

Framing Analysis of Pak-India Relations in Elite Press: Peace and War Journalism Perspective

Mehmood Ahmed¹, Shamas Suleman Arshad² and Zahid Yousaf³

. <https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2021.10.2.5>

Abstract

This study examined the framing of Pak-India relations in the elite English press (Dawn, The Nation from Pakistan and The Hindu, Hindustan Times from India) of both countries during the time-period (1st January to 30th June 2018). Galtung's peace journalism model has been used to assess the framing of different issues in Pak-India relations. Galtung forwarded war and peace journalism as two competing frames for press to cover conflict and war. Mixed method content analysis was used to study the editorials and columns both from the all four newspapers. Total 449 both editorials and columns, 322 from Pakistani press and 127 from Indian press, were analysed. The research question addressed in the investigation was 'how elite press of both countries are framing Pak-India relations and what issues are framed dominantly regarding war and peace framing categories?' Major hypothesis was 'Elite press of Pakistan and India is using war framing dominantly in covering Pak-India relations'. All the results were statistically tested by applying various tests including Chi Square. The findings of the study show that the elite press of Pakistan and India predominantly used war frames for the coverage of Pak-India relations. The highest frequency of coverage overall (peace and war issues) regarding Pak-India relations is on the part of Pakistani press. Kashmir issue was found to be the top most issue framed in war categories. 'Peace talks' was the issue which coverage dominated others among peace categories.

Key Words: Pak-India Conflict, Peace Talks, South Asia, Framing, Peace Journalism

Introduction

The practitioners of the paradigm of Peace Journalism forward the idea of revisiting norms (framing) of conventional journalism that until now take side of violence and/or conflict; and to develop new norms (frames) that favour communal harmony and address common grounds. (Jan & Hussain, 2020; Galtung, 1998, 2000, 2010, 2011; Lynch, 1998, 2010; Kempf, 2007; Nassanga, 2007, 2008; Lee, 2008, 2010; Birungi, 2009; Shinar, 2004, 2007; Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005, 2010 Tehranian, 2002; Howard, 2003, 2009; Wolfsfeld, 2004; Lugalambi, 2006). The proponents of Peace Journalism's claims based on historical facts in addition to research pointing out the destructive capacity; although the potential for peace, of human beings in which, as a social institution, media play an important role (Mitra, 2017;

¹ PhD Scholar, Center for Media and Communication Studies, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

² PhD Scholar, Department of Education, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

³ Chairperson and Associate Professor, Center for Media and Communication Studies, University of Gujrat, Pakistan



Thompson, 2007; UNDESA, 2005; OECD 2001; Dallaire 1997, 2003, 2007; Chalk, 1999, 2007). These studies urged the researcher to indulge in the task of examining the war and peace framing in elite press of Pakistan and India. No country can replace her neighbours in international arena. Therefore, to live side by side is not a choice but an inevitable truth for both Pakistan and India. Co-existence is far better than no-existence. These bilateral relations are either a blessing for the South Asian peace and prosperity or a bane. These two nuclear powers hold the key to regional stability, which also directly linked with global peace (Burke, 1994). Their importance to the world affairs, their geo-strategic location and the labyrinth of relations between each other full of conflicts and crisis that can trigger any fatal chain of sorrowful events between two nuclear hostile neighbours. The study will examine the role and dimension of the elite press of both the countries in determining bilateral relations in relation with peace and war journalism.

Soroka (2003) says mass media's content is the vital source of eventual changes in individuals' as well as community's preferences about foreign policy and relations among nations. Ross (2006) says media play a decisive role in international affairs and conflicts because of the people are dependent on mass media to give timely, trustworthy information about distant events.

According to Hewitt (1997), Pakistan and India share a sense of 'mutual distrust' since the partition. Sattar (2013) says the distrust erupted with the emergence of diverse disputes that darkened the horizon of peace and stability in South Asia. The era of seven decades of relations among neighbouring nuclear states comprising 1.5 billion people is marked with four wars, many other disputes and tensions along with some measures taken to reconcile and some parameters defined to bring relations to peaceful coexistence. (Amin, 2010; Burke, 1994; Sattar, 2013; Ali, 1967; Azad, 1959; Geelani, 1993; Arif, 1995; Lamb, 1991; Longer, 1988; Dixit, 2002; Cohen, 2003; Schofield, 2003; Rizvi, 2011; Burki, 2007).

Accessing the conflicting issues and disturbed relations between the two nations, it is imperative to investigate whether Pakistani and Indian media is trying to normalize the situation by practicing peace journalism or it tends to create hype by focusing on war journalism. In this study, the researcher attempts find out the editorial and opinion treatment on Indo-Pak conflicts by four elite English language newspapers. Moreover, by aiming to investigate the press' approach in reporting the relations of Pakistan and India, getting foresight from the Galtung's model of war and peace journalism, this paper attempts to facilitate develop a media policy to instill moderation and peace between the two nations.

