

## THE REGIONAL DIMENSION OF RUSSIAN BROADCASTING

### РЕГИОНАЛЬНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ РОССИЙСКОГО ТЕЛЕВЕЩАНИЯ

*Yuri M. Ershov, PhD, Associate Professor,  
Faculty of Journalism, Tomsk State University,  
Tomsk, Russia  
ershov@newsman.tsu.ru*

*Юрий Михайлович Ершов, кандидат филологических наук, доцент,  
факультет журналистики, Томский государственный университет,  
Томск, Россия  
ershov@newsman.tsu.ru*

*The author examines the role of television in the construction areas and other imagined communities, new typological approaches to the television channels definitions. The article analyzes the existing and possible classification of media coverage areas. This material may be of interest to journalists, researchers of the federal, regional and local television stations.*

**Key words:** *broadcasting; territory; broadcaster; region; typology.*

*Автор рассматривает роль телевидения в конструировании регионов и иных воображаемых сообществ, предлагает новые типологические подходы к определению телеканалов. Статья анализирует существующие и возможные классификации медиа по охвату территории. Материал может быть интересен журналистам; исследователям федерального, регионального и местного телевидения.*

**Ключевые слова:** *телевидение; территория; вещатель; регион; типология.*

The analysis of the Russian modern TV is complicated by the lack of clear and reasonable criteria of local and regional television. It is considered a priori that television which is not national (federal) is regional (local). The Law “On Amendments to Clauses 14, 33, 36 of the Federal Law “On Advertising” gives the definition of federal channel: it is “an organization which realizes on-air broadcasting on the territory of more than five subjects of the Russian Federation”. Current Russian laws, however, do not give such clear definitions of local or regional television. At the same time, conceptions of regional and local TV are often used as synonymous ones without concretization. This mixture of different types of broadcasting is caused by historical reasons, non-transparency of Russian business and anachronistic administrative division of the country. It is important to examine what principles were fundamental for the Soviet period of television technology distribution and what principles of dimensional organization of broadcasting are used nowadays. This article is devoted to the territorial dimensions of television coverage and to analysis of the role of open-air broadcasting in the construction of regions.

### **Economic geography of television. The background**

When examining the differences between Soviet and post-Soviet television it is typical to point out the abolition of the censorship and the appearance of the commercial channels with TV series and advertising. These differences may not be the most essential. The principles of location and the regulation of broadcasting have changed dramatically. Instead of the primitive dichotomy “Central Television – local studio” with duplication of the functions, formats and style of the Central Television in local programs, today there is a great variety of broadcasters.

This variety is created by international (transboundary) television companies and world services (*Euronews* and *Russia Today*), by almost twenty federal channels, by national broadcasting companies (*Tatarstan* –

*Noviy Vek, Moya Udmurtia, Sakha*), by nation-wide channels (*Perviy Kanal* and *Rossiya*), and also by regional channels (provincial, krai and okrug-wide) like *Yuzhniy Region Don, Yenisei-Region* and others. But the most significant change of the dimensional characteristics of television is connected with the penetration of modern TV in small audience groups at the level of municipal unit, city area and even a block.

In the Soviet period an oblast (krai) had a minimal or last status of television center. And even not all the administrative oblast centers had a broadcasting committee. As a rule, cities with population less than a million were not supposed to have a TV studio as well as evening paper, metro, opera house and some other creature comforts. In those small towns where TV center was built, the authorities could be punished for spontaneous activity, given that the Soviet view of television presupposed millions of viewers. Only processes of regionalization in 1990s spread TV to the compact audience groups. Corporative, university and school broadcasting centers appeared. There are no enormous differences in picture quality between home video and professional report any more. Technological innovations (continuous miniaturization and reduction in price of television equipment) brought down the coverage for local broadcasters to the level of village (aul or ulus).

However, only Canadian philosopher Marshall McLuhan called television world a “global village”. In Russia TV is, and always has been, a city media, which is weakly presented at the countryside. “According to the government statistics near 1,5 million of people who live in about 10 thousand settlements are not covered with broadcasting at all, and 3,7 million have access to only one television program” (*Televidenie v Rossii. Sostoyanie, tendencii i perspektivy razvitiya. Otrasleyvoi doklad*, 2010). Broadcasting covers the country’s territory not with a solid wave but as well as road network and circulation system with capillaries of television transmitters concentrated in the big cities. That is why geographical features, the character of settlements, communicative connectivity of territories exert a great influence on media landscape.

In the scientific literature devoted to television a question of appropriateness and reasonability of spreading of television technologies in one or another region depending on their human capital has not still been raised. Oddly enough, the question of economic reasonability of broadcasting in remote areas has not been put by public authorities as well. However, the installation of digital exciters and digital receiving systems by the Russian TV and radio networks (RTRS) in the outlying districts allows this statement of a question. Every new technological breakthrough sharpens the question of the price of penetration and pay-back. Should multiplexes be installed in those regions where even analog television does not differ in variety and quality of content?

### **Historical prerequisites of the placement of the first regional TV studios**

Spread of broadcasting in regions began only in the first half of 1950s. At the beginning, the enthusiasm of radio (and other electronic technologies) fans played a crucial role. The amateur TV studios appeared spontaneously in different cities. They mostly appeared in radio clubs, universities and institutes of technology. The authorities did not interfere with their work but were of little help either. In 1951 the broadcasting station constructed by amateurs appeared in Kharkov. While the television center was in process of construction local community was making home-made TV sets. Delegations from Odessa and Riga, Omsk and Vladivostok came to Kharkov in order to get to know technological devices and adopt the experience from the first broadcasters. In 1951 on initiative of the professor A. A. Vorobiyov, the director of Tomsk polytechnic institute who had familiarized himself with equipment of Kharkov's experimental television center, the decision to build an amateur TV-center in the polytechnic institute was made. At that time it was clear from the executive orders that the government was not going to build a television center in Tomsk in next five years. In half a year Tomsk polytechnics have created

transmitting television equipment (*Televidenie v Sibiri: monographiya*, 2011).

Television as well as other electronic communications is a technology which is not created by a single genius but absorbs discoveries of many engineers, research teams and design departments. Territories which have created the best conditions for a new communication technology achieve performance by way of growth of human capital. Like the Internet and mobile telephony now make users think fast, television, half a century ago, made audience clever. Television brings people closer to the cultural achievements of civilization and opens new perspectives in education and self-cultivation. At least it did so at the dawn of television's presence in social life.

