

XXXX PROGRAMMING IN IRAQ

Monitoring Panel Reviews

4-9 December 2006

Listener Panel Review • XXXX/04

CONTENTS

Summary	1
I. Introduction	5
II. Main Findings	7
III. Numerical Scores and Illustrative Quotes.....	13
A. Presentation/Production Quality	13
B. Music Quality.....	15
C. Content Quality.....	16
D. Daily Programs	17
4 December 2006, 22:00-23:00	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5 December 2006, 23:00-0:00	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6 December 2006, 13:00-14:00	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7 December 2006, 21:00-22:00	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8 December 2006, 19:15-20:15	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9 December 2006, 8:00-9:00	Error! Bookmark not defined.
E. Panelists' Perceptions of XXXX	Error! Bookmark not defined.
F. Comparison with Other Media.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
G. Respondents' Suggestions	Error! Bookmark not defined.
To Improve Presentation Style.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
To Improve Music Content.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
To Improve Information Content	Error! Bookmark not defined.
IV. Reception Monitoring.....	17

Project Manager: XXXX

Author: Heather Graham

SUMMARY

At the request of XXXX's management, InterMedia conducted a study monitoring the content and reception of XXXX's programming in Iraq. The study required respondents based inside Iraq to listen to and evaluate six XXXX programs. This report presents the results of the monitoring from 4 to 9 December 2006. The monitoring panel consisted of 10 panelists, all regular listeners to XXXX programming, located in Baghdad. This qualitative study represents the view of this panel only and does not necessarily represent the view of XXXX's target audience.

- All of the panelists repeatedly asserted their belief in XXXX as a reliable, timely and engaging news source committed to meeting the needs of listeners in the Arab world, and particularly in Iraq.
- The panelists commended XXXX's simple and straightforward productions, which they said allowed them to obtain news and information without strain or complication. They credited XXXX's hosts and correspondents with making the programs cohesive and easy to understand, and they lauded the journalists' friendly tone and excellent use of the Arabic language.
- The panelists reported excellent sound clarity and reception on every day of the monitoring, declaring the programs free of any extraneous noise or interruption, including during field reports.
- All of the panelists undoubtedly enjoyed XXXX's mix of music and informational content, and said interspersing music and news segments engaged listeners and set the broadcaster apart from other channels. Many panelists graciously commended XXXX's recognition of Iraqi listeners' need for entertainment during the ongoing conflict in Iraq. The panelists highly approved of XXXX's music mix, as they found popular Arabic music balanced with appropriate and unique Western songs.
- The panelists universally asserted the value of XXXX's informational content for Iraqi listeners, finding reports relevant to the daily concerns of the Iraqi people, frequently updated, often reported from the scene of an event, and overall more comprehensive and credible than other news sources.
- XXXX's use of live voices and firsthand accounts from the field, as well as discussion-based segments with guests from varied backgrounds and political beliefs, greatly contributed to the broadcaster's credibility in the eyes of these panelists. The panelists also lauded XXXX's willingness to tackle some of the most complicated and important Iraqi political issues in such discussion segments.
- The panelists attested that much of XXXX's content would be difficult to find on other channels, particularly the sensitive and objective discussions of Iraq's political situation. As well, many agreed XXXX often reported events well ahead of other sources, due to their on-the-scene network of stringers.
- The panelists expressed nothing but appreciation for all of the daily programs they monitored and, indeed, not a single panelist offered negative feedback for any of the

six programs to which they listened; many commented that XXXX is a popular and important news source inside Iraq.