Literature Review

McGoldrick & Lynch (2000) states that Peace Journalism uses conflict analysis and transformation to revise the concept of objectivity, fairness, balance and accuracy in reporting the conflict. Bagdikian (2005) concludes that the modern society is crammed with images from mass media about the world. Lee (2008) quotes Bell (1995) who "stressed on the impracticality [in journalism] of covering (standing) neutrally between victim and oppressor, right and wrong, good and evil" (p. 5). Mass Media works have been linked to the issues that consequence to violent behaviors such as the correlation among substantial exposure to the mass media and the enhancement in violent behaviors between mass media viewers (Felson, 1996). Numerous researchers who studied peace and conflict have defined conflict by relating it with material violence. For instance, to cite few researchers who have

linked violence to conflict are Mitchel (1991), Ramsbotham (2005). Abdalla et al (2002) consider other main factors contributing to conflict as Ethnic tensions, Religious issues, Political differences and Distribution of resources.

Oganjanyan (2012) says Peace journalism can be termed as a reaction in opposition to some of the flaws pointed out in contemporary practice of journalism. Instead of covering only bare facts in a conflict area, peace journalism tends to go much further, reporting the milieu to the conflict in addition to encouraging de-escalation and non-escalation (p.44). In the time of a conflict the key actors or institutions aims to hold the focus of press concentration. However, for a peace journalist, all parties of the conflict need to be the focus of attention instead of one, "peace journalism equally portrays the truths and lies of all rival parties; hold focus to ordinary public, their participation in exploration for solution and their sufferings" (Oganjanyan 2012, p. 45).

The key rationale behind peace journalism, as believed by some prominent scholars is the peace building and conflict transformation (Lynch, 2008, p.3). As indicated by Galtung (1998), peace journalist would perceive conflict as a chance to find novel ways of peace building in the region that is bearing conflict. Whilst some persons would see conflict to be a terrible thing, some school of thoughts have considered conflict to be the catalyst meant for transformation and community advancement (Ramsbotham, 2005). People often tend not to perceive the ease of use of the opportunity that can lead them to resolution. Within conflict, persons who determine to solve it can unearth an improved way of stopping that conflict for a very long term (Galtung, 1998). He further adds that conflicts would be noticed as a challenge for the world. As persons, groups, nations and groups of states appear to stand in each other's path (that is what conflict is with reference to) there is an obvious threat of violence. Except in conflict there is also an obvious opportunity for human development, using the conflict to discover new ways, transforming the conflict productively so that the prospects take the upper hand - devoid of violence.

Journalists are the earliest to try to interpret violent measures to wider masses. People or groups who have their stake in the continuance of a conflict are fit served by portrayals of group hostility as intractable, never-ending: (Sharp, 2013)

Galtung (1998) forwards the idea that mass media often follow the "low road" in covering conflict-chasing wars. Galtung argues for an alternate course: the „high road“ for peace journalism that concentrates on the phenomenon of conflict transformation. Peace journalism struggles to depolarize the issue of conflict by presenting the black and white of each and every side, and peace journalism also works to de-escalate it by stressing on peace and conflict resolution as much as violent behaviour. Peace journalism tries to curtail the rift between opposed groups by not saying again facts that demonize one side and prepare the stage for conflict, (Lynch and McGoldrik 2001; Patel 2004). According to Galtung (1986, 1998) the war journalism and peace journalism are two competing frames in the media's coverage of conflict and war. He brackets peace journalism with truth, people, conflict and solutions. These four broad categories are the bases of his orientations towards the conceptualisation of peace journalism. On the contrary side, the conceptualisation of war journalism is rooted in elite oriented coverage, propaganda, violence/war and victory. The journalist can understand and accurately expresses the historical and cultural foundations of conflict by presenting the views of all the parties involved in conflict that makes the conflict understandable and creates empathy. Through application of consistent and active peace journalism practices, the journalist creates an environment that is necessary to seek ways and

possible solutions to solve conflict. Other main techniques argue to involve editorials and columns using preventive advocacy approaches and create demand for reconciliation by objectively focusing on common interests and not stressing upon vengeance, differences and retaliation. Through highlighting stories that emphasis on the hidden results of violence such as damaging social structure and emotional trauma (Lee, 2010).

Two aspects frequently influence coverage on conflict: the connection of the mass media with governments and armed forces authorities for the duration of a conflict (Aulich, 1992; Herman and Chomsky, 1994; Kellner, 1992; Liebes, 1992; Philo and McLaughlin, 1995) and, secondly, the influence of journalistic schedules and practices (Conflict and Peace Courses, 1997; Williams, 1992; cited in Fawcett 2000).

Wolfsfeld (2004) argues that the “original mode of action for the media is to cover tension, clash, and violence” (p. 156). Shinar (2004) finds in a relative study that the press prefers to use war frames even whilst covering peace talks.

Siraj (2007) conducted a study about the coverage of Pakistan-India conflict in the elite US press from 2001 to 2002 that was among one of the pinnacle conflict eras between Pakistan and India based on Galtung’s theoretical assumption of war and peace journalism (1986, 1989). He concluded from the study that based on whole, coverage of the relations of Pakistan and India in both the dailies (Washington post and New York Times) was more favourable towards war journalism than that of peace journalism.

Jan and Khan (2011) concluded in their study examining peace keeping role of Pakistani media that press can fabricate peace in the nation and the journalism is considered an instrument to resolve conflict. Preponderance of respondents considers that the press can resolve conflicts while peace journalism is observed as the conflict trigger. Press persuades the policy makers for peace and highlights hidden narratives in face of audience.