On September 15, 1955, The Council of Ministers of the USSR accepted a resolution № 1689 "On Measures for Further Development of Broadcasting in the USSR". The phase of rapid development and spread of technical facilities of television broadcasting in regions had started. The resolution obliged Government of the RSFSR and Councils of Ministers of the union republics to build television centers and relay stations, to make and assemble microwave-link equipment for relay stations in 1956–1958. At the same time, the government did not state the principles of television centers location. It put into operation those centers which were built at the expense of executive committee and enterprise forming a company towns budget. And then the government would suddenly remember to amend the site location plan of television centers. In 1965 the Resolution of CPSU "On State and Measures of Improvement of Local TV Studios in the RSFSR", which provided requirements only for strengthening of material and technical basis and ideological orientation of broadcasting, was adopted. Leadership of a party declared putting into operation dozens of satellite communication receiving stations "Orbita" in Siberian regions, the Far East, Central Asia and the Far North. It was expensive equipment which would never be installed at the expense of local budget. However, the Communist party stopped closing its eyes to the unauthorized activity which local television studios had

been showing since 1950s. The party wanted television to demonstrate the advantages of the Soviet way of life. Otherwise there was no need to construct all the satellite system.

Struggling with “amateur activities” of local TV studios, leaders of Central Television even promoted closure of some autonomous broadcast centers. For example, of all television studios which appeared in Altayskiy Kray at the end of 1950s only one in Barnaul was still operating by 1970. The same thing happened in Tyumenskaya Oblast – only the regional television center was left there. Closure of the TV studios in Biysk, Rubtsovsk, Nizhnevartovsk, Khanty-Mansiysk and other Siberian cities ought to be authorized somehow. As an excuse an economical version was suggested which stated unprofitability of small studios and difficulty of their regular technical modernization. Researcher of the TV E. Bagirov writes about this version: “General enthusiasm for television in the early 1960s provoked spontaneous construction of television centers on the initiative of local community without regard to the state resources for their regular modernization” (Bagirov, 1985).

However, there was another reason which was not named explicitly but local television journalists understood it correctly. A number of local TV studios still missing their role of the Central Television as information and journalistic branch were keeping on making all-embracing reports, thus bringing themselves to the useless competition with the all-Union programs. On principles of political monocentric Central Television was formed and it became the main supplier of information for the Soviet people. And local TV studios, on the complementary principle, were to make “News from the Fields” on a regional scale. As Central Television’s power was rising, local studios were brought down to the level of the correspondent’s offices. It may be said that in the geographical location of television centers Soviet government was seeking for simplification of situation, as “plurality should not be posited without necessity”. It can explain, for example, the fact that Vilnius had a republic committee on television, while neither Riga nor Tallinn had one.

## **New principles of geographical location of television companies**

After the August Putsch of 1991 the “parade of sovereignties” began, and instead of general television system, which had been being created for decades, fifteen independent state television and radio complexes appeared in half a year. It took a lot of time and strength to create uniform information space which was destroyed almost in a blink. At the beginning of 1990s idea of independent private television was maturing among many of journalists and businessmen. This period was the most favourable for creation of media business due to many reasons. State television was extremely depressed, it was splitting into separate production units. Professional personnel of state television companies were seeking for more creative and well-paid work.

State authority was unconcerned with television. The licensing system for broadcasting was working on default. There was no such term as “pirate movie” in public conscience. There had not been rivalry on the market because there had not been a market itself yet. In this very period the principles of geographical location of broadcasters changed dramatically. If in 1950s government solved the problem of TV tower’s construction from the state considerations, then at the beginning of commercialization of the regional television area only ambitions of the local founders and initial capital initiated the start of new telecasting station broadcasting.

It became clear very soon that it is easy to start broadcasting in one or another human settlement but it is not so easy to keep an audience and to compete with other broadcasters. To understand the logic of state and private broadcasters’ formation in the provinces it is necessary to examine the triad of key concepts “Center – Regions – Outlying districts”. Between the center and regions the same relations of subordination are being formed as between a region and its outskirts.

Metropolis takes tax payments, competitive production and best specialists from regions and gives in return budgetary subsidies, foreign goods and culture samples (including television programs of central

channels). As a matter of fact, this is colonial policy but today it disguises itself in economic and cultural forms. The further from capital the less possibilities of TV programs reception, variety of channels and quality of television production remain. Oblast and krai centers act towards raions and oblast towns in the same manner as the capital acts toward the provinces.

There are more than 12 thousand of municipal units in Russia today. Our analysis of the registry licenses for broadcasting, kept by Roskomnadzor<sup>27</sup> gave us 3753 licensees in television. Not all of them produce something for broadcast and go on air because of economic reasons. According to A. V. Malinin, the Deputy Minister of Communications and Mass Media, “the number of cities where federal channels have interest from the economic point of view in spreading their programmes with all-Russian and local advertising is not more than 120”<sup>28</sup>. In consideration of the fact that Russia has only 11 megalopolises with population of more than a million inhabitants, it is clear that among 120 “cities profitable for TV” not all are equally profitable. It is obvious from the national sampling of TNS Gallup Media: there are 29 big Russian cities which are the most interesting from the point of development of local television and advertising market.

Does it mean that television is being located in the area of regions-markets and obeys the market laws of profit? The answer is both yes and no. Spread of programs at the territory of oblasts’ raions has little interest for local commercial television companies because they have to pay operators of RTRS (Russian Television and Broadcasting Network) for signal propagation. The coverage of outlying regions does not promise the same advertising revenues as those which can be made from broadcast of TV programs in the administrative center of the oblast. The question of costs and profit is not prior for the Oblast Administration while the issue of political influence among the electorate is quite pressing. That is why

---

<sup>27</sup> The Federal Service for Supervision of Communications and Mass Communications. URL: <http://rsoc.ru/mass-communications/reestr/>

<sup>28</sup> National Association of Broadcasters. URL: <http://www.nat.ru/>



oblast television channels (telenets) mostly have state legal status. Thus, non-state broadcasters which make business from TV are concentrated in the provincial centers. State broadcasters which make a political and social project from television try to cover all the territory of the federal subject.

There is its own specifics in the commercial way of broadcasters' location which is connected with the fact that the principal business of our country is associated with hydrocarbon raw materials. Let us suppose that Khanty-Mansiysk has a population of 75 thousand people. According to this number this city is not supposed to have seven institutes of higher education, two theatres, two state museums, two newspapers and a television company which NAT (National Association of Broadcasters) praised as the best of the year for three times. As far back as 2007 television channel *Yugra* started broadcasting in the digital standard DVB-T in MPEG4. *Yugra* is the only regional television radio company which produces live-action films and TV series based on their own studio *Yugra-film*.

