

PECULIARITIES OF “UNIFIED NEWS” TELEVISION BROADCASTING: (NON)ADHERENCE TO PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS, LANGUAGE AND ETHICAL NORMS

^aNATALIIA SHULSKA, ^bNATALIIA KOSTUSIAK,
^cNATALIIA BUKINA, ^dOLHA KYRYLIUK, ^eRUSLANA
 ZINCHUK, ^fOLENA AFANASIEVA, ^gTETIANA
 LEVCHENKO, ^hVOLODYMYR SADIVNYCHYI,
ⁱSVITLANA BARANOVA, ^jOLENA MEDVID

^{a,b,e}Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, 13, Voli Ave,
 43025, Lutsk, Ukraine, ^cNational Aviation University, 1,
 Liubomyra Huzara ave, 03058, Kyiv, Ukraine

^dVolodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State University, 1
 Shevchenka Str., 25006, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine

^fS. Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, 9a,
 Nauky Ave., 61166, Kharkiv, Ukraine

^gState Hryhorii Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav, 30,
 Sukhomlynskyi Str., 08401, Ukraine, Kyiv Reg., Pereiaslav,
^{k,i,j}Sumy State University, 116, Kharkivska Str., 40007, Sumy,
 Ukraine

email: ^achulskanatalia@vnu.edu.ua,

^bkostusyaknataliia@vnu.edu.ua,

^cnataliibukina@npp.nau.edu.ua, ^dkyryluk@ukr.net,

^eZinchukRuslana@vnu.edu.ua,

^fen.afanasieva@gmail.com, ^gtanyalevchenko2010@ukr.net,

^hvsadiv@journ.sumdu.edu.ua, ⁱsbaranova@gf.sumdu.edu.ua,

^jomedvid@gf.sumdu.edu.ua.

Abstract: The article monitors the broadcasts of the joint telethon “United News” (1+1, Rada, STB and ICTV, Inter, My – Ukraina, and Suspilne) in terms of compliance with professional standards, language and ethical norms. The research material included news, live broadcasts, and guest studios. The analysis takes into account the specifics of wartime and its impact on compliance with standards. It was found that media professionals violate a standard on average every minute. Among the deviations from the standard of credibility, the following phenomena were recorded: generalized pseudo-references to sources of factual material, authorship of subjective opinions, quoting unverified information from the Internet, including social networks. The use of overly emotional and figurative statements, unauthorized subjective opinions, and vague quotes on the air indicate non-compliance with the standard of separating facts from opinions. It was established that the violations of the information accuracy standard are the discrepancy between the picture and text in the stories, as well as inadequate illustration of live broadcasts. The lack of answers to the main questions of the news, unclear designation of the archive in the background, incomplete introduction of studio guests or speakers in the synchronized newscasts indicate errors in the standard of completeness of information. Various types of violations of the standard of accessibility of information presentation include the use of lexemes that are not clear to the general public, difficult terms, jargon, abbreviations, borrowings, infographics, etc. Such anomalies occur when journalists mention concepts that are incomprehensible to the general audience without the appropriate background. It has been found that the standards of efficiency and balance of opinions and points of view are hardly violated in the telethon. The monitoring has shown that media professionals are prone to ethical anomalies. In the news, we come across non-compliance with the Code of Ethics of Ukrainian journalists, in particular, the dissemination of biased information or unfounded accusations. Violations of ethical norms are also evidenced by disparaging statements or foul language used on the air.

Keywords: journalistic standards; ethics; language norms; media; telethon “United News”.

1 Introduction

Today, journalism is entrusted with the mission of shaping public opinion, and this, accordingly, requires media professionals to take great responsibility for adhering to professional standards and ethical norms. In a time of war, it is important not only to present an objective picture of events, guided by the standards of reliability, accuracy, completeness, and accessibility of information, but also to maintain a balance of opinions and points of view, to avoid subjective statements, i.e., to separate facts from opinions, to use moral and ethical standards, and to use the correct set of vocabulary. After all, the rhetoric of hatred that Russia is trying to “push” into the Ukrainian information space under the guise of hostile narratives often finds its way into the domestic media through journalistic oversight.

Negative statements used by the modern media for clickbait have a significant impact on the formation of the information space and radicalization of the mood in society. Instead of promoting

cohesion, which is so necessary in times of war, they often lead to a split in society, conflicts between certain groups of citizens, demoralization of Ukrainians, discrediting some in the eyes of others, etc.

National TV channels, which have the largest audience and thus a significant influence on public opinion, should be conscious of adhering to professional standards and the Code of Ethics for Journalists, as well as language norms. Media professionals must take precautions to ensure that news content is of high quality, especially in times of war.

The “United News” telethon is a joint project of the channels “UA: Pershyi”, Rada, 1+1, ICTV, Inter, and Ukraine 24. It was launched on February 24, 2022, the day of Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine. This TV project broadcasts news, interviews, expert commentaries, and other journalistic materials related to the war in Ukraine around the clock. The telethon has a number of advantages. First, it allows reaching a wide audience, as it is broadcast on the three largest TV channels in Ukraine. Second, it provides timely and reliable information about the events of the war. Thirdly, “United News” contributes to the consolidation of Ukrainian society in times of war.

However, this journalistic format currently demonstrates distinct disadvantages. Firstly, it can lead to information overload for the audience. Secondly, it is likely to be used to spread disinformation. Thirdly, it can be subject to censorship, as the channels participating in the telethon may be restricted in covering certain topics.

Studying the professional communication of journalists and hosts of the telethon, media expert I. Kulyas notes that “the total number of violations of standards on the air is constantly growing” [8]. We observe that the quality of the TV programs of “United News” is deteriorating every month, which indicates a negative trend. In view of this, it can be argued that the listening audience does not always receive a reliable and adequate information picture of what is happening in the Ukrainian and global media field.