- Many panelists identified themselves as regular XXXX listeners, stating that they admired the broadcaster before participating in this monitoring and would continue their listening. They deemed XXXX a culturally sensitive broadcaster concerned with their informational and entertainment needs, and those of all Iraqi listeners.
- Most panelists turned to the radio or television for their news, and several identified XXXX as the only source they needed because they found it so comprehensive. Less than half of the panelists reported accessing the internet during a month's time, and the female panelists said access is restricted for women in Baghdad.
- XXXX's unique content had a profound impact on the thoughts and feelings of these panelists, many of whom found that being informed about current events empowered them to better understand and act on the serious problems in Iraq.
- The panelists offered few suggestions for changing XXXX's programming. A majority encouraged the broadcaster to play more Iraqi music, including traditional songs and those by female artists. Many requested the broadcaster strive to target women and youth more in its programming, as well.

Comparative Overall Ratings of Program Evaluation Criteria

	Overall Six-Day Scores	
	Panelists	Control Listener
Initial Response to the Broadcasts		
1. 1. Overall Impression of Program		
Presentation/Production Quality		
2. Presentation Style		
3. Program Organization		
4. Use of Announcements/ Billboards/Station ID		
5. Pace and Liveliness		
6. Hosts		
7. Quality of Language		
8. Clarity of Language		
9. Clarity of Sound		
10. Overall Impression of Presentation Quality		
Music Quality		
11. Selection and Variety of Music		
12. Uniqueness of Music		
13. Balance in Types of Music		
14. Length of Individual Songs		
15. Transitions Between Songs		
16. Transitions Between Music and Other Segments		
17. Overall Appeal of Music		
Content Quality		
18. Accuracy		
19. Timeliness		
20. Balance of Views		
21. Relevance to Audience		
22. Quality of Reporters		
23. Thematic Balance		
24. Quality of Analysis		
25. Use of Actualities		
26. Quality of Commentary		
27. Quality of Interviewing		
28. Uniqueness		
29. Overall Impression of Journalistic Quality		

Note: The ratings in the above table represent the averages of the overall scores the panel assigned to each of the criteria after they completed all of the required listening. The ratings in the table are based on the following ranges: 1.0–1.3 = poor; 1.4–1.6 = poor to fair; 1.7–2.3 = fair; 2.4–2.6 = fair to good; 2.7–3.3 = good; 3.4–3.6 = good to excellent; 3.7–4.0 = excellent.

Comparative Average Ratings of the Programs Reviewed

Date and Time	Panelists (10)		
Date and Time	Presentation Quality	Music Quality	Content Quality
4 December 2006, 22:00-23:00			
5 December 2006, 23:00-0:00			
6 December 2006, 13:00-14:00			
7 December 2006, 21:00-22:00			
8 December 2006, 19:15-20:15			
9 December 2006, 8:00-9:00			

Note: The ratings in the above table represent the average of the average scores for content and presentation quality for each of the evaluated programs. The ratings in the table are based on the following ranges: 1.0–1.3 = poor; 1.4–1.6 = poor to fair; 1.7–2.3 = fair; 2.4–2.6 = fair to good; 2.7–3.3 = good; 3.4–3.6 = good to excellent; 3.7–4.0 = excellent.

I. INTRODUCTION

Study Description

At the request of XXXX's management, InterMedia conducted a study monitoring the content and reception of XXXX's programming in Iraq. The study required respondents based inside Iraq to listen to and evaluate six XXXX programs. This report presents the results of the monitoring from 4 to 9 December 2006.

Panelist Descriptions

InterMedia commissioned the XXXX-based firm XXXX to recruit 10 panelists in Iraq to participate in the project. All were regular listeners to XXXX in the past year, as well as avid followers of domestic media and current events. The panelists represented diverse ages, education levels, occupations and listening histories as follows:

- **Panelist 1:** Male, 24, university graduate, engineer, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 3 years
- **Panelist 2:** Male, 21, high school graduate, university student, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 2 years
- **Panelist 3:** Male, 29, completed institute, English teacher, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 4 years
- **Panelist 4:** Male, 28, completed institute, primary school teacher, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 2 years
- **Panelist 5:** Male, 25, completed institute, Arabic teacher, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 4 years
- **Panelist 6:** Female, 23, completed institute, primary school teacher, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 2 years
- **Panelist 7:** Female, 24, university graduate, government officer, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 3 years
- **Panelist 8:** Female, 19, high school graduate, university student, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 2 years
- **Panelist 9:** Female, 26, completed institute, government officer, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 3 years
- **Panelist 10:** Female, 30, completed high school, housewife, Baghdad, regular listener to XXXX for 4 years