During the nationalistic wars (Bosnia, Rwanda and Sierra Leone), scholars pointed out towards the catastrophic impact of media and its correlation with the messages of hate (war frames) and the subsequent massacre (Thompson, 1999; Des Forges, 1999; Onadipe & Lord, 1997; Kirschke, 1996). The propaganda of this type was related with one of the most terrible genocidal waves in human history. The Rwandan media was believed to be the decisive contributor to the initiation of carnage that took lives of more than half million people in less than one hundred days (Metzl, 1997; Straus, 2007; Monasebian, 2007). Print and electronic media in Bosnia fuelled the ethnic conflict in the name of promotional campaign of nationalism’s ideology (Buric, 2000).

Lee and Maslog (2005) studied the framing of Iraq-US war in comparison with four Local conflicts from Asia, Pakistan and India’s clash over Kashmir, Tamil Tiger’s movement in Sri Lanka, the separatist movement of Muslims in Philippine’s Mindanao province and the civil wars of Aceh and Maluku in Indonesia. They concluded that all Asian newspapers used war framing for local conflicts and peace framing for Iraq war (international conflict). Lee et al (2006) explained that the reason behind war framing for local conflicts was the involvement of the respective countries in the conflict where the newspaper based. They further explained that the Asian press predominantly used peace and neutral frames for Iraq war, whereas the western media such as associated press mostly produced the war frames. According to Spenser (2007), the media, in the race of sensationalization, is obsessed with the frames of confrontation rather than non-confrontational frames and lacks perceptiveness to propose promoting integration and build constructive peace through discourse, media discourse zero-sum politics rather non-zero-sum.

Bayuni (2008) argued that media mishandled, exaggerated and oversimplified the issue of East Timor by selecting dominant war frame in coverage; by portraying it a war between giant military of Indonesia and Fretilin Separatists, a clash between Christian East Timor and Muslim Indonesia.

Djebah (2003) study the newspaper coverage of Nigerian Delta crisis, concluded that the media presented the clash as a war in which it focused on who retreats and who advances, measured the losses in the estimate of material damage, number of citizens killed and wounded. The dominant theme was the zero-sum perspective.

Chung et al (2008) analysed media coverage to the North Korean nuclear test in 2006. Leading dailies from five countries (Japan, Russia, China, US, South Korea) firmly emphasised on status quo and with a clear partisan approach. Peace framing (mostly found in Chinese, Japanese and Russian newspapers) used a multi-party approach and avoided confrontational and emotional language. Lynch (2005) found UK's newspapers on coverage of Iranian nuclear crisis that the coverage was highly conflict provocative and war favoured thus paving the way through media discourse for military invention. McGoldrick (2008) found that the framing war journalism had more negative serious impacts on the feelings and psyche of people than peace journalism.

Siraj & Hussain (2010) concluded that the media framing was predominantly oriented towards war journalism. English press is more war oriented than the Urdu press. Kasbari (2006) says media institutions frequently exercise war and conflict oriented frames. Shinar (2004) reveals the media would prefer to apply war framing even though it is covering peace negotiations. According to Fawcett (2002), the media did not prefer conciliatory framing to conflict framing and frequently used conflict frames in reporting. Here are some indicators that are inspired from Galtung and used by Siraj (2010).

War-journalism indicators

- Differences-oriented
- Visible effects
- Elite-oriented
- Here and now
- Dichotomies of good/bad guy
- Two-party orientation
- Partisan-oriented
- Zero-sum orientation
- Uses of demonizing language

Peace-journalism indicators

- Solution oriented
- Invisible effects
- People-oriented
- Causes and consequences
- Avoid of good/bad guy
- Multi-party orientation
- Non-partisan
- Win-win orientation
- Avoid demonising language

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical support is from the framing perspective. Baran & Davis (2012) say the frame analysis theory has been founded on the idea that people make understanding of everyday life by using expectations. Reese (2010) identifies frames as persistent socially shared organising principles, which meaningfully build the social world by working symbolically (p.17). Van Gorp (2010) points out that the journalism enterprise carries a vibrant process of construction of meanings and continuously structures social reality by a systematic process in which a journalist entitles with the role of presenting additional interpretations of events and issues in the form of news articles (p.84). Scott (2007) says that media plays a decisive role in helping citizens to perceive what is socially normal and acceptable as common sense by both preferring some particular framings of news incidents and continuous repetition.

Whilst construction of reality is an interactive and complex process, the content of the newspapers conveys implicit and explicit judgements which create a “coherent whole” and attach particular meanings to distinct facts by the way of defining news, selection of facts and sources and by applying different semantic devices (Tuchman, 1978; Goffman, 1978; Parenti, 1993; Van dijk, 1991; Giltin, 1980; Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Entman, 1993; Domke, 1997; Pan & Kosiki, 1993; Gamson, 1989). Media framing decides a milieu for comprehension and decides the relevancy of information (Gamson, 1989; Tuchman, 1978; Giltin, 1980; Tichenor, Donohue & Olien, 1980; Gamson et al, 1992). According to these pre explained views of the established intelligentsia of mass communication, media frames sways what public think about and how they perceive the world around.