The professional standards of modern news journalism are studied by Ukrainian media experts I. Kulyas and O. Makarenko [7], L. Suprun [13], M. Tymoshyk [16], and others. M. Tymoshyk [16] carried out a conceptual analysis, a study of the genesis and content of professional standards. The topic of standards and ethical norms in the guidebook for professional journalists “Media Compass” was studied in more detail by O. Holub [2]. Reflections on whether standards are the basis of professional activity or an outdated framework are presented by O. Zakharchenko [18]. O. Vasina [17], M. Dorosh [1], N. Kuryata [8], Y. Syvakivskyi [15], N. Steblyna [12] write about the relevance of journalistic standards during the war. The issue of a detailed description of a particular journalistic standard and its features is the subject of a study by V. Kozak (the issue of balance of opinions and points of view) [4], as well as O. Jolos (competence and identification of experts in the context of compliance with the standards of balance and reliability of information) [3]. The research by O. Sushkova and O. Medvid [14] on the pragmalinguistic potential of news is also related to this area. Violations of ethical norms and hate speech in the media are covered in the scientific works of N. Shulska, N. Kostusiak, and other researchers [10; 11]. The general monitoring of the professional standards of the “United News” telethon in 2022–2023 was carried out by I. Kulyas [5; 6].

Despite the existence of publications of various thematic and genre ranges that relate to journalistic standards and ethics, in particular in times of war, there is currently a lack of scholarly works devoted to a comprehensive study and monitoring of compliance with professional standards and ethical norms during the Russian-Ukrainian war. We consider this issue to be relevant, as it leads the researchers to the most important

problems of our time, including the formation of respect for professional standards and ethical norms.

Thus, the purpose of the article is to analyze television broadcasting on the example of the United News marathon in terms of compliance/non-compliance with professional standards, language and ethical norms, in particular, to identify typical violations of the standards of reliability, accuracy, completeness, accessibility of information, separation of facts from opinions, promptness of presentation, balance of opinions and points of view, and to characterize examples of non-compliance with language norms and ethical principles.

2 Materials and Methods

In the course of the study, we monitored the broadcasts of the joint telethon “United News” (1+1, Rada, STB and ICTV, Inter, My – Ukraina, and Suspilne) for compliance with professional standards, language and ethical norms, recording typical violations and mistakes of media professionals. The research material included news, live broadcasts, and guest studios. In our analysis, we took into account the specifics of wartime and its impact on compliance with standards. The objectivity and comprehensiveness of the study was ensured by the use of a number of methods: descriptive, which allowed systematizing and characterizing language units that are outside the scope of ethical norms and journalistic tolerance, as well as professional standards; contextual analysis, used to identify and clarify the role of professional standards within the analyzed materials; communicative and pragmatic analysis, which aims to identify the impact of sensitive content on recipients, including vulnerable groups; monitoring, which is aimed at systematizing data on compliance with journalistic standards in the “United News” telethon.

3 Results and Discussion

The monitoring data of the telethon broadcasts indicate that the media violate a standard every minute on average. The most numerous mistakes were recorded in the news of the 1+1 TV channel. ICTV, STB, and Inter TV channels also demonstrate non-compliance with the principles of professional journalism. Their news content accounts for almost a third of all violations of the telethon standards. “Rada” and “My – Ukraina” channels pay more attention to standards, ethical and linguistic norms. The fewest violations were found in the broadcasts of “Suspilne”, although as a public broadcaster, such inaccuracies should not have occurred at all.

Information reliability standard

When we studied the TV coverage of the United News telethon in 2023, we recorded frequent violations of this standard. Media expert I. Kulyas notes the disappointing trend: “The amount of inaccurate information continues to grow steadily, both in absolute terms and in relative quantities” [6].

We note that this standard, which is key one to quality journalism, is violated by media outlets every three minutes. This standard is most often neglected in the news of 1+1 TV channel, where it is violated on average 24 times per hour. On other TV channels, the number of violations is relatively lower: “Rada” (20 times), “STB” and “ISTV” (19 times), “Inter” (18 times), “Suspilne” (14 times), “My – Ukraina” (19 times) [5].

On all TV channels, except for Suspilne, one of the most common violations of the credibility standard in the “United News” continues to be generalized pseudo-references to sources of factual material. Media outlets refer to various organizations and institutions, experts or specialists without specifying them. Large groups of people based on a particular profession, affiliation, social or territorial factor are repeatedly cited as sources of facts. Occasionally, we see generalized references to unnamed media, again without specifying a particular resource or expert.

Another drawback of the telethon is unverified information from the Internet, in particular, social networks such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. Journalists often take messages from unknown websites or Telegram channels, YouTube. We observe that telegram channels are one of the popular sources of information for “United News”, which puts this content under obvious doubt, because we understand that such information cannot always be trusted. The second place is occupied by unspecified resources, which is also a matter of concern. Social networks such as Facebook and Twitter are no less popular. The news quotes information from YouTube and Instagram less often.

Also among the unreliable sources of “United News”, there are quotes of subjective opinions. Most of the references are to anonymous representatives of various professions. On the other hand, we observe generalized references to the opinions of dubious “experts” and “analysts” presented without specifying the person concerned. Occasionally, we come across testimonies of so-called “generalized people”. It is a gross violation of professionalism that in some quotes journalists refer to the authorship of unknown Russians.