Programming Evaluation Procedure

The titles and broadcast dates of the specific XXXX programs reviewed were as follows:

- 4 December 2006, 22:00-23:00
- 5 December 2006, 23:00-0:00
- 6 December 2006, 13:00-14:00
- 7 December 2006, 21:00-22:00
- 8 December 2006, 19:15-20:15
- 9 December 2006, 8:00-9:00

The panelists listened to the broadcasts at home on FM. All of the respondents completed an evaluation questionnaire for each of the daily programs they listened to, as well as a summary questionnaire for the week's programming as a whole.

Each questionnaire required the respondents to evaluate a list of programming quality criteria on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good and 4 = excellent. The averages of the scores that appear throughout the report can be interpreted with the following ranges: 1.0–1.3 = poor; 1.4–1.6 = poor to fair; 1.7–2.3 = fair; 2.4–2.6 = fair to good; 2.7–3.3 = good; 3.4–3.6 = good to excellent; 3.7–4.0 = excellent.

The daily evaluation questionnaires also required respondents to give their impressions of the programs, specifically how the programs balanced and integrated music and news reporting in a 24-hour daily format. In the summary questionnaire, respondents were asked to explain why they chose the numerical score they assigned to each evaluation criterion, as well as to provide their overall suggestions for how to make XXXX's programming more competitive, relevant and useful to its target audience.

In addition, the study required the panelists to monitor the reception quality of the broadcasts in order to assess the actual listening experience for XXXX's audience in Iraq. The panelists also followed their usual sources of information throughout the monitoring period in order to place their evaluation of XXXX within the context of the competitive domestic media environment in Iraq.

Analyses of the panelists' evaluations and comments are included in Part II of this report. Part III presents illustrative quotes supporting the main findings, as well as the respondents' scores for the various evaluation criteria. The results of the reception monitoring are presented in Part IV.

II. MAIN FINDINGS

The panelists offered virtually no criticism of the XXXX programs they evaluated during this monitoring period, finding them professionally and concisely produced with an appropriate mix of entertaining music and relevant content. All of the panelists repeatedly asserted their belief in XXXX as a reliable, timely and engaging news source committed to meeting the needs of listeners in the Arab world, and particularly in Iraq. They assigned a rating of “good to excellent” to the programs overall, and none of the ratings for individual aspects or daily programs fell below the “good” range.

Presentation/Production Quality

Overall, the panelists commended XXXX’s simple and straightforward productions, which they said allowed them to obtain news and information without strain or complication. They rated presentation quality “good to excellent” overall, and no rating for individual criteria fell below the “good” range. All of the panelists agreed XXXX provided a professional and contemporary broadcast in every aspect, from clear sound and organization to friendly, educated hosts.

Indeed, all of the panelists credited XXXX’s hosts and correspondents with making the monitored programs cohesive and easy to understand, and they lauded the journalists’ friendly tone and excellent use of the Arabic language. The panelists uniformly agreed that the broadcast staff spoke respectfully to listeners, and the panelists believed smooth transitions and relevant content resulted from the experience and education of XXXX’s high quality journalists. Many panelists also praised hosts’ and correspondents’ contemporary use of Arabic, stating that the language they heard on XXXX matched “street language” in Iraq, down to the accents and idioms with which Iraqis were familiar.

The panelists further asserted that XXXX programs’ simple, connected organization and style made information easily accessible. All of the panelists acknowledged the role of smooth transitions and XXXX’s lively pace in keeping their interest and helping them more readily understand the news and topics under discussion. For instance, most panelists said the hosts’ ability to switch from political to nonpolitical topics smoothly made it easy for listeners to follow along, no matter how varied the subjects. As well, many positively commented on the use of music in program organization, stating that songs engaged them between information segments.

