal as well as for party purposes. Yet there is no data about how these resources are obtained. ARF has a large supporting organization in Diaspora. Whatever the sources of their revenues, currently they are in a better situation than are the other parties. The third party, which is OE, uses the technical resources of their newspaper but it is not published now. The other parties, whether they want to cooperate with media or not, have not enough resources for such activities. Therefore they cannot achieve all of their media related goals or can achieve very little of them.

Many of the media specialists were complaining that party leaders do not allocate enough resources for media related activities. This brings to the front the issue of decision-making powers within party organizations. Almost in all six parties that have responsible people in charge of media relations those people have different levels of authority. In ARF and HSH all

important decisions are made within media/information their departments. In AzhM the press secretary alone was dealing with every media related issue. In contrast to this, in HZhK and AIM all important decisions, including those related to media are the sole property of party leaders, who are not media experts. In a political party where the manager of media activities thinks that they do not work enough with media but he or she has not enough authority to oppose the viewpoint of the party leader who thinks that their media activities are enough, there is no room for improvement or increase of efficiency in parties' overall job. This is exactly the case with AZhM.

Another sad picture is then case with HZhK. The person in charge of media work has the ultimate power in deciding everything that relates to the media but she works alone and without any resources. From time to time she gets some pay for her work. However it is not because their party leader recognizes the importance of media activities. The pay she gets for her job is some kind of financial aid, she is being compensated because she was fired from a previous work place for her party affiliation. Nevertheless, HZhK and RPA Formed the "Unity" block, which managed to get the highest 41.7% of votes in 1999 National Assembly elections. From first glance it seems strange that the two parties do not initiate almost any work with media managed to get the highest support of electorate. However, the later explanation was that they were using media/communication resources of one state agency. This does not imply in any way that there should be a relationship between the work of political parties with media and the votes they got in the 1999 National Assembly elections. For example, in the Communist party media relations were spontaneous even during election campaigns. From the other side, ARF or HSH were carefully planning their activities and devoting much time and resources to the election campaign in 1999. However, CPA got 12.1% vs. ARF's 7.8% and HSH's 1.2%.

Different factors outside political party-mass media relations may affect the results. Since political parties fail to properly use media, people may have misconceptions about different parties' proposals. Older voters may choose to support CPA for the memories of the last years of USSR that were better than that of transition period. For the atrocities and anarchy during HSSH rule, whatever they offer to electorate may not be accepted because people might have lost the trust in HSSH. Nevertheless the basic problem remains with parties themselves: that is, the mass media are not used as the arena and means for competition in political market.

Some parties did work with media during 1999 National Assembly elections. However, because of the low level of professionalism no one in the parties knows what were the effects of media activities of those parties. During the Soviet era there were institutions specializing in public relations in general, or media relations in particular. Because of the one party system, there was no need for such specialists. Now almost everything has changed but institutions for higher education do not offer those necessary courses. Neither in journalism department of Yerevan State University nor in the political science department of American University of Armenia and Yerevan State University can anyone learn the theory and practice of public relations or communications in general. The consequence of this lack is the non-professional work of political parties with mass media.

Six political parties out of ten have media/information departments or at least a press secretary. None of them employ media experts. Five are specialists of some language and one has a Ph.D. in Political Science from a new program at Yerevan State University. All of them have some experience or work with mass media. Yet they all bear the burden of the communist past. None had any experience of work in western type of media or in a multi-party system. The lack of literature about public relations or political marketing in Armenian or at least Russian

further complicates the matter. These people need a lot of time to learn political communication through their mistakes. Some of them even do not understand what is a media access, the techniques to get into a particular media, and why it is important for their parties. They think that it is responsibility of media to come and ask political parties for cooperation.

Media in general were considered very politicized by all political parties. They all complain that some clan or political power is supporting different kinds of media. Many political parties called Armenian Public Television (“H1”) and “Prometevs” TV channels pro-governmental. Some of them claim that they have no access to “H1”, which is the only station broadcasted in all territories of the country. For example, the newspaper editor of CPA claimed that they have no access to “H1” and all their coverage is negative. Yet he could not give any example when they have tried to gain access to “H1.” He said broadcast time is very expensive and that they can not afford to pay for it. By access to “H1” he understands buying the broadcast time and saying whatever they want via that particular channel. Majority of observed political parties considered the “A1+” television channel as the most objective. This channel is said to be financed and supported by currently opposition and one time ruling party HHSh.