The main mistakes were caused by the fact that the media workers referred to social media (in particular, the main page of the State Emergency Service on social media, not the official website). However, if the official website's social media page is verified, it can be a reliable source of information. Let us look at examples of violations. In order to prove the authenticity of the message, videos were shown from the anonymous telegram channels “Realnyi Kyiv”, “aeronavtv”, “H...evaya Odesa”, “@ukrbavovna” and “@ukrwarzone”, as well as Russian telegram channels “Shot”, “Donbass Operativnyi”, “Krymskiy veter”, which clearly indicates the doubtful veracity of this information. This is evidenced by the following syntactic hyperbolic pointers to the sources of messages: “*shared on social media*”, “*the Internet is full of videos*”, “*all portals and telegram channels are full of them*”, “*social media users have dubbed it*”, “*the video was posted by dazed drivers*”, “*social media actively discussed the video*”. Also unreliable are references such as “*the video is being shared online*” and “*the footage is being shared online*”.

In the broadcast on October 10, 2023, journalists even quoted the “Trukha” telegram channel, which repeatedly spreads disinformation.

Often, television broadcasters use generalized references, for example: “local telegram channels report”. In the news of October 10 on “Inter” TV channel, the media used the phrase “a message from terrorists appeared on the network”, which indicates that information was transmitted from an unreliable source – a social network, without specifying which one. The most inappropriate is the indication of the source of information conveyed in the construction “I saw a video online” (“Suspilne”, October 10, 2023).

Another violation is that the broadcasts showed videos from Russian social networks and TikTok. Analyzing the television content for November 11–13, 2023, we observe that the standard of credibility was violated by media workers most often, which is categorically unacceptable for a public broadcaster.

Another variation of this standard violation is generalized pseudo-references to the authorship of subjective opinions. Often, media outlets unjustifiably refer to anonymous representatives of various groups of people by their professional characteristics. This accounts for the majority of all quotes in the news. The second place goes to the opinions of unnamed representatives of certain structures and organizations, generalized “experts” without specification, unknown analysts, etc.

Erroneous in journalistic materials were generalized references to sources of facts, for example: General Staff, Ministry of Internal Affairs, SBU, DBR, SES, Lviv City Council, Ukrenergo, Energoatom, Kherson, Luhansk, Zaporizhzhya

Regional Military Authorities, Kyiv City Military Authorities, Kherson Regional Prosecutor's Office, National Recovery Agency, Red Cross, Zaporizhzhiaoblenergo, etc.

It is incorrect that media outlets use pseudo-specifics when indicating the source of a message: *"rescuers reported"*, *"foresters say"*, *"city authorities and rescuers call"*, *"doctors admit"*, *"commenting on the law in the relevant committee"*, *"sappers say"*, *"according to the regional council"*, *"some experts predict"*, *"some political scientists predict"*, *"according to law enforcement officials"*, *"according to Ukrainian economic experts"*, *"some Ukrainian and Western military experts see it"*, *"the police say"*, *"the military fighting near Bakhmut report it"*, *"dog handlers emphasize it"*, *"local journalists note it"*. Journalists often resort to generalizations: *"this is what the regional military administration says"* or *"this is what the regional council reports"* without specifying the source of information. We observe that news reports repeatedly resort to abstract references, using the verb *"noted"* without specifying who made it.

In the media content studied, we found the unlawful use of authors with subjective opinions as experts: *"we talked to people and they say"*, *"analysts say"*, *"according to experts"*, *"military are convinced"*, *"guys are talking about it"*, *"military experts say"*, *"experienced specialists say"*, *"according to many intelligence officers"*, *"neighbors and volunteers say"*, *"villagers are sure"*. Such constructions are incorrect for journalistic broadcasting, as they cast doubt on the credibility of the material.

The news often contains abstract references without identifying the person who reported it. For example: *"it was reported"*, *"we have just been told"*, *"proven"*, *"reported"*, *"known"*, *"said"*, *"heard"*, *"as far as I know"*, *"some even predict"*, *"seen on the news"*.

We also come across materials in which factual information is presented without reference to any sources.

A standard for separating facts from opinions

Among the violations of this standard, emotional assessments are the most numerous. We observe that news outlets use figurative emotional expressions when covering the topic of war, in particular, when reporting on combat operations, the consequences of enemy shelling, etc. It is also inappropriate to use pretentious vocabulary when depicting realistic pictures at the front. We often observe the substitution of opinions for facts in journalistic materials. Among the significant violations of the standard under study is the fact that the news does not always give the right to speak to real experts. We note that journalists often resort to the method of giving out "instructions" and "useful tips". They repeatedly use unjustified authorization of opinions, personal emotions about the events depicted, and expressive lexemes to attract attention.

Journalists also use unauthorized subjective opinions in their own materials and in talk shows. The use of unfounded generalizations and vague quotes in the news is relatively less common. Other examples of violations of this standard are the use of emotionally loaded verbs such as "admits", "noted", "emphasized", "called", "convinced", etc. The news also contains subjective journalistic assessments conveyed through such syntaxes:

TV channel "Rada": *"bad weather caused disasters"*, *"inspiring story"*, *"he was incredibly lucky"*, *"new drones confused the Russians"*, *"the work of sappers is extremely difficult and very dangerous"*, *"the most acute situation"*, *"yesterday it was much worse"*, *"they conducted successful operations"*;

TV channel "1+1": *"in snowy captivity"*, *"prepared very seriously"*, *"actively collecting gifts"*, *"work is in full swing"*, *"blizzard is raging"*, *"so cold that one can't just tell"*; *"Russians hit us"*, *"speaks with great pain"*, *"mutilated body"*, *"those areas are the hottest"*;