All of the panelists additionally said the broadcaster’s use of announcements, billboards and station identifications guided them to interesting program content and ensured that they could easily tune in XXXX despite the proliferation of stations on close frequencies. For instance, several panelists liked the announcements they heard about upcoming content, which engaged their interest in upcoming programs. Most panelists also said XXXX frequently and appropriately aired identifications that aided listeners searching for the broadcaster’s frequency, or those who tuned in midway through the program.

The panelists reported excellent sound clarity throughout the monitoring. All of the panelists declared XXXX's programs free from sound fluctuations or interruptions, even during field reports, and many praised the consistent sound for further making their listening comfortable and useful.

Music Quality

All of the panelists undoubtedly enjoyed XXXX's mix of music and informational content, and said interspersing music and news segments engaged listeners and set the broadcaster apart from other channels. Overall, the panelists rated music quality as "good," and all of the music quality criteria were rated as "good" or higher. Many panelists graciously commended XXXX's recognition of Iraqi listeners' need for entertainment and relaxation during such a difficult time in the country's history. Not only did this unique feature encourage Iraqis to continue listening to XXXX, they said, but it also provided necessary relief from constant military and political news.

The panelists highly approved of XXXX's music mix, as they found popular Arabic music balanced with appropriate and unique Western songs. All of the panelists felt that each genre of music received equal airtime. As well, they lauded XXXX for carefully choosing music appropriate to the broadcaster's content, but light enough to engage listeners and encourage them to stay tuned in. Several also praised XXXX's commitment to playing many different songs throughout the news day, refraining from repeats.

When asked about the uniqueness of XXXX's music content, all of the panelists agreed the broadcaster's selection of Western music set it apart from other stations. While many panelists felt they could find XXXX's Arabic music elsewhere, they said the Western songs made XXXX more likeable and interesting for its listeners. Additionally, a couple of panelists said the broadcaster's mixed music and news format made it a unique provider in Iraq.

The panelists further agreed XXXX's music and news mix did not make programs more confusing, as the broadcaster ensured appropriate song length and smooth transitions between songs themselves and between music and other segments. Many panelists stated XXXX's musical selections were just long enough to capture their interest before the songs faded easily into news content, and several attested that they hardly noticed when they began listening to news rather than music.

Content Quality

The panelists universally asserted the value of XXXX's informational content for Iraqi listeners. They found reports relevant to the daily concerns of the Iraqi people, frequently updated and often reported from the scene of an event, and overall more comprehensive and credible than other news sources. The panelists rated content quality in the "good to

excellent” range overall, and none of their ratings for individual criteria fell below the “good” range.

XXXX’s use of live voices and firsthand accounts from the field made the broadcaster’s programs credible and engaging for these panelists. Due to the ever-changing military and political situations in Iraq, the panelists found XXXX’s on-the-scene reports highly useful, and many praised the broadcaster’s worldwide stringer network for providing them with immediate and concise news updates. Several panelists further stated that live voices from the field engaged their interest in news stories and made them more curious about developing reports.

The panelists also lauded XXXX’s willingness to tackle some of the most complicated and important Iraqi political issues through discussion segments with guests and experts representing a range of opinions. The panelists not only found such discussions helpful for better understanding their country’s political situation, but they also placed more trust in XXXX because of its commitment to airing opposing viewpoints. In every discussion segment during the monitoring period, the panelists claimed they always heard many opinions represented, and that guests were allowed to air their views free from leading questions or personal commentary on the part of XXXX’s hosts.

XXXX further illuminated complicated political and social topics for the panelists by consistently providing expert commentaries, detailed background information and thorough analysis. All of the panelists agreed the broadcaster’s thorough analysis helped them more clearly understand the reasons behind an event and its possible consequences. As well, the panelists said XXXX accompanied some news stories and discussions with commentaries from appropriate parties, engaging their interest in both the topic and further listening to XXXX.