About framing, Entman (1993) says it is “selection of some aspects of a perceived reality and to make it more prominent in the content of communication in such manner that it reflects a special problem definition, moral evaluation, causal interpretation or/and recommendation for treatment (p.52). Some scholars also focused on the definitions of framing that are more narrative specific or according to their interpretations. For instance, Tankard, Hendrickson, Silberman, Bliss, and Ghanem (1991) understood the concept of media framing as the main idea working behind the news stories, which supplies a context and recommends what the issue is by the use of emphasis, selection, elaboration and exclusion (p.277). Gamson (1992) suggest that like a story line, a frame is an organising idea. Iyengar (1991), Entman (1993), and Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007) are off the view that the framing has been in use to define and construct the issues by highlighting some salient features of a social reality which the particular audience already understand. Scheufele and Tewksbury (2007) says the framing is “sorts of presentations that communicators and media practitioners use to communicate more complex issue in such manner that makes them understandable to the general audience (p.12). Lugalambi (2006) argues that the selective determination of the exclusion and inclusion of the content, journalist permits some frames to appear on the cost of others, in this way supporting the framing dominance that results in ultimate help of status quo. Brewer and Kimberly (2010) embark on their part on the mission of classifying frames in media nothing that partisan-frames, for example are often sponsored and constructed by players in a given circumstance with the intention to move the opinion of people in a way in line with pre supposed policy outcomes or position held (p.139).

Researchers in this article will try to evaluate the application of the usual conventional news framing of conflict events in light of newer frames as forwarded by proponents of the model of Peace Journalism (Lee, 2008; Lynch, 1998; Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005; Galtung, 1998,

2000; Tehranian, 2002; Shinar, 2004, 2007a-b; Wolfsfeld, 2004). Watzlawick et al (1974) who define it as a way of reshaping reality by bringing it in a new light. They explain it as “reframing something, means to alter the emotional or/and conceptual viewpoint or setting to which an event or a situation is experienced and to put it in some other frame that fits the facts of the similar situation evenly or better than that, and so altering the whole meaning (p.95).

Whilst the material facts about Pakistan-India relations such as different religious and political affiliations and biases, different ethnicities, longer border and territorial disputes and tensions, mishandled resource distribution and other structural factors contributing to situation causing conflict that can trigger violence will not evaporate suddenly. The reframing of their covering style in media will adjust and neutralize the meanings attributed to them and their outcomes in society. Following hypotheses and research questions are formulated:

Research Question

How elite press of both countries are framing Pak-India relations and what issues are framed dominantly regarding war and peace framing categories?

Following is first main hypothesis for this inquiry.

H1- Elite press of Pakistan is using war framing in covering Pak-India relations.

The second main hypothesis is

H2- Elite press of India is using war framing in covering Pak-India relations.

Methodology

The study is primarily a content analysis. Using qualitative and quantitative methods of content analysis. The method of employing various styles of investigation in research is termed as ‘triangulation’ and used by many scholars (Hansen et al., 1998; Fortner & Christians, 2003; Patton, 2002). Patton (2002), concluding from many other scholars on the topic of triangulation, signifies four categories mainly used, which are investigators triangulation (involvement of several evaluators or researchers); data triangulation (using several data sources in research); theory triangulation (using numerous perspectives to understand single data set); and methodological triangulation (using multiple research techniques to investigate single problem or issue). Out of many triangulations, researcher here employs the explicit type of methodological triangulation by using both quantitative and qualitative methods of research as many other researchers have applied (Mike et al, 2009; Cookman, 2003; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Therefore, the study examined both qualitatively and quantitatively the editorials and columns specified for the categories of analysis in the selected both Pakistani as well as Indian English language newspapers, *The Daily Dawn* and *The Nation* from the Pakistani Press and *The Hindu* and *Hindustan Times* from Indian press. The time-period selected for the study was from 1 January to 30 June 2018.

The categories that have established in this study to investigate war journalism are:

- A. Kashmir issue
- B. Cross border firing/violations and territorial disputes
- C. Nuclear issue & Weaponisation
- D. Terrorism
- E. Water dispute

The categories for peace journalism are

- A. Peace talks

- B. Bilateral trade
- C. Sports
- D. Showbiz, arts and culture
- E. Visa policy

The qualitative part has been carried out by constructing the slant recording directions as Positive/Favourable/Supportive, Negative/Unfavourable/Unsupportive and Neutral/Balanced/Mixed

Coders have assigned to code the data and the inter-coder reliability is measured by using the formula given by Holsti (1969) who presents this formula for measuring the reliability of nominal data in terms of percentage of agreement:

$$\text{Reliability} = 2M / N1 + N2$$

A small separate study was conducted with 30 stories to test the inter-coding reliability. The sample study yielded 92 per cent agreement for topic, 89 per cent for the type of stories, 823per cent for slant and 84 per cent for frames.

Data Analysis and Results

Table-1

Country of news paper				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
India	127	28.3	28.3	28.3
Pakistan	322	71.7	71.7	71.7
Total	449	100.0	100.0	

Table one (1) highlights total number of observations with respect to country of news paper. There are two countries India and Pakistan. There are (127) columns and editorials from Indian news papers whereas 322 columns and editorials from Pakistani news papers. With respect to percentage, Indian news papers percentage is 28.3 percent while Pakistani newspaper percentage is 71.7. A valid percentage of same percentage is also stated in the table. In last table contains the cumulative percent of total observations with respect to country of origin of news papers in all issues and theoretical reflection.

Table-2

Country of news paper		
Name of the news paper		Frequency
The Hindu	India	62
Hindustan Times	India	65
The Nation	Pakistan	199
Dawn	Pakistan	123

Table two (2) shows the frequencies in total in four newspapers (The Hindu, Hindustan Times, The Nation and Dawn). The Hindu have 62 stories, The Hindustan Times have 65, The Nation 199 and Dawn 123.