TV channels "STB" and "ICTV": *"bombed every day"*, *"covered with snow, blizzard, wind, demolished and destroyed"*, *"catastrophically lacking"*, *"this is a story about something incredible"*, *"simple steps make wonders"*, *"so that life does not seem like sugar"*, *"miraculously survived"*, *"sluggish coverage"*, *"it is unrealistic to do this"*, *"the most difficult situation"*, *"this is a complex and responsible profession"*, *"much-needed equipment"*, *"these are the main challenges"*, *"more relevant than ever"*;

TV channel "Inter": *"to the hottest spots"*, *"total ruin"*, *"made a mess"*, *"unfortunately, two people were killed"*, *"sadly admits"*, *"enthusiastically tested"*, *"volunteer in despair"*, *"fortunately, enemy artillery is silent"*, *"mercilessly knock out the occupiers"*, *"its quality is terrible"*;

TV channel "My – Ukraina": *"very frightened"*, *"terrible events of that day"*, *"it shocked the relatives of the victims"*, *"unfortunately"*, *"shocking information"*, *"very frightened"*, *"a few days before the tragedy"*, *"destroyed to the ground"*, *"fierce fighting"*;

TV channel "Suspilne": *"these days are quite busy"*, *"it's basic"*, *"the damage is quite significant"*, *"what problems we may have encountered"*, *"the main thing worth noting"*, *"good news"*.

Despite the fact that journalists often resort to subjective insertions such as "fortunately", "surprisingly", and "unfortunately", such syntaxes are justified in war stories because they reinforce the context with a call-to-action and add to the belief in victory over the enemy.

On the other hand, it is unjustified that in television broadcasting journalists use their own assessments on any occasion: *"a very common practice"*, *"disagreed for quite a long time"*, *"listens to the coaches attentively"*, *"significantly delayed"*, *"experienced politician"*, *"a real holiday"*, *"huge traffic jams"*, *"huge queues"*, *"the situation is relatively calm"*, *"the situation was even more difficult"* (TV Channel "Inter").

A notable feature of the studied broadcasts is the dynamics of the process of objectification of the ENEMY concept in news reports. Our observations show that a significant factor in these changes was the beginning of the full-scale invasion on February 24, 2022. Before that date, news anchors, in particular of the "ICTV" TV channel, mostly used the words and constructions used in the daily reports of the Joint Forces Operation headquarters and defined by the Law of Ukraine "On Peculiarities of the State Policy on Ensuring the State Sovereignty of Ukraine in the Temporarily Occupied Territories in Donetsk and Luhansk Regions" (2018) to refer to the enemy. These are the following labels: *armed formations of the Russian Federation, the occupying state, Russian occupiers, Russian occupation troops, Russian mercenaries*; also, in some places, people used the lexicon *militants*, since Russia did not officially recognize its participation in the armed conflict at that time. For example: *"Russian occupants fired at Ukrainian New York with grenade launchers... The day before, Russian armed forces attacked Ukrainian positions 8 times"* ("ICTV Facts", November 30, 2021); *"This week, Russian occupation forces attacked Stanytsia Luhanska again"* ("ICTV Facts", December 11, 2021); *"Positions of our soldiers came under fire from militants"* ("ICTV Facts", October 26, 2021).

However, after February 24, 2022, we recorded the use of emotionally colored words with a pejorative connotation in the news broadcasts. The phrase *"rashist aggression"* was used to refer to the war itself, and stylistically marked vocabulary such as *rashists, barbarians, invaders*, as well as dehumanizing language units (*non-humans*), including those with zoomorphic semantics (*orcs*), were used to refer to the enemy. Also, the adjective **Putin's** is often used next to such words. For example: *"The rashists call it 'liberation' and the entire sane world – 'genocide'"* ("ICTV Facts", March 13, 2022); *"Putin's barbaric troops carry out missile and bomb attacks on populated areas"* ("ICTV Facts", March 13, 2022); *"In the Kyiv region, Putin's*

inhumans shot a convoy with women and children” (“ICTV Facts”, March 13, 2022); *“We want this nightmare to end as soon as possible, so we seem to be ready to beat the orcs with our bare hands”* (“ICTV Facts”, March 13, 2022).

Although contrary to journalistic standards, such language was still in line with the general public demand at the time, caused by the shock of the first period of the Great War. However, in 2023, the number of such linguistic units in news reports has significantly decreased. Nowadays, words that mostly comply with ethical standards and guidelines dominate the designation of the enemy on the air: stylistically neutral (*Russians, enemy, adversary*) and emotionally colored (*invaders, occupiers*).

Personal opinions during live broadcasts, such as in the news of TV channel “Rada”, are also inappropriate in journalistic texts: *“We advise Kyiv residents to dress warmer and really use public transport”, “So we hope that people will be helped and the roads will be cleared more efficiently”*. Some TV channels, in addition to expert assessments and opinions of journalists and anchors, feature “figurative statements”, “instructions to viewers”, etc: *“The first frosts and snowstorms showed that we have to prepare for power outages, and even if they are not large-scale and long, they will happen, so we should first of all take care of saving resources”; “Many men would rather stay at home and take breaks than change their pre-war managerial suit for an electric welder’s overalls, because it is not prestigious”; “This is exactly the approach that needs to be changed, and many people will have to do this in order to survive, because post-war reconstruction will require not managers, but workers who will be worth their weight in gold”* (“STB” and “ICTV” TV channels); *“However, bad weather can only affect the launching of missiles from the sea, but Russia can use aircraft for missile strikes in such weather conditions”; “In such weather conditions, Russian ships are unlikely to be able to go to sea and launch deadly weapons at the territory of Ukraine”* (TV channel “My – Ukraina”).