However, AIM considered “A1+” to be the worst one among all television channels. This clearly shows the politicization of media channels. Regional television channels also are used by political parties. The access to them is much easier and it does not cost much. For political parties like NU with small financial resources and without access to “H1” or “Prometevs,” the regional television stations with smaller broadcast areas are at least an option.

More parties work with newspapers than with television. Personal relations here play important role. Since many of media relations managers of political parties have previously worked in different newspapers, whatever the orientation of newspapers, it is easier for them to

cooperate. However, all of them mentioned that newspapers are printed in small numbers. Four parties have official newspapers. Usually, they are something like “the voice of the party.” None of them are profitable except for Iravunk, the official newspaper of SIM. In contrast to the other three parties, SIM views its newspaper as a source of revenues for the party. It is a successful example of how a party can both present its activities to the public and benefit financially from having a newspaper.

As a natural consequence of undeveloped and expensive telecommunications, only one party, the ARF, has web pages and SIM has its newspaper online. In this case ARF is an exception because it has its branches all over the world. The other parties do not consider the web important because Internet users are not many in Armenia, and the Internet is a novelty in communication technologies both for Armenian political parties and the public.

By using the above mentioned communication means political parties are trying to reach the whole “population in general” as they claim. Such claims once more show that they lack professionalism in their work. Only two parties stratified their audience according to different media. They were the ARF and AIM. As an example the ARF representative mentioned that youth and the old people are the main audience of radio channels, therefore their activities with radio channels target that audience.

THE CAUSES AND THE EFFECTS

It was mentioned before that the currently functioning political parties could not efficiently use the mass media for their best interests because of various reasons. At least three of them do not think that they can influence the agenda of media in any way. This means that they even do not understand the role and functions of political parties to aggregate demands of their

representatives and influence policy debate and formation within the country. With RPA and SIM, who do not work with media as such, fifty percent of the parties in this study demonstrated that they do not understand the power of public opinion.. However, all the parties with the exception of NU understand the agenda setting power of mass media. NU representative believes that media does not have influence on the opinion of the public. He claims that they are using media to give true information to the public. But making people think about some issues and not others misses setting the public agenda.

Cooperating and discussing with different media about some issues and not the others even without the likely outcomes is already some influence on media. The parties work intuitively in this direction, yet they do not understand the process itself. As a consequence they can not use media to achieve their short or long time party goals. The media for Armenian political parties has become simply a medium to speak with other parties. Almost none of them use media to communicate with their electorate. This point is obvious because of small audience of different media like newspapers or the Internet. Some of the parties neither initiate any work with existing media with small audience nor have any plans for future cooperation.

With the above-mentioned definition of access to different media, the majority of political parties are not satisfied with the access they have. Particularly complicated is the issue of television access. Only two parties, AzhM and OE said that they have no problems with access to media television. Two main reasons mentioned hindering media access were lack of money and political unwillingness. The third reason observed was lack of professionalism in work with media. Political unwillingness means that all media have some interest and the events and problems are presented from their viewpoint only. This creates a situation where media cannot

be independent, because they are highly dependent on the subsidies of their patrons with strong political interest.

The same problem exists with newspapers but to a lesser extent. There are many non-official newspapers to which access is much easier. Moreover because of their small circulation newspapers are not considered that important. In contrast to television, it is possible to benefit from newspapers and even from official newspapers of political parties. One successful example is the newspaper of SIM, Iravunk.

The case of radio is an exceptional one. Almost all parties are satisfied with their access to radio. The point here is that they “do not need” it. The network of Armenian National Radio is almost destroyed and the FM stations do not have political programs. Everyday the one-hour program of “Radio Liberty” is the one option left for the parties. The only other medium in this study – the Internet – remains as a far reality for use by Armenian political parties.

A clear trend was mentioned by some of political parties’ media managers: access to state-financed media channels like Armenian Public Television, “Prometevs” TV, Hayastani Hanrapetutyun newspaper, or Armenian National Radio have become much more difficult during President Kocharyan than it was before. The HSh party claimed that during the regime of the previous president (that is, under their own ruling regime) the media access was much easier to attain. The media coordinator of HZhK party mentioned that when their leader was the Prime Minister their access to media was easier than after assassination of their leader on October 27, 1999. If the impression of Armenian media specialists is correct then it can be concluded that Armenian mass media is far from being free or independent because with the changes in the balance of political power the level of access to media by different political parties changes.