Table-3

	War Journalism			Peace Journalism			Total		
	Positive	Negative (N)	Neutral	Positive	Negative (N)	Neutral	Positive	Negative (N)	Neutral
Country									
India	58	20	6	27	13	3	85	33	9
Pakistan	113	78	5	91	32	3	204	110	8
Newspaper									
The Hindu	29	12	4	9	7	1	38	19	5
Hindustan Times	29	8	2	18	6	2	47	14	4
Nation	73	62	3	32	28	1	105	90	4
Dawn	40	16	2	59	4	2	99	20	4

Table 3 shows the frequencies in combined theoretical reflection of war journalism, Peace Journalism and total with respect to three responses (positive, Negative and Neutral) in two countries and four newspapers (The Hindu, Hindustan Times, The Nation and Dawn). The response of war journalism in Indian newspapers is fifty-eight (58) positive, twenty negative (20) and six (6) neutral. The response of peace journalism in Indian newspapers is twenty seven (27) positive, thirteen negative (13) and three (3) neutral. The response of war journalism in Pakistani newspapers is one hundred thirteen (113) positive, seventy-eight negative (78) and five (5) neutral. The response of peace journalism in Pakistani newspapers is ninety-one (91) positive, thirty-two negative (32) and three (3) neutral. For the newspapers, The Nation counts more war journalism stories than any other newspaper that is 73 whereas the Dawn counts for the highest peace journalism stories that is 59. The Hindu and Hindustan Times both dominantly used war journalism with 29 positive stories.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

	N Stat	Mini Stat	Maxi Stat	Mean Stat	Std. Dev Stat	Skewness Stat	Kurtosis		
							Std. Error	Stat	Std. Error
Combine War	280	1.00	3.00	1.4286	.56976	.927	.146	-.138	.290
Combine Peace	169	1.00	3.00	1.3373	.54432	1.350	.187	.886	.371
Total war and peace	449	1.00	3.00	1.3942	.56146	1.070	.115	.150	.230

Table 4 is about descriptive statistics, the table shows the theoretical reflection (Peace and War Journalism), N statistic which is number of observations with respect to each newspaper, theoretical reflection. Mean statistics shows the mean value against each category, standard deviation shows the values deviating from means in each category, next are skewness and kurtosis values, which are for the normality of data.

Statistical analysis of N (number of observations) against the theoretical reflection shows the highest frequency in columns two eighty (280) which is in war journalism. In Means value statistics highest means value is in War Journalism which is (1.4286), this means that The stories are inclined towards negative response because the value above 1.50 means the most of the responses are other than one which increase the mean value. This value subjectively means the response of in war journalism they project these war issues negatively in the stories. Standard deviation is a measure of how spread out the data points is. A set with a low standard deviation has most of the data points centered on the average. A set with a high standard deviation has data points that are not so clustered around the average. Skewness is slightly negatively skewed. A rule of thumb is skewness less than 1.0 (or less than -1.0). The values of kurtosis are normal that is the general rule of thumb to analyze the normality of data.

Table 5. Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Combine War	280	62.4%	169	37.6%	449	100.0%
Combine Peace	169	37.6%	280	62.4%	449	100.0%

The Table 5 of case processing concludes that war frames are predominantly used.

Table 6. Chi-Square Tests 1

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.418 ^a	6	.017
Likelihood Ratio	15.082	6	.020
Linear-by-Linear Association	.029	1	.864
N of Valid Cases	280		

a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.53.

Table 7. Chi-Square Tests 2

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.816 ^a	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	32.519	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.993	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	169		

a. 5 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .60.

Asymp. Sig. values are less than 0.05 that means the values lies within the range described for confidence interval 95 %. This table shows the both issue are equally significant in the elite press of both countries. There have been three slants, positive, negative and neutral with respect to war and peace framing. This chi square test is applied to analyze and find out the meaningful and significant difference between the categories. The result shows that there is significant difference exists, as P value is less than 0.05. In case of war framing, P value is

0.017 and in peace framing, the value is 0.000. These values are less than 0.05. Hence the hypothesis are proved that are

H1- Elite press of Pakistan is using war framing in covering Pak-India relations.

H2- Elite press of India is using war framing in covering Pak-India relations.

Discussion

Total 449 articles (editorials and columns) are analysed in the study from which 322 are from Pakistani elite press (Dawn, The Nation) and 127 are from Indian elite press (The Hindu and Hindustan Times). It shows that the larger part of the data is from Pakistani newspapers that are seventy-one point seven percent (71.7%) and the lesser share is from Indian side that is twenty-eight point three percent (28.3%). It shows the eagerness of the Pakistani press to present Pakistan's relations with India, while on the other hand; Indian press did not show one-third zeal of the same subject. Research question is addressed as the elite press of Pakistan and India framed (62.4%) of the total content in war frames. The statistical results as shown tells that the Asymp. Sig. Value and Chi Sq. value for the combine war journalism for the elite press of India and Pakistan shows the significance of the data that means most of the values in this category is recorded in the 'Positive' direction. As the directions described in the 'methodology' segment, it is clear that these issues are taken as war provoking and conflict arising issues by the elite press of both countries. Hence, two things are proved here, first, the categories are trustworthy and worked as they were tend to work and understood, second, the elite press of Pakistan and India framed more for war than peace issues. These results endorse the findings of some previous studies held in the context of war and peace journalism in different geographical locations of the world taking different dailies for content analysis (Shinar, 2012; Fawcett, 2002; Lee and Maslog, 2005; Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005; Thompson, 1999; Des Forges, 1999; Onadipe & Lord, 1997; Kirschke, 1996; Lee et al, 2006; Siraj, 2007; Spenser, 2007; Bayuni, 2008; Djebah, 2003).