We come across common attention-getting markers that are unnecessary in news content. For example, in the news of the “Rada” channel: *“I can add more”, “I want to say”, “I also want to note”* (“Rada” channel); *“I’ll tell you”, “I can note that”, “but we’re not relaxing”, “so we hope”* (TV channel “1+1”); *“by the way”, “moreover”, “I see it on the video”, “I remember”* (“STB” and “ICTV” TV channels); *“worth reminding”, “interesting”, “by the way”, “imagine”, “I’ll add”* (TV channel “My – Ukraina”).

An example of a violation of the analyzed standard is groundless generalizations by journalists, often hyperbolic: *“most people still followed the advice of the Kyiv City Military Administration”, “because everyone is freezing”, “all public transport is overcrowded, but it works properly and it arrives on time”* (TV channel “Rada”); *“those who were admired by the whole of Ukraine”, “everyone understands this”, “many Kyiv residents decided to leave their cars at home”* (TV channel “1+1”); sometimes they are too categorical, as in the following fragments: *“there is no one to work in Ukraine”; “but Ukrainians expected more understanding from their neighbors, partners, friends”* (“STB” and “ICTV” TV channels); *“the explosions were so powerful that the whole city heard them”* (TV channel “My – Ukraina”).

During guest studios, hosts should resort to authorizing opinions, which they do not always do, thus violating the standard. Also, media professionals do not substantiate their statements when acting as experts. For example, the following are fragments from TV news broadcasts: *“Indeed, the second question arises here, another one that concerns the readiness of NATO itself, the North Atlantic Alliance, and these countries”* (TV channel “Rada”);

A violation of the standard is when news anchors quote experts’ opinions in the news, which indicates incorrect quoting. For example, the “ICTV” news anchors, when quoting the opinion of the spokesperson Yuriy Ihnat, incorrectly used citation markers. As a result, the last point made by the spokesperson sounded like

the anchors’ own opinion. A similar incident occurred in the news of the TV channel “My – Ukraina”, when the host of the guest studio incorrectly marked the boundaries of the quote of the invited guest, so the last thought sounded like the opinion of the host herself.

Standard of accuracy of information presentation

The monitoring shows that the frequency of violations of the information accuracy standard is increasing with each issue. The worst dynamics is demonstrated by the news of the “1+1” TV channel (from 6 to 9 violations per hour). Fewer inaccuracies are made by “STB” and “ICTV” (from 5 to 8 violations), “Inter” (from 4 to 6 violations). On TV channels “Rada” and “Suspilne”, the number of violations of this standard increased, but not in a large number. Only the news of TV Channel “My – Ukraina” showed a positive trend, with relatively fewer violations of the accuracy standard (from 7 to 6 violations).

Among the types of non-compliance with this standard, we record a mismatch between the picture and the text in the stories. For example, on November 27, 2023, on the TV channel “Rada”, journalists talked about the snowy weather in different regions of Ukraine, but showed videos only from Odesa region. Speaking about the road accident in Odesa region, the TV channel showed pedestrians in Kyiv during the live broadcast. Another violation of this standard is the factual errors made by “United News”.

Journalists also resort to inappropriate illustrations of live broadcasts of their correspondents. The highest number of such violations was recorded on TV Channels “1+1” (0.8 per hour) and “Rada” (0.7), the lowest number was observed on “My – Ukraina” (0.2) and “ICTV” with “STB” (0.3), since these channels do not have a lot of live broadcasts. Here are examples of violations recorded on the air of TV Channel “Rada”. A correspondent from Poltava was talking about the consequences of bad weather, while a video of a fireplace with firewood was shown in the background. The photo was also inappropriate during another story about the situation on the capital’s roads, as the reporter was in a pedestrian zone during the live broadcast and could not see the road. This happened in other stories as well. For example, a correspondent from Odesa was commenting on the situation on the roads, while a video of the street was shown on the air. On November 27, 2023, the statement of the correspondent from Kropyvnytskyi did not correspond to what was illustrated in the news. The journalist claimed that *“roads in the region are being cleared according to priority, with primary work being done on roads of international and national importance”*. At the same time, they were showing two municipal workers shoveling snow from the sidewalk in Kropyvnytskyi.

Standard of completeness of information

Recently, the average number of examples of non-compliance with this standard has almost doubled. The biggest increase was on “Rada” channel (from 1.2 to 6.6), “1+1” (from 1 violation per hour to 2.9), and “My – Ukraina” (from 1.8 to 3.1).

The number of such violations as failure to indicate the archive in the background has increased from 0.3 to 0.8 per hour of broadcasting. The highest number of such inaccuracies was made on “1+1” and “Rada” (both of them had 1.4 violations per hour on average). The telethon’s media outlets did not always answer the key questions of the news in their stories.

Occasionally, we find incomplete presentation of studio guests or speakers in synchronization. There are also cases when there are no backgrounds or interjections in the video. While monitoring the stories of TV channel “Rada”, where we recorded the most violations of this standard, we came across the following journalistic inaccuracies. When introducing expert Petro Chernyk to the audience, the hosts called him “colonel”, forgetting to add that he was a “retired colonel”, so the message was incomplete. In another case, the host introduced MP Serhiy Nagornyak as “a member of the Committee on Energy and

Utilities”, forgetting to specify that this is a committee of the Verkhovna Rada.

In a story about the blocking of the Polish border, they aired an archive video from a week ago without labeling it as an archive. Also, in several cases of news, the video did not have an upsound.

On the “1+1” TV channel, examples of violations of this standard were the absence of captions on the synchronized videos. In other stories, journalists did not provide dates for the background archival video.

In the news of “STB” and “ICTV” TV channels, we recorded the following inaccuracies. In the story about the new shelter, the host’s quote contained an unclear lexeme that needed to be explained: “*a sports ground for workout*”. In the news, it is not enough to present Serhiy Hrabyskyi as a “military expert” and Vadym Denysenko and Mykola Davydiuk as “*political scientists*”.