The use of all these aspects made XXXX’s content reliable, accurate and updated in the eyes of these panelists, leading them to speak highly of the broadcaster and its importance for listeners in Iraq. As the panelists lived through XXXX’s Iraq-focused news each day, they claimed they could easily verify the accuracy of the broadcaster’s content. Many particularly appreciated XXXX’s constant news updates regarding Iraq’s ever-changing situation, and several noted that the broadcaster even inserted periodic news summaries or breaking news between music segments, allowing listeners to stay on top of developing events and continue listening to music.

In light of this content mix, all of the panelists agreed that XXXX excellently integrated political and nonpolitical informational rubrics with Arabic and Western music segments. They further contended that the broadcaster appropriately gave equal time to the different types of content, political and nonpolitical, facts and analysis, which they felt kept XXXX’s listeners engaged in the programs and informed on a variety of themes. Several panelists even found other news sources superfluous after listening to XXXX’s comprehensive content.

All of these aspects combined to make XXXX a complete and unique source for the panelists. The panelists attested that much of the broadcaster's content would be difficult to find on other channels, particularly sensitive and objective discussions of Iraq's political situation. As well, many agreed XXXX often reported events ahead of other sources, due to their on-the-scene network of stringers.

Reactions to Daily Programs

The panelists expressed nothing but appreciation and praise for all aspects of the daily programs they monitored: Iraq-focused content and discussion segments, professional and objective presentation, and an engaging mix of Arabic and Western music. Indeed, not a single panelist offered negative feedback for any of the six programs to which they listened, and many commented that XXXX is a popular and highly relevant news source inside Iraq.

All of the panelists most valued XXXX's discussion segments (aired from 6-9 December and aimed at covering crucial issues in Iraq) for the balance of viewpoints and relevant information they heard about topics not covered by other media. Many panelists claimed on multiple days that they "greatly benefited" from these discussions, which they said promoted listener understanding of the current political and military situation in Iraq. For instance, many panelists said the XXXX segment on 6 December, which illuminated the issue of Iraqi martyrs, gave them complete and straightforward information about a subject many Iraqis may not well understand. Similarly, XXXX on 7 December highlighted the influence of Muqtada al-Sadr's Mahdi army, and many panelists said the segment gave them a sense of the true activity and importance of that sect. XXXX (8 December) and XXXX (9 December) invited guests from various sects and political parties in Iraq for discussion, prompting all of the panelists to praise XXXX's neutrality and commitment to the informational needs and opinions of all listeners. The panelists unanimously agreed that XXXX's Iraq-focused approach and attention to objectively covering sensitive issues made the broadcaster a necessary and trustworthy source in Iraq.

The panelists further lauded XXXX's newscast and brief summaries of Iraq news, which they found detailed, engaging and professionally presented. The panelists appreciated hearing news from around the world, and many praised XXXX's extensive stringer network, but they also acknowledged the broadcaster's commitment to emphasizing the impact of world events on Iraq. For instance, the panelists said reports on the discussions between U.S. President Bush and British Prime Minister Tony Blair during the monitoring period focused on the repercussions of these talks for Iraq. As well, reports from Lebanon, Israel and Palestine discussed events in those areas in terms of their regional and political impact in Iraq.

Although they mentioned it only occasionally in relation to the daily programs, several panelists also liked XXXX's integration of Arabic and Western songs into the news programs. Some simply liked the mix of music, while others said the music breaks helped

retain their interest in the programs and sometimes prompted them to continue listening to XXXX.

Panelists' Perceptions of XXXX

Many of the panelists identified themselves as regular XXXX listeners, stating that they admired the broadcaster before participating in this monitoring and would continue their listening. All of the panelists professed positive opinions of XXXX prior to the monitoring, stating they believed it to be professional and objective, that were only deepened by their intensive listening on these six days. Further, the panelists unanimously agreed they would continue tuning to XXXX, and a few said they would recommend the broadcaster to others or involve their families in the listening.