It reminds, by the way, of Manaus, Brazilian town, where the world's largest opera house was built in 1896, in the days of the rubber boom and world-famous tenors were being invited there. *Yugra* is the only television company which covers the administrative center of the oblast with broadcasting, although it does not have high ratings in Tyumen. *Yugra* shows how television can work without paying attention to the administrative boundaries. The very fact of the existence of such a unique television company maintains understanding of the region as a corporation. But still the situation of one television company going beyond the boundaries of the autonomous district is unique and even ridiculous in some way. Usually city television companies are closed on their city audience from which they collect advertising contacts for financing of broadcasting.

## **System approach to the location of local broadcasters as a side-effect of government regional policy**

Government bodies have their own logic of broadcasters' location which coincides neither with market logic nor with corporate. And this logic is not easy for understanding. Why, for example, Kudymkar, the administrative center of Perm Krai, has GTRK "Komi-Permyatskaya", though population of this town is only 31 thousand people? And why does not the big industrial Siberian city like Novokuznetsk with the population of 563 thousand have any state television radio company? Neither has Tolyatti which population is 703 thousand people. And Tura (an urban-type settlement in Evenkiysky District of Krasnoyarsk Krai) with 5 thousand of inhabitants has GTRK "Heglen". Only high social tasks can explain such audience imbalance in state broadcasting.

However, regional authorities think only on a local scale and do not want to take extra responsibility for interregional projects. "Thinking within limits and borders obstructs project activity at the macro-regional level for the simple reason that any idea of cooperation between regions or between their parts is usually being rejected due to "natural" escape from excessive complications" (Glazychev, Schedrovitsky, 2004). Some attempts have been made to build horizontal relations at the level of "Siberian Accord" but governors of 15 krajs and oblasts went no further than making declarations. Position "it is better to have little and not much of a good but yours" impedes the creation of interregional programs (TV channels). Siberia had an experience of co-production and information exchange within the framework of programs *Gubernskie Novosti* (GTRK "Novosibirsk", GTRK "Tomsk", GTRK "Altai") and "News of Siberia" (a regional network NTSC), but it was short-lived.

The basic problem of digital divide, which is connected with disproportions in the location of television forces, consists in the lack of regional policy. There is Ministry of Regional Development, there are many policy documents and declarations but there is no policy itself, no policy as a state participation in affairs of regions. "Russia has no distinct

regional policy. Today the course on income equality of the Federation units is set. This course leads (sooner or later) to the reduction of donor regions and this is happening now. I think that another strategy should be adopted – the rate based on the regions of growth, around which outpacing economic growth is starting, and which will draw neighboring territories into their own orbit of development” (Khloponin, 2004).

It is exactly the absence of the distinct and coherent regional policy that has led to the situation when municipal TV companies, which only began to appear as a type of broadcaster, have to scale down their operation here and there. Let us say, in Krasnoyarsk region five municipal TV stations were asking for entering into the television holding “Yenisei-Region”, because they were not able to live on advertising revenues. The new edition of the Law “On Principles of Local Self-Government” and the relevant amendments to the Budget Code have frozen the partial municipalization process of territorial administration. Now, not only grants and subsidies from the regional funds, but also federal subsidies for exercising on state powers can enter the municipality not directly but only through the subject of the federation. We do not get a lesson from history although it had been already stated in the XIX century that “The bigger territory tending to one center, the more desert is all other area culturally and spiritually. The only salvation for the border regions from the devastating action of centralization is to establish regional councils and to hand over disposal of local finances to them” (Potanin, 1995).

### **Management failures in the attempt to link the communicative space regions by district TV**

It would not be fair to refer all the failures in creating of new regional broadcasters only to the rigid chain of command and self-interested “regional barons”. The failure in establishing district television is due to a more complicated set of managerial, professional, and financial reasons. When establishing the seven federal districts by the Presidential Decree № 849 in

2000, the most adventurous media managers decided that they had received *carte blanche* to create inter-regional broadcasters. The motto of these projects was “the formation of the uniform information space in the regions”.

In 2001, with the support of the Minister of Press Michael Lesin and RTR chairman Oleg Dobrodeev Siberian entrepreneur Jacob London created television station “TV-Siberia” with the financial support of tycoon Oleg Deripaska. However, TV company went on air with the news programs only in the fall of 2002, and six months later difficulties with licensing and financing of the project began. In the summer of 2003 most employees, who had been enticed by high salaries from Kuzbass and Altai television companies, were withdrawn from the staff without service benefits.

Despite the fact that Ural has a similar television company – “Yermak” – which exists for seven years already, the experiment in creating inter-regional television in the federal districts cannot be called successful. Firstly, the founders of “Yermak” and “Siberia” have not solved the problem of signal delivery over large areas (Siberian Federal District occupies 5114,8 sq. km., Ural Federal District – 1788,9 sq. km.). To such coverage a huge transmitter-receiver system, the broadcast license and costs (for which no one, as it turned out, was ready) would be required. Programs of “TV-Siberia” could be seen only in Novosibirsk.

Secondly, such a huge territory, divided into several time zones, has different climatic and, what is more important, different economic conditions. Evenk reindeer-breeder in Taimyr, a worker of the agricultural holding in the south of Omsk Region and, say, a teacher from Irkutsk actually have little in common. They are not interested in the news of distant areas which live different lives. None of them considers Novosibirsk a capital of the region and newsreel reports from this city are unlikely to have a national news status which would justify their distribution.

Jacob London’s project could have been successful only if the professional team of television journalists, assembled from all Siberia, had started to make high-quality programs for regional TV stations in the mode-production studio. In 1950–1960s local studios used to exchange their best programs regularly, but then this practice faded. From 1992 to 1996, the ANO

“Internews” was releasing a program *Local Time*, the purpose of which was to share news items of various genres (primarily without information occasion) among dozens of local TV companies – program participants.

If “TV-Siberia” had become a ground for the creative experiments and exchange of journalistic experience, if it had formed the horizontal relations between regional broadcasters, the project would have succeeded. But the first Jacob London’s problem was, apparently, to draw 10 million dollars allocated by O. Deripaska for formation of district TV. Another reason for the regional TV project’s failure was non-transparency of the issues of property and funding sources. And in a year and a half of the project Oleg Deripaska failed to understand when and in what form he would receive dividends from the investment in the district television. Naturally, the businessman lost interest in such kind of investment soon.

### **TV development trends in regions during the digital television transition**

It is obvious that a full digital transition guarantees drastic changes to regional television and it has already started to make an impact. “There is an actual risk that in the “Digital Age” local companies could become marginal. Today all strategically minded managers are already pondering how to save these companies, and what they could produce in future. It is important to realize that this issue concerns not only the TV business. In fact, regional media develops civil society and, in Russia, is an essential part of it. Therefore, keeping and development of the media is of common cause” (Shvydkoy, 2010).