The “Inter” TV channel also violated this standard. In a story about a polyclinic in Trostianets, journalists did not caption some of the synchronized footage. It is not enough to present the invited persons in a generalized way, without specifying their position or place of work – for example, like in stories featuring Taras Zahorodnyi or Volodymyr Fesenko.

It is a violation that TV journalists do not always provide dates for background archival videos. This was recorded in a story about a polyclinic in Trostianets, as well as in a material about an accident in Brovary. In the broadcasts about the water quality in Marhanets and about the heating stations in Mykolaiv, instead of intertitles, they played music that did not match the context.

Failure to comply with the standard is also evident in the news about the head of the Presidential Office, Andriy Yermak, being included in the list of “most influential” people in the Politico publication on the “My – Ukraine” TV channel, as there is no relevant background on the official powers of the head of the Presidential Office. In one story about the founder of the organization ‘Reactivna Poshta’ Pavlo Narozhnyi, the journalists did not provide information about the organization represented by the speaker, so that the viewers could understand the competence of the expert. It was not enough to present the guest Ihor Reiterovych only as a “political scientist” and “political consultant”, and in another story, to speak about Petro Chernyk only as a “military expert”.

On the air of “Suspilne” on November 27–28, 2023, 5 examples of violations of this standard were recorded. In a piece about changes to mobilization, which was aired twice, there was a quote with an indication of the source: “David Arakhamia said”, “Arakhamia summed up”, but the journalists forgot to provide information about who the expert was, without mentioning that he was a member of the Parliament. Not all viewers might have known this. Also, some news items on the video did not have an upsound.

The standard for the promptness of information presentation

There were few violations of this standard, so it is not worth talking about their systematic nature. Only three participants of the telethon had violations: “1+1”, “ICTV” with “STB”, and “Inter”. Mostly, this concerns the presentation of outdated information. The messages were also broadcast with a delay of several hours or even days. However, this is acceptable in a time of war, so there are no serious violations of this standard.

Among other violations of the analyzed standard, we note the lack of coordination between the channel’s guests and news studios, which does not contribute to updating information. For example, in the “Suspilne” story, despite the fact that Serhiy Tsehotskyi, an officer of the 59th separate motorized infantry brigade, spoke about the frontline situation in the Avdiivka sector in the channel’s guest studio, the final newscast again

quoted him from an interview with “Radio Svoboda” in the same form as in the newscast at 18.00.

The “Inter” TV channel twice presented as news the information about the completion of the SBI investigation into the Brovary accident. This was the event of the previous day, which was widely covered in the telethon the day before. However, the news lead did not even mention that it had happened the day before.

On November 28, 2023, the “My – Ukraine” TV channel aired a report on the “Grain from Ukraine” summit that took place in Kyiv a few days earlier, on November 25.

A standard for a balance of opinions and perspectives

Monitoring of “United News” shows that the telethon does not always cover topics which require a balance of opinions, so we did not find any significant violations of this standard. Over the course of several months, the number of violations increased slightly (from an average of 0.1 violations per hour to 0.2), mainly due to the “Rada” TV channel, which had 0.5 violations of the standard per hour of broadcasting on average.

An example of a violation of the balance of opinions can be seen in a story on “1+1” TV channel on November 27, 2023, when the studio discussed amendments to the law on national minorities in Ukraine. Three government officials were invited as experts, but there were no representatives of the opposition.

Also, in the material of the TV channel “My – Ukraine” of November 28, 2023, there was no mandatory expert assessment in the twice repeated message about the inclusion of the Head of the Presidential Office Andriy Yermak in the list of “most influential” people of the Politico publication.

Standard of accessibility of information presentation

Recently this standard has been violated more than before. The highest number of inaccuracies was found on the TV channel “1+1” (1.6 per hour), and the lowest – on “Inter” (0.8). Among the main types of violations, we record the use of lexemes that are not understood by the general public, difficult terms, jargon, abbreviations, borrowings, infographics, etc. Such anomalies occur when journalists mention concepts that are incomprehensible to the general audience without the appropriate background.

Among the examples we recorded on TV Channel “Rada”, we found that they showed infographics of enemy losses 5 times in the news, which is difficult to understand, because complex numerical information in large quantities is presented on one slide in small print. It is inappropriate that during such visual support, the presenter voiced the positions in a different order than the one presented in the table.

Among the negative phenomena of violation of the standard, we observe the unjustified use of difficult-to-understand syntactic constructions of the clerical style in the oral speech of the hosts. For example, on the TV channel “Rada” in journalistic communication, we find such a difficult to understand statement that was voiced twice by the host: “*Investigators have notified five SES officials of suspicion. In particular, the head of the Aviation and Aviation Search and Rescue Department of the State Emergency Service of Ukraine, the acting commander of a special aviation detachment, the deputy commander for flight training, the commander of an aviation squadron and the head of the flight safety service of a special aviation detachment of the operational and rescue service of the civil protection service of the State Emergency Service of Ukraine from the city of Nizhyn, Chernihiv region*”.

Also, in the newscast on “Rada” TV channel on November 27–28, 2023, the media used neologisms in their broadcasts that may not be clear to the general audience: “*to whom this message is directed*”, “*it is necessary to recharge gadgets*”, “*about international tracks*”, “*our information slot*”. A similar phenomenon was observed in a news item on “1+1” TV channel,

when a medical expert used a highly specialized lexicon: “we have already blocked that **gap**”.

Little-known words were also used by the hosts on “ICTV” on November 28, 2023 (“they set up a sports ground for **workouts**”; “we have to leave **discretion**”; “it was such a **crash test**”) and “Inter” (“It’s not exactly an American **shutdown**, but it’s very similar”).