There is another support from the results of this data for the argument that the local conflicts, in which the press (being analyzed) is involved as belonging to either side (country, group) of the conflict, predominantly prefer war frames in covering those conflicts. (Bayuni, 2008; Siraj, 2007; Lee & Maslog, 2005; Lee et al, 2006; Thompson, 1999; Des Forges, 1999; Onadipe & Lord, 1997; Kirschke, 1996; Fawcett, 2002).

This data proves the hypotheses

H1- Elite press of Pakistan is using War framing in covering Pak-India relations.

H2- Elite press of India is using War framing in covering Pak-India relations.

Conclusion

This study has concluded that the frames mostly presented by press of both Pakistan and India are predominantly war oriented. Therefore, if the press behaves the same, there has been a fair chance of promotion of the sympathies for the military solutions in masses to the conflicts also going on and those, which may come in future. The advantage of the study is that it is a combination of old and new issues between Pakistan and India. And the time-period is latest. Hence, the findings are exclusive and current combining all issues. The results are significant statistically and in-line with some reputed studies in the area of war and peace journalism. This study can help in understanding the framing of different foreign policy issues in elite press. The study can also helpful in determining the future way in

relations of Pakistan and India. It has shown the indicators of war that is the issue of Kashmir predominantly succeeding terrorism issue. It has also shown the way to peace that is peace talks process to solve conflicts on the basis of give and take.

References

- Abdalla, Amr., Susan, Shepler., Suleiman, Hussein. (2002). Evaluation of Talking Drum Studio – Sierra Leone. In Abdalla, Amr. (2002). *Research and evaluation projects in Sierra Leone. Search for Common Ground*.
- Ahsan, Chaudhry Mohammad. (1996). *Pakistan and great powers*. Karachi. Academy Publishers
- Arif, General K. M. (1995). *Working with Zia*. Pakistan. Oxford University Press
- Aulich, James (1992) “Wildlife in the South Atlantic: graphic satire, patriotism and the fourth estate”, in: James Aulich (Ed.), *Framing the Falklands War: nationhood, culture and identity*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, pp. 84–116.
- Azad, Maulana Abul kalam. (1959). *India Wins Freedom*. India. Orient Longman
- Bagdikian, B. H. (2005). When the Post banned anonymous sources. *American Journalism Review*, 27, 33
- Baran, J. S. and Davis, D.K. (2006). *Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment, and Future*. 4th Ed. Toronto: Thomson Wadsworth
- Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2012). *Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment, and Future* (Sixth ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bayuni, Endy M. (2008). Ringside view to the 1999 East Timor debacle. 21 December 2008, The Jakarta Post.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*, New York: The Free Press
- Berger, A. A. (2011). *Media and Communication Research Methods: An Introduction to Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 2nd Ed. Los Angeles and London: Sage
- Bertrand, I & Hughes, P (2005). *Media Research Methods: Audience, institutions, texts*. London. Palgrave
- Birungi, M. (2009). “Challenges of Integrating Peace Journalism into Conventional Journalism Practice: Case Study of LRA Peace Process in Uganda.” Masters Dissertation: The Faculty of Peace and Conflict Studies, European University Center for Peace Studies, Stadtschlaining –Austria
- Burke, S.M. (1994). *Pakistan’s Foreign Policy*. 2nd Ed. Oxford University Press
- Burki, Shahid (2007) *Kashmir: A Problem in Search of a Solution*. United States Institute of Peace, Washington, DC.
- Chalk, F. (1999). “Hate Radio in Rwanda.” In Adelman, H. & Suhrke, A. (Eds.). *The Path of Genocide: The Rwanda Crisis: From Uganda to Zaire*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publications.
- Chalk, F. (2007). “Intervening to prevent genocidal violence: the role of the media.” In
- Thompson, A. (Ed.). *The media and the Rwanda genocide*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers; London: Pluto Press