As a matter of fact, the conception of the TV broadcasting development in Russia for 2008–2015, which was already approved in 2007, includes the digital transition, however, it does not consider regional channels at all. Alexey Malinin, Deputy Minister of Communications and Mass Media of the Russian Federation, admitted only at the end of 2010 that the Ministry was “yet to carry out a large amount of work in

terms of analysis of the regional market”. But we are talking only about the third multiplex, which will include those who did not get into the first and the second set of programs. It may be assumed that there are several methods regional broadcasters can use to “minimize the damage from the digital transition”. First of all, a regional channel which managed to enter a multiplex could share its space in the broadcasting schedule with those companies which would otherwise not be present in an obligatory TV package. These companies, however, have to be reclassified as production companies (that is production-studios) rather than television broadcasters in order to use this broadcasting space.

Since all local companies are in a severe competition to get a sponsor, it will be psychologically difficult to enter the broadcasting space as “junior partners”. There is another way for the whole television community to enter a multiplex. A new company has to be created by the integration of current broadcasters. If an appropriate legislation were developed, local companies would be able to create a public broadcasting system. Besides, a big company, even of a commercial kind, with its own programming and 15 hour air-time could provide competition to the federal channels and network television companies at least in terms of information broadcasting. The possibility of creating a merger of broadcasters should involve ambitions of media managers who are not eager, as well as regional governors, to merge with anyone at all.

If the integration of broadcasting systems does not succeed either on the base of the most powerful local company or on the basis of a new TV company being an association of all existing provincial broadcasters and production companies, then regional TV companies will have only one choice: to move to non-air space – cable networks and the Internet. In fact, even now, some companies, tired of “fighting with the windmills”, agreed with cable TV providers on including their production in a paid TV package. There is no doubt that non-air space has its own growing competition, but the level of tension there could be hardly compared to the cruelty prevailing in the regional air divided between television networks and federal channels.

Nowadays, therefore, since the Soviet times, the country inherited inefficient spatial organization of public broadcasting in the regions, linked to the outdated administrative-territorial division of the republics, regions and districts. VGTRK (RTR) has to maintain redundant structure of broadcasting in sparsely populated districts, even though this broadcasting takes up the airtime only for two to three hours per day. This outmoded system opposes to the emergence of horizontal relations between producers and distributors of programs and to establishing of regional networks and channels.

The emergence of private broadcasters in the 1990s and the transition to the commercial broadcasting economy have not eliminated disparities in regional development. They just prepared the ground for aggressive Moscow capital. Federal channels together with television networks squeezed local broadcasters out of the airtime and turned them into “VCR”. Lack of regional content in the TV even in the form of local “windows-spots” contributes to the loss of the regional identity for residents of the province.

National Television Syndicate (NTS) plays an important role in supporting the broadcasters, who refused the networking and switched to their own programming. But NTS started providing TV packages to local television stations only in 2005, when television networks had already been firmly entrenched in the regional space, therefore, nowadays it is difficult to recover lost ground in the air.

Russian regions need cross-border television, which would support the communication connection between currently decaying and degrading peripheral territories. TV should be viewed as a public service and human capital investments. The reformative problem of education and young potential development should be posed for regional broadcasters. We need a federal program to support municipal television stations. These companies, in association with the local cable networks, may become this very “e-government”, which for a long time has been discussed by the officials in the government and in the President’s administration.

The reconfiguration of TV functions is also a problem for the scientific community of faculties and departments of journalism. We must create a

typology of television broadcasters to include spatial measurements of coverage and bind different TV legal forms to some areas. Following the new classifications we should develop broadcasting concepts and strategic development scenarios of those new companies that have not yet found a place in the regional information space. As man said in the past, to help mass media find their own face. Therefore we have to join in the real media-economy with the research and influence the media landscape of the regions.

## References

Bagirov, E. (1985). *Televidenie 70kh: nekotorye osobennosti razvitiya* [Television of 1970s: Some Peculiarities of Development]. In *Televidenie '84: vchera, segodnya, zavtra: sbornik statei* [Televidenie '84: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow: Collected Articles]. Moscow.

*Cifrovoe TV i regional'noe veschanie. Central'niy federal'niy okrug* [Digital TV and Broadcasting in Regions. Central Federal District]. (2010). URL: <http://www.nat.ru/>

Glazychev, W., Schedrovitsky, P. (2004). *Rossiya. Prostranstvennoe razvitiye* [Russia. Spatial Development]. URL: <http://www.archipelag.ru/agenda/povestka/evolution/development/doklad2004/>

Khloponin, A. Severnoe sliyanie [Northern Merger]. (2004). *Profile*, 9(376), P. 20.

Potantin, G. N. (1995). Oblastnaya tendenciya v Sibiri [Regional Trend in Siberia]. In *Otechestvo. Sibirskii istoricheskii almanakh* [Motherland. Local History Almanac], 6. P. 98.

Shvydkoi, A. M. (2010). Mestnoe vremya [Local Time]. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*, 5116, February 24. P. 1.

*Televidenie v Rossii. Sostoyanie, tendencii i perspektivy razvitiya. Otrastlevoi doklad.* [Television in Russia. State, Tendencies, and Prospects of Development. Industrial Report]. (2010). Moscow. P. 142.

*Televidenie v Sibiri: monografiya* [TV in Siberia: Monograph]. (2011). By Yaroslavtseva, A. E., Baydina, V. S., Blinova, E. V., Eremenko, O. A., Ershov Yu. M., Makeeva, O. E., Khalina, E. V. Tomsk. P. 17.



Typology of local and regional broadcasting<sup>29</sup> by organizational-legal form and reach

ORGANIZATIONAL-LEGAL FORM AND OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE TV COMPANIES			
Coverage of the territory / administrative-territorial units	State-owned companies* (federal, state, district, regional)	Non-state (private)** companies (Inc., Ltd., etc.)	Public-private partnership – Mixed forms of company-branches, subsidiary companies
The federal districts (8)	Ural district broadcaster “Yermak”	—	—
Republics (21)	GTRK “Bashkortostan” and another 20 similar TV-companies	Small business “Ethir” (Kazan), Ltd “TV 12 Region” (the Republic of Mari El)	Ltd “AIST” (Irkutsk and Transbaikal region)
Territories and regions (55)	Regional state TV channel “Yenisei-Region”, state unitary enterprise Regional Television Network (OTS) in Novosibirsk	OTV-3 (Omsk), TV “Yuzhny Region Don”, JSC “Oblastnoe TV” Ekaterinburg, TV-21 of Murmansk and other channels	STS-Kuzbass (Kemerovo), Samara GubernskoeTV, etc.
Autonomous regions / districts (5)	GTRK Jewish Autonomous Region “Bira” (Birobidzhan), Aga Buryat GTRK (village Aginskoye), etc.	Ltd. Salekhard Video Channel, Inc. TRC SurgutInterNovosti, etc.	Autonomous facility of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous District “District broadcasting company “Yugra”, etc.
Municipal formations / cities, towns (12000)	“New TV” (Novokuznetsk), TRC STV (Strezhevoy), TRC Nazarovo, etc.	JSC “TV-2” (Tomsk), Ltd “TV Channel Four” Ekaterinburg, etc.	ANO “Novgorod regional TV” ANO “Volga television broadcasting company”, etc.