We can also see the complexity of the statement in the synchronization of the doctor in the story about the opening of a modular polyclinic in Trostianets: “includes an **autoreflectometer**, a **sign projector**, and an **automatic digital foropter**”. The synchronization is not informative, because the audience will not understand some of the words.

Another type of violation of this standard was seen in a story on the TV channel “My – Ukraina” on November 28, 2023. In the news about a missile attack in Zaporizhzhia, the synchronization with a lengthy caption “*Oleksiy Kravets, Deputy Director of the Department of Social Protection of the Population of Zaporizhzhia City Council*” lasted less than a minute and a half. Obviously, viewers did not have time to read it. In another story, a beautiful infographic was presented, but since it was shown on the screen for less than two seconds, viewers did not have time to perceive the information presented. We often find complicated abbreviations in the news subtitles that need to be deciphered: “Artur Mikhno, co-founder and **CEO** of Work.ua”; “At the **SES** Centralized Technical Training Center”, etc.

Violation of ethical standards

While monitoring television broadcasting, we found that media professionals are prone to ethical violations. In the news, we come across non-compliance with the Code of Ethics of Ukrainian Journalists, in particular, the dissemination of biased information or unfounded accusations. Despite the high-profile nature of the event, we still consider it unethical to identify people in a story before the relevant court decision, as journalist Lilia Goncharuk did by naming the names of the organizers of the so-called “drunken parties” (“Suspilne”, February 4, 2023). It is also a violation that both suspects were shown in the footage, although journalists should have kept in mind the right to privacy of the suspects until the court decision. In this case, the criminal topic is not of great public interest, as it is not related to war or corruption, and the named individuals are not public figures.

It is also unjustified to resort to anonymous accusations, as the media did in a story by “Suspilne” TV channel, talking about a criminal case of embezzlement of humanitarian aid in Estonia by an anonymous ex-volunteer Maria. In this journalistic material, we find another ethically incorrect phenomenon. A security guard was shown on the air without his face being blacked out, filmed with a hidden camera. The journalists did this without warning or consent of the person, which indicates interference with the person’s personal space and also violates the professional actions of media workers.

Guided by ethical norms, journalists should closely monitor their broadcasting to avoid discrimination and stereotyping of vulnerable groups on air. Clause 15 of the Code of Ethics for Ukrainian Journalists states that no one should be discriminated against because of their gender, language, race, religion, national, regional or social origin, or political preferences. Accordingly, incorrect language and offensive phrases that may generate hate speech should be avoided in statements. It is necessary to refrain from allusions or comments regarding a person’s physical characteristics or illness. For example, the Commission on Journalistic Ethics found unlawful the statement made by Olga Nemtsova, host of the “Rada” TV channel, during the broadcast on October 18, 2023, when the journalist compared the behavior of Russian President Vladimir Putin to autism. In a statement, the commission said it “categorically condemns the practice of stereotyping people with autism. This is a gross violation of journalistic ethics. Such words spread

prejudice against people with autism, may contain signs of hate speech, and ultimately lead to discrimination” [9].

Violations of ethical standards are also evidenced by the use of derogatory language by journalists. For example, in a story on the “STB” TV channel, a journalist used the derogatory phrase “third world countries”: “*The delegation of the ‘third world’ countries arrives at the security forum*”.

It is unethical to present foul language on air in news content. For example, the material about military operations in the Zaporizhzhia sector contained swear words in the synchronized voices of the military (TV Channel “1+1”). Also, the TV channel “My – Ukraina” aired an unblackened logo with the obscene construction “H...evaya Odesa” (without three dots), and this happened at ten o’clock in the morning, when there could be children watching the screens.

Another ethical violation by the journalists of “United News” is the incorrect use of archival images. We have recorded such cases on several TV channels. For example, in stories about offenses at the Territorial Recruitment Center, images of random employees of the TRC, who did not have their faces covered and were easily recognizable, were superimposed on text that was negative in terms of connotative content. A similar incorrect use of illustrative content can be seen in the material of the “1+1” TV channel on June 27, 2023. Talking about the detention of a Russian accomplice during a missile attack on Kramatorsk, the journalists showed a man who had lost loved ones in the attack. At that time, the presenter said a phrase that did not match the image: “*SSU investigators have already notified the detainee of suspicion*”.

The failure to comply with ethical standards by “Inter” TV channel journalists is evidenced by the synchronization of one of the leaders of Hamas terrorists, in which he makes emotional appeals to Muslims to protest.

Another unethical statement was made by TV presenter Tetiana Honcharova on the “Rada” TV channel on August 11, 2023. The journalist uses morally unacceptable comparisons in the story: “*Let’s think about this death today. That is, Russia launches four ‘Kinzhals’, one of the ‘Kinzhals’, and the result of this launch is the death of a child. That is, a Russian missile costs 10 million dollars and as a result, one Ukrainian child dies. In any case, these are not commensurate figures in any case*”.

4 Conclusion

The analysis shows that journalists most often violate the standard of separation of facts from opinions in the TV coverage of the “United News” telethon, followed by the violation of standard of reliability. We recorded relatively fewer violations of such standards as accuracy, completeness of information, accessibility of information, balance of opinions and points of view, and efficiency. Among ethical violations, we detected about 0.2% of inaccuracies, in particular, the use of unethical considerations or incorrect lexical items.