The panelists deemed XXXX a culturally sensitive broadcaster concerned with their informational and entertainment needs, and those of all Iraqi listeners. All of the panelists praised XXXX repeatedly for its commitment to Iraqi listeners, from respecting them by presenting fast, objective content, to simplifying their listening by integrating simple Arabic language and pleasing music. The panelists felt XXXX cared about listeners in the Arab world, and particularly in Iraq because of its focus on troubles and developments in that country.

Comparison with Other Media

The panelists primarily differentiated XXXX with the other media they followed by the broadcaster's willingness to tackle difficult themes and political issues related to Iraq. On almost every day of the monitored programming, the panelists identified as unique XXXX's discussion-based segments that focused on political problems and divisions in the country, and they particularly appreciated the broadcaster's commitment to inviting guest speakers from a range of backgrounds and ideologies, stating that most other news outlets promoted only certain viewpoints. This diversity on the part of XXXX, as well as its focus on Iraq, led panelists to claim that XXXX cared more for the needs and concerns of Iraqi citizens than other sources. Several panelists felt this was even illustrated in the broadcaster's use of Western and Arabic music, which they said filled an important relaxation and entertainment need for listeners in the war-torn country.

The panelists overwhelmingly agreed that the Western music they heard on XXXX was not available from any other sources, and several also said the broadcaster aired unique reports from Washington, D.C. through stringers. All of the panelists appreciated XXXX's music as a break from hearing about political difficulties in Iraq, and several thanked XXXX for giving them entertainment to drown out the ever-present sound of "gunshots" in Baghdad.

Most panelists turned to the radio or television for their news, and several identified XXXX as the only source they needed because they found it so comprehensive. Less than

half of the panelists reported accessing the internet during a month's time, and only one used it for gathering news, primarily navigating to the websites of Arabic newspapers and television channels, including BBC and Al-Jazeera. The female panelists, including a university student, pointed out that women are barred from internet cafes in Baghdad, and said access was not available in their homes, either.

Increased Understanding

XXXX's unique content had a profound impact on the thoughts and feelings of these panelists, many of whom found that being informed about current events empowered them to better understand and act on the serious problems in Iraq. All of the panelists agreed XXXX enabled them to form their own opinions about Iraqi issues by giving them correct and objective information. The panelists asserted their greater awareness of events and issues worldwide, although they said the minimal reporting from the United States meant their impressions of that country remained unchanged.

Respondents' Suggestions

As mentioned previously, the panelists offered few suggestions for changing XXXX's programming, as they already found it excellent in most aspects. All of the panelists lauded the broadcaster's presentation as an example of high journalistic quality, and they appreciated the pleasant mix of Arabic and Western music with relevant, objective content. However, a majority did request XXXX include more Iraqi music in its programs, both traditional and modern songs, and one panelist said she would like to hear more music from Iraqi women. Specific suggested topics of informational interest included:

- Iraq's economy and reconstruction;
- Youth issues;
- Women's issues and the family; and,
- Computers and technology.

Reception Monitoring

All of the panelists listened to XXXX at home on FM and reported good to excellent reception on every day of monitoring.

III. NUMERICAL SCORES AND ILLUSTRATIVE QUOTES

This section presents the panel's numerical scores for the individual program evaluation criteria, followed by the most salient and illustrative quotes that explain the given scores. Part A presents the scores and quotes for the presentation/production quality criteria; part B, the scores and quotes for the music quality criteria; part C, the scores and quotes for the content quality criteria; part D, the scores and quotes evaluating the specific programs chosen for review; part E, the quotes for the panelists' perceptions of XXXX; part F, the quotes comparing XXXX to other media; part G, the respondents' suggestions for how XXXX might improve its programming.