- Christians, C.G., Theodore L. G., McQuail, F., Nordenstreng, K., and White, R.A. (2009). *Normative Theories of the Media: Journalism in Democratic Societies*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press
- Cohen, S. P. (2003). India, Pakistan and Kashmir. In S. Ganguly (Ed.) *India as an emerging power* (Vol. 1, pp 32-60). Portland, OR: Frank Cass Publishers
- Dallaire, R. (1997). «La relation entre les Forces armées canadiennes et les médias lors des conflits. » Beauregard, C. et Saouter, C. (Eds.). *Conflits Contemporains et Médias*. Montréal (translation).
- Dallaire, R. (2003). *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. Toronto: Random House Canada
- Dallaire, R. (2007). "The Media Dichotomy." In Thompson, A. (Ed.). *The Media and the Rwandan Genocide*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers
- Des Forges, A. (1999) Leave none to tell the story: Genocide in Rwanda. New York: Human Rights Watch. Retrieved March 3, 2014 from <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1999/rwanda/>
- Dixit, J. N. (2002). *India-Pakistan in war & peace*. New York: Routledge
- Djebah, Oma, (2005), Peace Journalism in Africa: the Nigerian experience, retrieved on (21-05- 2013): www.warandmedia.org/members_det_a.htm
- Domke, D. (1997). Journalists, framing, and discourse about race relations. *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs*, 164, 5-55.
- Doob, L.W. (1993) *Intervention: Guides and Perils*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Fisher, R., Ury, W. and Patton, B. (1991) *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreements Without Giving In*, 2nd edn, New York: Penguin.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Fawcett, L. (2002). Why peace journalism isn't news? *Journalism Studies*, 3(2), 213-223.
- Felson, R. (1996). *Mass Media Effects on Violent Behavior*. Annual Reviews. Jstor.org.
- Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2083426>
- Fisher, R., Ury, W. and Patton, B. (1991) *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreements Without Giving In*, 2nd edn, New York: Penguin.
- Galtung, J., & Ruge, M. H. (1965). The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crises in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of peace research*, 2(1), 64-90.
- Galtung, J., & Vincent, R. C. (1992). Toward a New World Information and Communication Order. *Hampton, Cresskill, NJ*.
- Galtung, J. (1998.) *High Road, Low Road: Charting the Course for Peace Journalism*. Track Two, 7 (4). Retrieved from http://www.ccr.uct.ac.za/archive/two/7_4/p07_highroad_lowroad.html
- Galtung, J. (1998b). High road, low road: Charting the course for peace journalism. *Track Two*, Centre for Conflict Resolution South Africa, 7(4). Retrieved from http://www.ccr.uct.ac.za/archive/two/7_4/p07_highroad_lowroad.html

- Galtung, J. (1998c, September). *Peace journalism: What, why, who, how, when, where?* Paper presented at the TRANSCEND workshop “What Are Journalists For?” Taplow, UK.
- Galtung, J. (2000). “The Task of Peace Journalism.” In *Ethical Perspectives* 7(2-3): pp.162-167
- Galtung, J. (2010). “A Theory of Conflict.” TRANSCEND University Press. URL in March 2012 at www.transcend.org/tup
- Galtung, J. (27 June 2011). “Nonviolence: Negative Vs Positive.” TRANSCEND Media Service. URL in March 2012 at www.transcend.org/tms
- Galtung, J., & Ruge, M. H. (1965). The structure of foreign news. The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crisis in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of Peace Research*, 2(1), 64-91.
- Galtung, J., Jacobsen, C.G. and Brand-Jacobsen, K.F. (2002) *Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEND*, London: Pluto Press.
- Galtung, Johan and Vincent, Richard C. (1992) *Global Glasnost: toward a new world information and communication order*, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, W.A. & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 1-37.
- Gamson, W.A. (1989). News as Framing. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 32 (2), 157-161.
- Gamson, W.A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 373-393.
- Geelani, Syed Ali. (1993). *My Life in Prison (Roudad e Qafas)*. Islamabad. Institute of Policy Studies.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hackett, R.A. (2006). “Is Peace Journalism Possible? Three Frameworks for Assessing Structure and Agency in News Media.” In *Conflict & Communication online*, 5(2)
- Hanitzsch, T. (2004). Journalists as Peacekeeping Force: Peace journalism and mass communication theory. *Journalism Studies*, Volume 5 (4), 483-495
- Herman, Edward and Chomsky, Noam (1994) [1988]. *Manufacturing Consent: the political economy of the mass media*. London. Vintage.
- Hewitt, V. (1997). *The New International Politics of South Asia* (1st ed.). New York; Manchester University Press.
- Hofstetter, R. (1976). *Bias in the News*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Howard, R. (2003). *Conflict Sensitive Journalism: A Handbook for Reporters*. Vancouver and Copenhagen: IMPACS. URL in January 2014 at http://www.i-m.s.dk/files/publications/IMS_CSJ_Handbook.pdf