<sup>29</sup> The total number of TV companies, having a valid license, is estimated at 3753

\* The total number of public television stations in the Russian regions is estimated at 512 (13,6%)

\*\* The total number of non-state TV stations in the Russian regions is estimated to be 3114 (83%)

## RUSSIAN MEDIA AND THE INTERNET

## РОССИЙСКИЕ МЕДИА И ИНТЕРНЕТ

*Maria M. Lukina, PhD, Associate Professor,  
Chair of New Media and Communication Theory,  
Faculty of Journalism, Lomonosov Moscow State University,  
Moscow, Russia  
maria\_lukina@list.ru*

*Мария Михайловна Лукина, кандидат филологических наук, доцент,  
кафедра новых медиа и теории коммуникации,  
факультет журналистики МГУ имени М. В. Ломоносова,  
Москва, Россия  
maria\_lukina@list.ru*

*The Internet that changed the shape of media at a global, national and regional level influenced the Russian media as well. Despite the economic crisis the Russian media advertising indexes showed positive dynamics and Internet advertising market since 2010 demonstrates the faster growing in comparison with advertising in the “old” media. Russia gains the first place in Europe in the number of Internet users (68,0 million as for June, 30 2012) and is rated as intermediately penetrated country (Internet World Stats. Usage and Population Statistics, 2012). The Internet has become the third resource for obtaining news after television and print media for the whole population (18+0), and the second – for the younger generation in the age group of 18–24 (Osobnosti potrebleniya informacii: stolici vs drugie goroda Rossii, 2012). Two Russian media websites – www.kp.ru and www.ria.ru got into European top 10 in this category by the number of unique visitors. These data drive media researchers to move further for comprehensive understanding of online media sites and their affects on traditional media practices, experiments with new media platforms forcing them to newsroom convergent solutions, new platform integrations, interaction with audiences, and alternative agenda setting.*

*The paper covers historical perspective of Russian Internet media, and describes its three periods of development; it distinguishes two media groups and several sub-groups, their basic and extra features as part of media system, and figures out local and global trends that sooner or later affect development of Russian media industry and determine a next stage in online media development.*

**Key words:** *Internet; Runet; online media; hypertext; multimedia; interactivity; user generated content.*

*Интернет, изменивший конфигурацию СМИ на глобальном, национальном и региональном уровнях, оказал серьезное влияние и на российские средства массовой информации. Несмотря на экономический кризис российские рекламные индексы продемонстрировали положительную динамику, а рынок интернет-рекламы, начиная с 2010 г. развивался более высокими темпами роста по сравнению с рекламой в «старых» СМИ. Сегодня Россия занимает первое место в Европе по числу интернет-пользователей (68,0 млн. на 30 июня 2012 года) и оценивается экспертами как страна с умеренным индексом проникновения Интернета (Internet World Stats. Usage and Population Statistics, 2012). Интернет стал для населения (18+) третьим источником новостей после телевидения и печатных средств массовой информации и вторым — для молодого поколения в возрастной группе 18–24 (Osobennosti potrebleniya informacii: stolici vs drugie goroda Rossii, 2012). Помимо этого, два российских медийных сайта [www.kp.ru](http://www.kp.ru) и [www.ria.ru](http://www.ria.ru) попали в первую десятку европейских сайтов в этой категории по количеству уникальных посетителей.*

*Эти данные заставляют медиа исследователей продолжать свои дальнейшие изыскания над выяснением природы интернет-СМИ, их взаимодействием с традиционными практиками средств массовой информации, изучать эксперименты редакций на новых медиа-платформах, конвергентные решения создания текстов и новые форматы взаимодействия с аудиторией, приводящие к созданию альтернативных повесток дня.*

*В статье автор описывает российские интернет-СМИ в исторической перспективе, выделяет три периода их развития, предлагает вариант их деления на две медиа-группы и несколько подгрупп, рассматривает их основные и дополнительные функциональные характеристики как части системы средств массовой информации, выделяет их локальные и глобальные свойства, которые рано или поздно повлияют на развитие российской медиа индустрии и определяют дальнейший этап развития онлайн-СМИ.*

**Ключевые слова:** Интернет; Рунет; интернет-СМИ; гипертекст; мультимедиа; интерактивность; контент, созданный потребителями.

## **Online media in Russia: periods of development**

In 2011 the amendment to the main Federal Media Law legalized the definition of online media that briefly sounds as “a website in the Internet registered as mass medium in accordance with this law” (Zakon “O sredstvakh massovoi informacii”, 2011). According to the law the registration as media is *ex gratia* and not mandatory. Those websites which are not registered legally do not belong to media. Debates on what is mass media in the Internet (Internet-SMI: Teoriya i praktika, 2010) have finished.

The short historical account of media in Runet (the Russian Internet segment) could be described in terms of three periods.

The first started in March, 1995 when *Uchitelskaya Gazeta* jumped online (Gorny, 2007). As opposed to other emerged media sites being just presentations of their “parent” publications from the very beginning it exported the full package of information from a print edition to a digital platform. In 1996 *National News Service* conducted online transmission of the presidential election. Although it was available only for 5,000 users and mostly from abroad this event was the next step to demonstrate

media consumers and media producers broad opportunities of a new channel. By 1998 several other newspapers have made timid experiments in digital environment mostly by computer enthusiasts.

The second period (1999–2004) was marked by appearance of several content outlets capable to compete with traditional media. Among them there were *gazeta.ru*, *lenta.ru*, *strana.ru* and other media content projects that positioned themselves as online media which did not have equivalents in offline and spread information only via the Internet. The audience gradually got used to them as a full-scale information source. Khodorkovsky, Gusinsky and other media moguls were general investors, and Fund for Efficient Politics was the main developer.

During this period the *RosBusinessConsulting (RBC)* success story turned around. RBC opened its server in 1995 and during the financial crisis this Internet agency which was not well known to the digital natives and much less to the general public started online publishing the most demanded information about currency rate changes. From this very moment *www.rbc.ru* became the most visited site specialized in finance. The chosen information strategy led to the fact that the amount of visitors nearly equals the circulation of a daily newspaper.