From this vantage-point the issue of state versus media relations acquires crucial importance. In an age of representative democracy free media is of utmost importance. If Armenian State financed media are not free from the influence of high authorities then the “watching function” of media will die in different state agencies. Considering that state financed media is the most professional, well financed, and have the largest broadcast area the routes of democracy may be damaged if these media channels are not independent.

Media coverage of political parties’ activities also shows that state financed, or as some parties’ officials call it “pro-Governmental,” media are not free from outside influence. At least six political parties are not satisfied with their coverage in “H1”. Yet this is not the case with other television channels. However, there is not enough data to show strict correlations because of two reasons. Firstly, the President has no major supporting political party for comparing its coverage on “H1” with that of others. Secondly, the party, which currently forms the Government – RPA – does not work with media and nobody knows what is the content of its coverage in “H1.” The case of newspapers is not much different from that of television. Parties want more access to different newspapers, yet everything published goes through the filter of editors who always have some political interests. The word access here is understood or misunderstood as ability to print in a given newspaper whatever they want. From the answers of respondents it was clear that many of them have not thought about these issues before. Their arguments were not strong and they hesitated before every answer.

Lack of professionalism was the most apparent when the question came to the results of their work. As showed in the examples given by party officials they do not work much with media. However, the majority was satisfied with the results of their work. Only two parties said that they do not work enough. From these two the AZhM party’s leaders do not want to have more

work done in this field. This clearly shows that media specialists of Armenian political parties do not understand how much is it possible to achieve by proper use of mass media. They even do not know with what kind of resources what it is possible to achieve. When asked what percent of their goals they can achieve with available resources, they gave spontaneous answers. Some of those without resources said that they can achieve almost 90% of their goals. Some parties have many goals and no resources when the others like OE have some resources but not many goals related to media activities. All this findings lead to many interesting conclusions.

CONCLUSIONS

The overall assessment of parties about the results of their work with mass media was positive. Yet, considering the poor job done by them and also that the initiative comes more from media side one may conclude that despite saying that they understand the power of media to set public agendas, they do not understand the process.

In general the percentage of vote's parties got in 1999 NA elections does positively relate to their resources for media activities. The only puzzle was with the Republican Party that reported it does not work with media. And the key to that puzzle was that they were using the media resources of one state agency.

Further research is necessary to find out the relationship (and the dependence, if any) of state financed media channels and the state. Yet, this relationship will help to understand only part of the political polarization of Armenian mass media and its consequences. The political parties do not have any data about the results of their media activities on the public in general or on policymaking processes in particular.

Development of free media is important along with educating political parties about the strategies of using media for achieving their goals. Only through mass media citizens in a mass society can be informed about plans and platforms of different political parties, their ideas and ideologies. Without it representative democracy will remain an ideal, which is impossible to achieve.

Four political parties have official newspapers of their parties. However, the other media also are backed by some political force. For having independent mass media and free press it is important to make legislative changes that restrict political organizations from financing or supporting any kind of media. This practice is successfully used in some old democracies like Great Britain.

All the media managers of political parties had higher educations. Yet, none of them was specialized in media management, public relations, political marketing or other related fields. Of course, there was no need for this kind of specialist during Soviet era because of its one party system. However, even now, after eleven years of independence this need is not recognized publicly. From the other side, the people who are dealing with media management in Armenia cannot learn from the experience of western democracies because the translations of western literature in this field are not available to them. Such conclusions present the need for several policy recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Develop programs for the institutionalization of democratic communication structures. For example, organize a communication or public relations department at AUA.

2. Organize programs of support for political parties to develop their skills in mass communication.
3. Translation of some western literature on democracy and mass communication into Armenian, because very few party officials speak foreign languages.
4. Publish current research in Armenian and distribute it to political parties.
5. Organize information campaigns for political parties about different think tanks that provide assistance and/or grants to political parties.
6. Restrict the rights of political parties to maintain official newspapers.

USAID and intergovernmental or international organizations can support these proposals for the development of civil society and democratic institutions in Armenia. Moreover, the Armenian government also can support these kinds of activities. An upcoming law on political parties may put some obligations on the government in this respect.