A. PRESENTATION/PRODUCTION QUALITY

This section presents respondents' average scores and written responses for each of the presentation quality criteria. The panelists' score for each category represents the average of the overall scores they assigned to each criterion after they completed all of the required listening; the control listeners' scores reflect their overall evaluations of each criterion. The scale used for the ratings was 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good) and 4 (excellent), and can be interpreted with the following ranges: 1.0–1.3 = poor; 1.4–1.6 = poor to fair; 1.7–2.3 = fair; 2.4–2.6 = fair to good; 2.7–3.3 = good; 3.4–3.6 = good to excellent; 3.7–4.0 = excellent. Following the scores for each criterion are the most illustrative and instructive quotes from the respondents' written responses for that category.

PRIVILEGED RESEARCH

B. MUSIC QUALITY

This section presents the respondents' average scores and written responses for each of the music quality criteria. The panelists' score for each category represents the average of the overall scores they assigned to each criterion after they completed all of the required listening; the control listeners' scores reflect their overall evaluations of each criterion. The scale used for the ratings was 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good) and 4 (excellent), and can be interpreted with the following ranges: 1.0–1.3 = poor; 1.4–1.6 = poor to fair; 1.7–2.3 = fair; 2.4–2.6 = fair to good; 2.7–3.3 = good; 3.4–3.6 = good to excellent; 3.7–4.0 = excellent. Following the score for each criterion are the most illustrative and instructive quotes from the respondents' written responses for that category.

PRIVILEGED RESEARCH

C. CONTENT QUALITY

This section presents respondents' average scores and written responses for each of the content quality criteria. The panelists' score for each category represents the average of the overall scores they assigned to each criterion after they completed all of the required listening; the control listeners' scores reflect their overall evaluations of each criterion. The scale used for the ratings was 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good) and 4 (excellent), and can be interpreted with the following ranges: 1.0–1.3 = poor; 1.4–1.6 = poor to fair; 1.7–2.3 = fair; 2.4–2.6 = fair to good; 2.7–3.3 = good; 3.4–3.6 = good to excellent; 3.7–4.0 = excellent. Following the scores for each criterion are the most illustrative and instructive quotes from the respondents' written responses for that category.

PRIVILEGED RESEARCH

D. DAILY PROGRAMS

This section presents program logs for the XXXX programs reviewed in Iraq, as well as the panel’s evaluations of the programs. The daily evaluation tables display the respondents’ individual ratings for all of the presentation, music and content quality evaluation criteria, as well as the panelists’ average rating for each aspect.

The scale used for the ratings was 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good) and 4 (excellent), and may be interpreted within the following ranges: 1.0–1.3 = poor; 1.4–1.6 = poor to fair; 1.7–2.3 = fair; 2.4–2.6 = fair to good; 2.7–3.3 = good; 3.4–3.6 = good to excellent; 3.7–4.0 = excellent. Following the tables are comments that illustrate what the respondents thought of the balance between music and information content in the monitored programs.

IV. RECEPTION MONITORING

As part of their overall monitoring task, the seven panelists were asked to keep track of the quality of reception of XXXX’s programming in Iraq over the course of the monitoring period. This section provides a table summarizing the waveband and reception quality for each day of listening, followed by quotes and daily tables that detail the precise nature of any reception difficulties.

Table 1. Waveband and Reception Quality by Day of Listening and Respondent

Listening Date and Time (Local Time)	P. 1 Baghdad	P. 2 Baghdad	P. 3 Baghdad	P. 4 Baghdad	P. 5 Baghdad	P. 6 Baghdad	P. 7 Baghdad	P.8 Baghdad	P.9 Baghdad	P.10 Baghdad
4 Dec 2006 22:00-23:00										
5 Dec 2006 23:00-24:00										
6 Dec 2006 13:00-14:00										
7 Dec 2006 21:00-22:00										
8 Dec 2006 19:15-20:15										
9 Dec 2006 08:00-09:00										