The financial crisis pushed out *gazeta.ru*: at the end of February 1999 it published a beta-version and since March 1999 started production on a regular basis. *gazeta.ru* was the first medium which called itself an online newspaper. Within several months ratings of *gazeta.ru* reached leading positions in Runet that signaled an appearance of the formation of an extra online media sector alongside traditional media – print, TV, radio.

Low-cost production turned out to be attractive for investors and with-in 1999 a number of media outlets were opened. Some of them appeared to be successful; others survived for a short time but then were closed down because of their unprofitability (Internet dlya zhurnalistov, 2001).

The next five year period (2005–2010) was marked by an open discussion about the crisis in traditional media, and especially in print ones. The concern was provoked by positive dynamics of online readership which was significantly larger than the increase in sales of traditional

newspapers. According to *World Newspaper Association* within the five-year period of time beginning from 1999 the number of Internet users increased by 350%, while the sales from print circulation grew by only by 4,75%. Along with the fall of circulation figures and the losses of advertisers, which were marked in all countries, it proved the presence of a serious crisis in the print and newspapers market (Internet-SMI: Teoriya i praktika, 2010).

Offline journalists all over the world were concerned about the new conditions of media consumption mostly by young audiences, active usage of portable digital devices; growing popularity of individual communication as well as participation in blogosphere, social networking, usage of social containers); and of classified ads that step by step moved from print media to the Internet (Sredstva massovoi informacii Rossii, 2011).

Taking into account these challenges many media sites reconstructed their online departments and newsrooms, which made an opportunity to gain more independence and the right to pack content according to online rules.

During its short history online media proved their substantiality as a part of Russian media system. They possess the whole package of classical media features along with original features which has a special social niche different from the old media audiences not that numerous but younger, richer, and more educated. Additionally they develop to be more flexible in periodicity; boundless in content distribution; reach smaller segmented groups; focus attention on information zones which are characterized by both universal and special topics (Internet-SMI: Teoriya i praktika, 2010).

By the end of this development period online media started off full exercise special digital essentials like hypertext, multimedia opportunities; interactivity, social networking and information exchange with the audiences. Here is the list of top media sites that by 2010 explored digital potential to the full extent: *RIA Novosti* ([www.rian.ru](http://www.rian.ru)), *Kommersant* ([www.kommersant.ru](http://www.kommersant.ru)), *Vedomosti* ([www.vedomosti.ru](http://www.vedomosti.ru)), *Komsomolskaya Pravda* ([www.kp.ru](http://www.kp.ru)), *Ekho Moskvyy* ([www.echo.msk.ru](http://www.echo.msk.ru)), *lenta.ru* ([www.lenta.ru](http://www.lenta.ru)).

## Online media: two groups

Due to the fact that Runet media sector is too young it is early to talk about a clear typological structure. However, we can distinguish several online media groups using a number of clear measures.

The structure of Internet media could be determined in connection with offline in two different groups. One emerged as a result of traditional media change-over to a new digital platform, the other – as initially digital and focusing only on the Internet as a distribution system for information. In another terminology: incumbents, or established organizations, and insurgents, as new firms (Kung, Picard, Towse, 2008).

Newspapers were pioneers to move online. We mentioned *Uchitel'skaya Gazeta* – the first traditional newspaper which jumped to Internet without any pressure. Later followers were *Izvestiya*, *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, *Argumenty i Fakty*, and all other national newspapers. Nowadays you cannot find any of them without a digital version.

From another originally Internet group that emerged initially on the basis of web-technologies and functioned only in the Internet environment we can name *gazeta.ru*, *lenta.ru* and other online outlets.

Experts divide the first group in three clusters (Sredstva massovoi informacii Rossii, 2011):

**1. “Clones” or equivalent copies of traditional media.** These media are still the majority in online catalogues especially in local and niche sector. The number of titles is close to the officially registered media, as no respectable print media outlet, radio station or TV channel could go now without a site in the net (Sredstva massovoi informacii Rossii, 2011).

**2. “Hybrids” or modified online versions of traditional media.** They emerged on the basis of their offline prototypes, but instead of duplication the content they create extra packages of information in order to reach wider audiences. New sections, hypertext links, multimedia solutions, interactive options – with the help of such various transmission schemes compared to parental media, these editions save the same typological frames and the same brand. This group is bounded mostly with

mainstream media, national papers (*Izvestiya, Rossiyskaya Gazeta, etc.*) and broadcasting channels (*VGTRK, NTV, Radio Mayak, etc.*).

**3. Online outlets independent from offline** with their own system of sections, news update dynamics (some publications passed to a continuous 24x7 content update), substantial multimedia and interactive solutions. These sites represent the third model of traditional media web-versions which is bound to the offline “parent”, however uses all the possibilities of the online environment (*Argumenty i Fakty, Ekho Moskvy* are good examples).

**The second group** includes media projects that emerged in the Internet and do not have offline prototypes. Trying to find their profile they build their own business strategies and unlike the first group take leading positions in Runet online ratings. Some of them openly state their commercial interests and promise to reach their payback point. In this group experts distinguish two clusters: information portals –multifunctional Internet services, which imply a variety of topics, genres and services along with the never ending flow of information; and sites of digital newspapers or magazines with a larger number of analytical articles than the news stories (*slon.ru*).

### **Extra measures for media sorting**

At the end of 2010 a new group of media that launches its projects both online and offline appeared. This media type includes such projects as the radio station *BFM* and site *BFM.ru*, the magazine *Snob* and its site *snob.ru*, etc. The emerging new type of both online and offline media is a signal to put a question about new measures for media classification sorting.

The popularity of such publications is also influenced by the fact that old media are not capable any more of satisfying the needs of new audiences for “24x7” information. The Internet practically destroys the established understanding of periodicity of the editions. The rhythm of



updates is unique in every editorial office; however, there are no technical limits for the frequency of updating. In an ideal situation the new information block should appear on the screen while the event is evolving, online.

The geographical reach of a publication has also been reassessed. In the Internet the notions of time and distance do not work, information becomes transboundary. The majority of sites including media are open for people from all over the world. The charge for content, technical problems with Internet access and the language of communication are the main barriers to information. In fact, online media with the Russian language potentially reach not only Russian citizens but also Russian speaking people from all over the world. In some cases the amount of visits from abroad could reach even 30–40% of daily visits (*www.kp.ru*, *www.rian.ru*). The globalization of audience dictates the character of the content, rhythm of updating, and time when different users in different time zones become active.

The character of information dissemination via the global computer network allows content producers to reassess the parameters of national and local press crucial to old media. In the Internet national media co-exist with local information. However, the character of consuming shifts towards external audience – users from other regions. We may say that the Internet capabilities compensate two vectors – the centripetal and the inclination towards regionalization.