Journalists’ failure to comply with the standard of accuracy is evidenced by such phenomena as generalized pseudo-references to sources of factual material, authorship of subjective opinions, and quoting unverified information from the Internet, including social media. The use of overly emotional and figurative statements, unauthorized subjective opinions, and vague quotes on air are manifestations of violations of the standard of separation of facts from opinions. Mismatches between pictures and text in stories, as well as inadequate illustration of live broadcasts, indicate violations of the standard of accuracy of information. Lack of answers to the main questions of the news, unclear designation of the archive in the background, incomplete presentation of studio guests or speakers in synchronized newscasts reveal errors in the standard of completeness of information. Various types of violations of the standard of accessibility of information presentation include the use of lexical items that are not understood by the general public, difficult terms, jargon, abbreviations, borrowings, infographics,

etc. Such anomalies occur when journalists mention concepts that are incomprehensible to the general audience without the appropriate background. It was found that the standards of promptness and balance of opinions and points of view in the telethon were hardly violated. The monitoring showed that media professionals are prone to ethical anomalies. In the news, we come across non-compliance with the Code of Ethics of Ukrainian journalists, in particular, the dissemination of biased information or unfounded accusations. Violations of ethical norms are also evidenced by disparaging statements or foul language used on the air.

Literature:

1. Dorosch, M. (2014, November 24). Persuasion or standards? *Detector Media*. http://osvita.mediasapiens.ua/ethics/standards/perekonannya_chi_standarti/.
2. Holub, O. P. (2016). *Media Compass: a guide for professional journalists. A practical guide*. Institute of Mass Information. Kyiv: Sofia-A.
3. Jolos, O. V. (2019). Competence and identification of experts in the context of compliance with the standards of balance and reliability of information. *Scientific Notes of the Institute of Journalism*, 1, 38–45.
4. Kozak, V. A. (2022). Balance of opinions and points of view in the context of other journalistic standards. *Scientific Notes of the Tauride National University. Series: Philology. Journalism*, 33(72), No. 5, 252–258.
5. Kulyas, I. (2023, December 29). Results of the monitoring of the telethon “United News” for October – December 2023. First part. *Detector Media*. <https://detector.media/shchodennitelenovini/article/221185/2023-12-29-pidsumky-monitoryngu-telemarafonu-iedyni-novyny-za-zhovten-gruden-2023-roku-persha-chastyna/>
6. Kulyas, I. (2024, January 6). Results of the monitoring of the telethon “United News” for October – December 2023. The second part. *Detector Media*. <https://detector.media/shchodennitelenovini/article/221421/2024-01-06-pidsumky-monitoryngu-telemarafonu-iedyni-novyny-za-zhovten-gruden-2023-roku-druga-chastyna/>
7. Kulyas, I., & Makarenko, O. (2006). *Effective production of TV news: standards of information broadcasting; professional ethics of a news journalist: A practical guide for journalists*. Kyiv: KhBB Publishing House.
8. Kuryata, N. (2021, November 26). Modern standards of professional journalism. *Institute of Mass Information*. <https://imi.org.ua/monitorings/suchasni-standarty-profesijnoy-zhurnalistyky-i42512>.
9. On the inadmissibility of spreading hate speech against people with autism in the United News telethon. Commission on Journalism Ethics (CJE): website. https://cje.org.ua/statements/pro-nedopustymist-poshyrennia-movy-vorozhnechi-shcho-do-liudey-z-autyzmom-v-telemarafoni-yedyni-novyny/?fbclid=IwAR3DxOo0BoXNrEgy_SgixFAnC6kMq1Qy5BsnXGBo_nhh88frtvc2c2ePT4
10. Shulska, N., Kostusiak, N., Pykaliuk, R., Sypchenko, I., Bondarenko, O., Dubetska, O., Yevdokymenko, I., Zyma, O. (2023). Incorrect nominations of persons as violations of journalistic ethics in modern materials of sensitive media content (On the Materials of Ukrainian Media). *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 13(2), Spec. Issue XXXVII, 63–70.
11. Shulska, N., Kostusiak, N., Zyma, O., Larina, K., Bukina, N., Kevliuk, I., Ostapchuk, S. (2023). Hate language as a negative phenomenon of the Ukrainian domestic media space in news content about the war. *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 13(2), Spec. Issue XXXV, 82–87.
12. Steblyna, N. (2022, June 29). Have regional journalists become better at adhering to professional standards during Russia's full-scale invasion? *Detector Media*. <https://detector.media/infospace/article/200560/2022-06-29-chy-staly-regionalni-zhurnalisty-krashche-dotrymuvatysya-profesijn-ykh-standartiv-pid-chas-povnomasshtabnogo-vtorgnennya-rosii/>.
13. Suprun, L. (n.d.). *Basic standards of information presentation by journalists*. <http://journlib.univ.kiev.ua/index.php?act=article&article=2401>.
14. Sushkova, O. M., & Medvid, O. M. (2022). *Pragmalingual potential of world news. Innovative pathway for the development of modern philological sciences in Ukraine and EU countries*. Vol. 3. Baltija Publishing.
15. Syvakivskiy, Y. (2019). Journalistic standards in the time of war: Citizen's position or objective professionalism. *Lviv University Bulletin. Series: Journalism*, 45, 123–134.
16. Tymoshyk, M. (2022). Journalism standards: Concept, genesis, content, practice. *Ukrainian Information Space*, 1(9), 30–56.
17. Vasina, O. (2023, August 24). Journalistic standards in time of war: relevant as ever or not true. *Nakypilo*. <https://osvita.nakypilo.ua/zhurnalistski-standarty-pid-chas-viyny/>
18. Zakharchenko, O. (2017, April 7). Standards of journalism: the foundations of professionalism or outdated framework? *Institute of Mass Information*. <https://imi.org.ua/articles/standarty-journalisty-osnovi-profesijnosti-chi-zastarili-ramki-i178>.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AJ