Appendix 1 Questionnaire

1. 1. With what television channels do you have relations or cooperate and why that channels?
 2. With what newspapers and magazines you have relations or cooperate and why with that ones?
 3. With which radio stations do you have relations or cooperate and why that channels?
 4. Any web page?
 5. What are the specific goals and purposes of this organization's media related activities?
 6. 2001 examples of goals/purposes/expected outcomes/expected effects and how achieved for each of 1-4. Any significant past activities not related to elections?
 7. Who is the audience you are trying to reach/target (for 1-3 separately)?
 8. Does the party have a strategy/plan for media activities in 2001? If yes, explain – e.g., types of activities engaged in 2001. If no, why? Do you have any future plans in that field?
 9. Which activities are most effective? Which do not work well in mass media relations?
 10. Do you think you, as a political party can influence the agenda of mass media?
 11. What would you do if you couldn't get into a particular media you want?
 12. Do you think it is possible to influence significantly or change opinion of public via mass media?
- **About the person(s) who is (are) in charge of management of the media relations/unit(s)**
 - Level of education
 - Specialty/major
 - Membership (yes/no, if yes how many years)
 - Employment Status/years employed
 - Previous experience
 - **History of info/communication unit/position. If none, why. Future plans – if yes or no.**
 - Main daily activities of the department/person
 - Years of activity of the unit or position
 - Regional structures? Their coordination (if any).
 - Resources (both technical and human)
 - Who says the final word in policy decisions?
 - Staff during 1999 NA election campaign

Self-evaluation of the level of success.

- Is your party successful in gaining the amount of access it wants to the mass media? Why or why not?
- Do you think your activities are fairly covered in mass media? Accurately?
- How would you assess the work done by you with mass media?
- What percent of your goals you think you can achieve with your current resources?

Appendix 2 Հարցաշար:

a) Ներքոհիշյալ 4 Ձանգվածային լրատվամիջոցներից (ՁԼՄ) որոնք են օգտագործվում Ձեր կուսակցության կողմից, կամ որոնց հետ եք Դուք աշխատում.

1. Հեռուստատեսություն
2. Օրաթերթեր
3. Ռադիո
4. Ինտերնետ էթե այո, ապա երբ է հիմնադրվել

Առաջին 3-ի համար **ԱՅՈ** պատասխանի դեպքում – Ձեք մասնավորեցնի թե որոնց (որ ալիքի կամ թերթի) հետ եք աշխատում: Ինչու:

Բոլոր 4-ի համար **ՈՉ** պատասխանի դեպքում -- Եթե ՈՉ ապա ինչու:

1. Ինչ նպատակներ է հետապնդում Ձեր կուսակցության կատարած աշխատանքը (հարաբերությունները) Ձանգվածային լրատվական միջոցների (ՁԼՄ) հետ:
2. Կարող եք մեկական օրինակ բերել _____ 1-4 _____ -ի հետ այս տարի աշխատանքի կամ հարաբերությունների, որոշակի հստակ արդյունքի հասնելու նպատակով, որը սակայն ուղղակի կապ չունենա որևէ ընտրությունների հետ: Նկարագրեք խնդրեմ ինչպես հասաք Ձեր նպատակին (ամեն օրինակում):
3. Ում եք փորձում հասցնել Ձեր հաղորդագրությունը (massage) __ 1-4 __-ի միջոցով: Who is the audience you are trying to reach?
4. Արդյոք Ձեր կուսակցությունը ունի Ձանգվածային Լրատվամիջոցների հետ աշխատանքի ռազմավարական (strategic) կամ ցանկացած այլ ծրագիր:

ԱՅՈ –ի դեպքում՝ Կարելի է տեսնել կամ նկարագրեք խնդրեմ հիմնական մասերը: Ով է պատասխանատու և ով է կազմել կամ մասնակցել այն կազմելուն:

ՈՉ –ի դեպքում՝ Իսկ ինչու չունեք, արդյոք ապագա ծրագրերում նախատեսում եք ունենալ:

5. Ձանգվածային Լրատվամիջոցների հետ աշխատանքի ժամանակ որ գործողություններն են ավելի արդյունավետ, իսկ որոնք ոչ: Բացատրեք խնդրեմ:
6. Ինչ կապերի վրա են հիմնված Ձեր հարաբերությունները 1-4 ՁԼՄների հետ: օր. անձնական, գործնական և այլն. What access do you have?
7. Ինչ քայլեր կձեռնարկեիք, եթե չկարողանայիք հաղորդել Ձեր ուզած ինֆորմացիան ձեր ցանկացած ՁԼՄ-ի միջոցով:

*** Do you think you, as a political party can influence the agenda of mass media?**

8. Ձեր կարծիքով, հնարավոր է արդյոք ազդել հասարակական կարծիքի վրա կամ փոխել այն ՁԼՄների միջոցով: Ինչու:

In case of no follow up: Եթե ոչ, ապա ինչ նպատակներ է հետապնդում ձեր կուսակցության կատարած աշխատանքը ՁԼՄների հետ:

- **About the person(s) who are in charge of management of the media relations/unit(s).**

Կրթությունը- Բարձ. Միջն.(8 or 10) Չունի

Մասնագիտությունը (Օր. էլեկտրիկ)

Անդամակցությունը տվյալ կուսակցությանը (եթե այո, ապա քանի տարի)

Աշխատանքային ստաժը և կարգավիճակը (full time, part time)

Նախկին աշխատանքային փորձը

9. Աշխատատեղի կամ բաժնի պատմությունը (երբ է բացվել և այլն.) Եթե չունեք, ապա ինչու, արդյոք որևէ ապագա պլաններ կան այս ուղղությամբ:

10. Բաժնի կամ անհատի հիմնական առօրյա գործունեությունը:

11. Ռեսուրսները (մարդկային և տեխնիկական) and money (do they have a budget?)

12. Կարևոր որոշումների ժամանակ ումն է վերջին խոսքի իրավունքը (ՁԼՄ ների հետ աշխատանքի ժամանակ):

13. Տարածաշրջանային կառույցներ կան արդյոք: Եթե այո, ում կողմից են ղեկավարվում:

14. 1999 Աժ ընտրությունների ժամանակ ինչպիսին էր աշխատակազմը:

Self-evaluation of the level of success.

- Արդյոք Ձեր կուսակցությունը կարողանում է իր ցանկացած քանակությամբ (access) ունենալ ՁԼՄ ներում (for 1-4): Բացատրեք խնդրեն պատասխանը:

- Արդյոք Ձեր կուսակցության գործողությունները արդարացիորեն են մեկնաբանվում ՁԼՄ ների (for 1-4) կողմից: Իսկ ինչ կասեք ճշգրիտության աստիճանի մասին:

- Ինչպես կգնահատեք Ձեր կատարած աշխատանքը ՁԼՄ ների հետ:

- Ձեր ներկա ռեսուրսների պայմաններում Ձեր նպատակների քանի տոկոսն եք համարում իրագործելի:

REFERENCES

- Armenian Political Parties Participating in the 1999 National Assembly Elections. Data collected and analyzed for the Open Society Institute's Website election project by The Center For Policy Analysis at American University of Armenia, May 1999 (Webpage: WWW.eurasianet.org/departments/election/armenia/partpro1.html).
- Benson, Ian. (1997) "Machine politics is the future." New Statesman. May 30, Vol.126 Issue 4336, 38-40
- Farrell, David. M. (1998) "Political consultancy overseas: the internationalization of campaign consultancy. (A Alate of Candidates, a Recession of Economists, an Advice of Consultants)." Political Science and Politics, June 1998 (Webpage: <http://www.findarticles.com>)
- Mancini, P. (1999) "New Frontiers in Political Professionalism." Political Communication. Jul-Sep99, Vol.16 Issue 3, 231-246
- Mutz, Diana C.(2001) "Facilitating Communication across Lines of Political Difference: The Role of Mass Media." American Political Science Review, March 2001 (Webpage: <http://www.findarticles.com>).
- Panebianco, A. (1982) Modelli di partito [Models of Parties] Bologna, Italy: Il Milino. Quoted in Mancini, P. (1999) "New Frontiers in Political Professionalism." Political Communication. Jul-Sep99, Vol.16 Issue 3, 231-246
- Pippa, Norris. (2000) "A Virtuous Circle? The Impact of Party Organization and the News Media on Civic Engagement in Post-Modern Campaigns. Paper for the ECPR Joint Workshops, Copenhagen 14-18th April 2000
- Plasser, F. (2001) "Parties' Diminishing Relevance for Campaign Professionals." Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics. Fall 2001, Vol.6 Issue 4, 44-60
- Kerbel, Matthew, R. (2000) Remote and Controlled: Media Politics in a Cinical Age. Bulder: Westview Press.
- Sartori, Giovanni. (1987) The Theory of Democracy Revisited. New Jersey: Chatam House Publishers, Inc.
- Wring, D. (1996) "Political marketing and party development in Britain." European Journal of Marketing, vol.30 Issue 10/11, 100-112