Internet publications treat differently the exclusiveness of the information product. For example, the equivalent copies (“clones”) use the same texts and selections of related articles as their offline parental editions. In an organizational perspective that means that media organizations do not need special staff working online and gathering and presenting of information is organized by using offline media principles – traditional content solutions, frequency of refreshing information, etc.

The particularity of the information model for “clones” lies in the fact that they publish information simultaneously with parental editions or with a slight delay. Moreover this kind of sequence (first print, then

online) is crucial for managerial decisions and is based on the fear to lose steady readers. But gradually media managers come to understanding that this strategy is not efficient: according to sociological surveys Internet audience does not match with the audience of old media. In Rунet more and more sites publish their online content on a separate schedule with permanent updating. The goal of editorial managers in this case is to attract new consumers and not to lose the old ones who for some reason do not buy print editions any more or do not switch on either TV or radio (Televidenie glazami telezritelei, 2012).

Modified versions of traditional media (“hybrids”) have their own approaches. They don’t copy their parent editions precisely, but publish online versions following their own structural rules and time schedule.

How do they integrate? Firstly, the materials are adapted for screen reading. Site creators understand that long texts are hard to perceive, that the main page should contain previews and leads to the stories, that headlines should be informative and include key words which help information search. Secondly, unlimitedness of space should be taken into account and articles could be supplied with extra related topics; information is updated online; hypertext links are included to enlarge the information field. Thirdly, clear and simple navigation system with original sections and stories. Fourthly, editorial office as separate department with own financing and organization scheme, adapted to online publishing.

Online media content balances between general and specialized, focused interest. Media that form online top-lists are mostly of general interest profile and could belong to both groups – online versions of “old” media and original online media (*gazeta.ru*, *lenta.ru*, etc.). However, we can find specialized and niche editions in the net as well. They are focused on audiences with special interests (finances, car industry, sports, religion, gender topics, etc.).

Digital technologies allow publishers to be more flexible in publication structure and composition. That is why online version of traditional media with a settled content scheme may transform and include extra

sections devoted to current events or topics of segment audience interest represent social groups, people sharing the same interests, etc.

Publications which are initially specialized show another trend. To attract a larger audience segments they expand covered topics. For example, *RosBusinessConsulting* includes in its information menu of general interest news and typologically became both financial and general interest online edition.

One of online media particularities is new possibilities for communication with audience. Almost all of them use the function of social networking, interactive discussions and forums for regular communication with readers. Shapes are different: informing and promotion in networks, chats based on focused interests, discussions concerning a given topic or a certain article, ratings, votes. Some media create their own virtual clubs, readers' communities for communication not only with the editorial office, but also with each other. Finding a steady reader is the most grounded answer to the challenges of the competition with "old" media.

## **Modernization features of online media**

Media sector of Runet is one of the most rapidly developing information fields. The characteristics of the new channel such as openness, non-limited access to information and accessibility for all population layers, interactivity and enhanced speed of information distribution, hypertext (the possibility to expand information in-depth) as well as multimedia are sure to contribute. The geographic position of the country, the spread of its territory and the remoteness of some regions also influence these development prospects.

But there is a number digital divide factors restraining developments which include the lack of broadband access to the Internet, the undeveloped system of electronic payments, poor equipment and low technical culture of society as well as rather high prices for Internet services. The

development of the sector is also limited because of the lack of legal base in the field, the lack of respect to copyrighting, and poor personal data protection mechanisms.

However, despite the objective difficulties the dynamics of Internet usage in Russia is growing positively and contributes to consumers' demand for online information. This fact encourages renovation processes in Russian digital media. Editorial offices especially in business and general interest sectors regularly consider their sites to be not only an additional channel of information but as independent projects separated from its digital version of the parent edition and giving users new possibilities of information consumption.

Below we specify modernization features that appeared in leading online media such as *RIA Novosti*, *Vedomosti*, *Kommersant*, and others (Internet-SMI: Teoriya i praktika, 2010).

The emergence of constantly updated online newsfeed becomes a required component for media sites' structure. In online newsrooms deadlines are designed with regard to demands of the users who want to get information 24 hours 7 days per week. This formula is the main principle to online newsroom managers and is used not only to breaking news coverage.

Online content is regularly constructed for various different electronic devices – mobile and smart phones, tablets and other mobile gadgets ([www.vedomosti.ru](http://www.vedomosti.ru), [www.kommersant.ru](http://www.kommersant.ru), [www.ria.ru](http://www.ria.ru), etc.).

Online content is packed for multimedia platforms which is probably one of the most serious novelties in Russian media. This fact proves that Russian professionals as their foreign counterparts think about new information strategies for attracting audiences with new practices for the consumption of information ([www.ria.ru](http://www.ria.ru), [www.kp.ru](http://www.kp.ru), etc.).

Content managers pay more attention to interactivity of their sites for both levels: content production and content consumption as well. The new channel allows to personalize the content with regard to the needs of the user who chooses stories according to his or her interests and has the possibility to work with the content by means of comments, ques-

tions, creating their own content (posting video, photos, etc.). Exploiting of user generated content is one of the main online media achievements which in some cases are considered as equal to that created by journalists. Such forms of co-working with audiences are materialized by means of different related services such as social networking, emails, online interviews, blogs, forums, voting and so on. Surveys and ratings are used for defining social position and preferences of all the site users. Forums are used for discussion of different issues; blogs make possible communication between different representatives of the audience. Recently *Facebook* and *Twitter* services have been also included in the list of editorial communication tools. We can find successful examples in *RIA Novosti* site [www.youreporter.ru](http://www.youreporter.ru) which in 2010 was awarded one of the main National prizes of Runet.

New conditions for media to work online oblige editorial offices to operate carefully with audiences, study their tastes, information preferences, behavior patterns. Russian experts advise media companies to distinguish precisely their audience niche, understand their demographic parameters, social profile, life style and habits, and special features of their media behavior. Several companies, national ones and units of global, work in the Russian Federation in the field of custom market Internet research and offer their services, among them there are *TNS Global* ([www.tns.global.ru](http://www.tns.global.ru)), *GFK-Rus'* ([www.gfk.ru](http://www.gfk.ru)), *FOM* ([www.fom.ru](http://www.fom.ru)), *Levada Center* ([www.levada.ru](http://www.levada.ru)), etc.

There are also several global trends that would sooner or later affect Russian media industry and will distinguish the next stage in online media development.

The first one concerned content monetization. Several units all over the world announced charging users for digital content. However, according to some experts content monetization faces serious difficulties connected with reluctance of young users to pay for the content. Teenagers consume increasingly more media products, but they are not ready to pay for them, the report of *Morgan Stanley Research Europe* (*Sredstva massovoi informacii Rossii*, 2011) says.

