

One. Trends of media means, Professional Level

Development of event

In viewing of chronological study of the event, Mongolia's mass media means had commenced to spread and distribute news and information about the result of election from early morning at 3am on June 30, 2008. Media had reported information from election headquarters of Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP) and Democratic Party (DP) as well as a fraudulence of vote counting. The media means operatively reported all important events including a gathering of the people in Sukhbaatar square on the night June 30 and a day of July 1 protesting election result; statements and press conferences by MPRP and DP; a statement by Batzandan and Magnai; actions of Magnai's call; statements issued by Civil Coalitions and other small political parties; attack to the MPRP headquarter, setting fire on building of MPRP headquarter, clash between citizens blockading traffic movement and policemen, action beating policemen by ordinary citizens, actions of gun shooting by policemen to the people and destroying properties etc. As well as it contained information on giving cash money and a bottle of gas to demonstrators among them there were adolescents etc. In addition, there was information that protestors were drunkards, chronic alcoholics, street homeless people living in holes, and organized criminals etc.

Eleven television channels devoted 107 hours or 15 percent of total 709 hours program coverage for information about July 1 event and its related confrontation situation. MNPTB devoted 19 percent of total program for news coverage on July 1 riot, Eagle television-18.7 percent, TV25 Channel- 12.1 percent, NTV -10.15 percent, C1-8.1 percent, TV5 -6.3% percent and TV9 and UBS-4.9 percent as well as TM -3.7 percent.

Daily papers gave 12.6 percent (118716 cm²) of total publication space for reporting the July 1 public disturbance. Daily newspapers Ardchilal (Democracy) and Zuuny Medee (Century News) devoted much space for reporting the event than other newspapers. Television channels made mostly a live broadcast to report on the event.

The monitoring team sought to evaluate mass media performance in providing objective and balanced coverage through a well defined and rigorous methodology that was popularly used in international journalism standards.

Information content

Commenting the July 1 event in a term of content, television turned to this event as following order: actions taken in connection with arisen situation – circumstance – consequences; while newspaper treated as reason of situation – circumstance - actions

July 1. Media Monitoring

taken in connection with arisen situation. Generally, television turned its attention to actions taken in connection with arisen situation, whilst, newspaper paid its attention to a reason of contradiction situation.

- **Reason of incident**

A total of 19.6 percent of total programs devoted to a reason of contradiction situation; meanwhile, 30.5 percent of total space was used by newspapers. Majority of information claims that MPRP, O. Magnai and J. Batzandan were guilty.

Television channels involved in monitoring explained in its July 1 program that the main reason of the incident was as following; this was basic issue of society; citizens had negative tendency over the police; election result contradicted with social awaiting; MPRP made election in fraud; DP and its Chairman Elbegdorj's incitement; riot organized by O. Magnai and J. Batzandan; Civil Society and the Republic Party arranged this public disturbance; MPRP itself organized this event; police failed to take necessary measure; General Election Commission worked badly; both MPRP and DP are guilty, the people are guilty; N. Enkhbayar is guilty and it was Chinese' incitement etc.

During the state of emergency, MNPTB wholly operated nationwide and an explanation of reason of the event was decreased 8 times. Most of programs contained information claiming this was a riot organized by O. Magnai and J. Batzandan (22.6 percent) and this public disturbance was arranged by Civil Society and the Republic Party (18.4 percent).

After a lifting of the state of emergency, a new explanation was added by television like the government worked irresponsibility; and fighting for Mongolia's wealth went out from the control.

- **Circumstance of the event**

20.7 percent of coverage devoted by television to this information, while 23.8 percent used by newspaper. It dominated information about actions of small political parties and negative vandalistic actions of demonstrators.

- **Consequences**

Television dedicated 20.5 percent of its coverage to information on consequences, meanwhile, newspapers devoted 14.1 percent. Television turned more attention on information about destruction of cultural heritage, but newspapers paid more attention reporting about losses of human lives.

July 1. Media Monitoring

- **Actions taken in connection with arisen situation**

Information on actions taken in connection with arisen situation occupied 24.6 percent in television and 16.2 percent in daily newspapers. Both television and newspapers turned much attention into an issue of the declaration of state of emergency.

- **Human rights issue**

Televisions devoted 14.2 percent of its coverage for the human rights issue, whilst, newspapers used 15 percent.

Difference between facts and view

Majority of information delivered to the public through media means (television 67.4 percent and newspapers 76.2 percent) was based on evidences and facts. This was a progressive showing that qualifies professional standards.

Balance of source

- Information source was one in average, for example; television has 1.2, newspapers as 1.5. This shows that information delivered was biased handling.
- Media means mostly delivered position of official authorities. By doing it, representation of source was unbalanced. Voices of amateurs (independent experts, NGOs etc) and consequence recipients (ordinary citizens and victims etc) were abandoned. It failed to keep professional norms that must reflect multi and many-sided social views and opinions.