The second one could probably arise in the local Russian press as it happened in Britain where batch of sites were launched all over the country to serve needs of hyper local communities. The authors of the project state that this idea is focused on the local inhabitants – ordinary people, who would be able to create their profiles, publish news and use websites as photo and video stocks, form groups for discussion, exchange comments and files, send emails to each other. It is assumed that these sites will be open also to business communities and advertisers as well as to ordinary people (Internet-SMI: Teoriya i praktika, 2010). If it happens in Rунet such kind of sites may become serious competitors to local newspapers.

Another trend demonstrates that Internet original media become very attractive for professional journalists. All start-ups that appeared during financial crisis of 2008–2009 become interesting to advertisers and create serious competitive conditions for traditional media. For example, in 2009 a new online media project *slon.ru* ([www.slon.ru](http://www.slon.ru)) announced in the statement that it intended to compete with print media in the field of comments and analytical articles that had always been a prerogative of the quality press. Editorial article which described in its mission a comparison between online and print media stated: “Almost all our journalists, designers and photo editors are former employees of print media. For most of them the work in *slon.ru* is their first online experience. This is a voluntary decision of the project. We hope to transfer some methods which are more characteristic for the print editions. We would also like to demonstrate to our colleagues from the print media that the borderline between the things they do and online journalism has faded”.

The next challenge is the influence of news business mainstream by information created by citizen journalists. Their emergence is connected with the users’ desire not only to receive news, but also to write, comment, form communities, discuss actual topics and form their own agenda following their own interests. The possibility to participate in content production – this is the main effect of the revolutionary phenomenon, which appeared due to transparency, interactive possibilities and democratic potential of the Internet as communication and information plat-

form, where anybody could publish posts, comments etc. This phenomenon is widely used by the steady Internet users – for example, active bloggers from the popular *LiveJournal*.

Publications from blogosphere influence media mainstream but user generated content (UGC) is totally different from regular media content because do not represent results of professional journalistic work – to generate a verified information. The penetration of citizen journalism into media content is more and more vivid during breaking news, crisis situations, and when the access to information for some reasons is limited. The well known examples in Russian media are connected with the bomb attacks in Moscow underground, accident at the Sayano-Shushenskaya hydroelectric power station, the so-called color revolutions in the post-Soviet countries and other events and stories when peoples' voices participated in agenda setting.

Although professional media in Russia use bloggers' postings and encourage bloggers to contribute as authors and participants of communication, the quality of their posts is criticized by the journalism community. One of the main arguments in favor of the traditional media is the verified data and for that reason the trust of the audience is higher. That is why bloggers who are struggling for the attention of the audience try to improve results of their work, and create their own media projects which pose high standards to the quality of texts (*www.chascor.ru*).

The competition between professional journalists and bloggers shifts to the media business sphere. There are cases when active content production in social networks was blocked in order to prevent competition with traditional media. We can name examples in the sphere of sports media where the distribution of photo and video created by users during sport events could be a serious competitor to professional journalism information. On the other hand, collaboration with bloggers and payments for their content has become a common managerial practice of media organizations.

However, the most significant trend of the recent years is the growth of the online advertising market and the afflux of advertisers into the Internet environment. Since 2010 it demonstrated the faster growing in comparison

to “old” media and increased (+56%) compared to TV (+18%), and print (+6%) (Rossiiskaya periodicheskaya pechat’: sostoyanie, tendencii i perspektivy razvitiya, 2012). However, the online advertising market of Runet has serious problems connected with the fact that advertisers measure the efficiency of the sites using only quantitative indicators of the traffic. This fact creates favorable conditions for traffic purchase which still is not condemned by all media players. Those media which are able to buy traffic do that.

## References

Eroshkina, E., Efremov A., Klimina, I., Frejdlin, S. (2012). *Segmentirovanie rynka rossiiskoi pressy: konceptual’niy podhod* [Market Segmentation of Russian Press: Conceptual Approach]. NIPKC Voshod-A.

*Fond Obschestvennoe Mnenie* [Public Opinion’s Fund]. (2012). URL: <http://runet.fom.ru>

Gorny, E. (2007). *Letopis’ russkogo Interneta*. [The Chronicles of the Russian Internet]. URL: <http://www.netslova.ru/gorny/rulet/>

*Internet dlya zhurnalistov*. [Internet for Journalists]. (2001). Moscow: MediaSoyuz

*Internet-SMI: Teoriya i praktika*. [Internet Media: Theory and Practice]. (2010). Lukina, M. (Ed.). Moscow: Aspekt-press.

*Internet v Rossii. Sostoyanie, tendencii i perspektivy razvitiya. Otrasevõi doklad*. [Internet in Russia. State, Tendencies and Prospects of Development. Industrial Report]. (2012). Moscow. URL: <http://www.fapmc.ru/rospechat/activities/reports/2012/item6.html>

*Internet World Stats. Usage and Population Statistics*. (2012). URL: <http://www.internetworldstats.com>

Kung, L., Picard, R., Towse R. (2008). *The Internet and the Mass Media*. Sage, London.

*Mediasfera Runeta* [Mediasphere of Runet]. (2009). URL: [http://download.yandex.ru/company/yandex\\_on\\_russian\\_internet\\_media\\_winter\\_2009.pdf](http://download.yandex.ru/company/yandex_on_russian_internet_media_winter_2009.pdf)



*Osobennosti potrebleniya informacii: stolici vs drugie goroda Rossii* [Characteristics of Information Consuming: Capitals vs Other Russian Cities]. (2012). URL: <http://runet.fom.ru/Proniknovenie-interneta/10712>

*Razvitie Interneta v regionah Rossii*. [Development of the Internet in Russian Regions]. (2012). URL: [http://download.yandex.ru/company/ya\\_regions\\_report\\_spring\\_2012.pdf](http://download.yandex.ru/company/ya_regions_report_spring_2012.pdf)

*Rossiskaya periodicheskaya pechat': sostoyanie, tendencii i perspektivy razvitiya. Otrasleyvoi doklad*. [Russian Periodical Press: State, Tendencies and Prospects of Development. Industrial Report]. (2012). Moscow. URL: <http://www.fapmc.ru/rospechat/activities/reports/2012/item3/main/custom/00/0/file.pdf>

*Sredstva massovoj informacii Rossii*. [Mass Media in Russia]. (2011). Zassoursky, Y. (Ed.). Moscow: Aspect-press.

*Televidenie glazami telezritelei*. [TV through the Eyes of Viewers]. (2012). Poluehtova, I. (Ed.). NIPKC Voshod-A.

*Zakon "O sredstvah massovoi informacii"*. [Law "On Mass Media"]. (2011). URL: <http://www.consultant.ru/popular/smi/>