- Howard, R. (2009). "Conflict-Sensitive Reporting: State of the Art, a Course for Journalists and Journalism Educators." Paris: UNESCO. URL in December 2013 at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001869/186986e.pdf>
- Itule, B. & Anderson, D. (1997). *News Writing and Reporting for Today's Media* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible?* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jan, I., & Hussain, S. (2020). Media, War and Peace: Towards Peace Journalism Strategies in Pakistan. *Global Regional Review*, V(I), 340-345. doi:10.31703/grr.2020(V-I).37
- Jan, M. & Khan, M. R. (2011). Peace Journalism and Conflict Reporting: The Case of Pakistani Media. *South Asia Studies*, 26 (2), 31-324.
- Kasbari, Carol, (2006), The Media Role in the Israeli Palestinian Conflict: Can it Promote Peace? retrieved on (12-10-2013), <http://nocosia.usembassy.gov/embatwork>
- Kellner, Douglas (1992). *The Persian Gulf TV War*, Boulder: Westview Press.
- Kempf, W. (2007). "Peace journalism: A tight rope walk between advocacy journalism and constructive conflict coverage." *Conflict & Communication online*, 6(2). URL in January 2014 at http://www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_2/pdf/kempf.pdf
- Khan, F. R. & Farish, U. (2005). Media coverage of the ideological other: Evidence from Newsweek and Economist. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 21 (1), pp. 36- 44. ISSN. 1019-8180.
- Khan, Muhammad Rashid. (n.d). The Kargil Conflict: Comparing Indian and Pakistani Newspapers' Editorial Treatment. *South Asian Studies* 23 (2)
- Kirschke, L. (1996). *Broadcasting genocide; censorship, propaganda, & state-sponsored violence in Rwanda 1990-1994*. London
- Korbel, Joseph. (1966). *Danger in Kashmir*. London. Oxford University Press
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to it Methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication, INC.
- Lamb, Alastair. (1991). *Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy*. London. Oxford University Press.
- Lederach, J. Paul (1995) *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Lee, P. (2008). "The No-nonsense guide to peace journalism." *World Association of Christian Communication (WACC)*. URL in January 2013 at <http://www.waccglobal.org/en/resources/no-nonsense-guides.html>.
- Lee, S. T. (2010). Peace journalism: Principles and structural limitations in the news coverage of three conflicts. *Mass Communication and Society*, 13(4), 361-384.
- Lee, S. T., & Maslog, C. (2005). War or peace journalism? Asian newspaper coverage of conflicts. *Journal of Communication*, 55(2), 311-329.
- Lee, S. T., Maslog, C. C., & Kim, H. S. (2006). Asian conflicts and the Iraq War. A comparative framing analysis. *The International Communication Gazette*, 68, 499–518.
- Liebes, Tamar (1992) "Our War/Their War: comparing the *Intifadeh* and the Gulf War on U.S. and Israeli television", *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 9, pp. 44–55.
- Longer, V. (1988). *The Defence and Foreign Policy of India*. New Delhi. Sterling

- Lugalambi G. W. (2006). "Media, peace-building and the Culture of Violence." In Mbaine Adolf E. (Ed.). *Media in situations of Conflict: Roles, Challenges and Responsibility*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers
- Lynch, J. & McGoldrick, A. (2005). *Peace Journalism*. Gloucestershire, UK: Hawthorn Press
- Lynch, J. & McGoldrick, A. (2007). Peace Journalism. In Webel, C. & Galtung, J. (Eds.). *A handbook for Peace and Conflict Studies*. USA and Canada: Routledge
- Lynch, J. (1998). "The peace journalism option." In *Conflict and Peace Forums*. Buckinghamshire, UK: Taplow Court. URL in January 2014 at <http://web.archive.org/web/20000822111932/www.poesis.org/pjo/pjotext.html>
- Lynch, J. (2010). Propaganda, war, peace and the media. In. Keeble, R.; Tulloch J. & Zollmann F. (Eds). *Peace Journalism, War and Conflict Resolution*. New York: Peter Lang. pp. 69-83.
- Lynch, Jake & McGoldrick, Annabel (2005). Peace journalism in the Holy Land. *Media Development*, 52 (1), p47-49.
- Lynch, J. (2008). *Debates in Peace Journalism*. Sydney: Sydney University Press
- Maslog, C., Lee, S. T., & Kim, H. S. (2006). Framing analysis of a conflict: How newspapers in five Asian countries covered the Iraq War. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 16(1), 19-39.
- McGolding, A & Lynch, J (2000). Peace Journalism – What is it? How to do it? Retrieved from www.transcend.org on Dec 2013.
- Mc Quail, Dennis. (1987). *Mass communication Theory*. London: Sage.
- Mc Quail, Dennis. (1994). *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Meltzer, Kimberly. (2006). Newspaper editorial boards and the practice of endorsing candidates for political office in the United States. *Journalism: Theory, practice and criticism*, 8(1).
- Mitchel, C. (1991). *The Structure of International Peace*. Great Britain: Macmillan Press Ltd
- Mitra, S. (2017). Adoptability and acceptability of peace journalism among Afghan photojournalists: Lessons for peace journalism training in conflict-affected countries. *Journal of the Association for Journalism Education*, Vol. 6. Issue 2, 17-27..
- Monasebian, S. (2007). • The pre-genocide case against Radio-Télévision Libre des Milles Collines.
- Nassanga, G.L. (2007). "Peace Journalism Applied: An assessment of media coverage of the conflict in Northern Uganda." In *Conflict & Communication Online*, Vol.6, No.2. URL in January 2014 at www.cco.regener-online.de/
- Nassanga, G.L. (2008). "Twenty years of conflict in northern Uganda: Reshaping the agenda for media training and research." In *Global Media Journal-Mediterranean Edition*, 3(2), pp.12-20.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2001). "*The DAC Guidelines: Helping Prevent Violent Conflict*." Paris: OECD Publications Service. URL in January 2012 at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/54/1886146.pdf>

- Oganjanyan, Amelia. (2012). *The August War in Georgi : Foreign Media Coverage*. Georgia: Diplomica Verlag
- Onadipe, A. & Lord, D. (1997) African conflict and the media. Retrieved March 1, 2013, from http://www.c-r.org/occ_papers/occ_af_conf1.htm
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10 (1, Jan.-March), 59-79.
- Patel, T. (2004). Media and Conflict Resolution in context of India – Pakistan conflict over Kashmir. Statement of Intent Paper MPhil Program.
- Peterson, T. (1963). The social responsibility theory of the press In F. S. Siebert, T. Peterson and W. Schramm (Eds.). *Four theories of the press*. Urbana: University of Illinois
- Philo, Greg and McLaughlin, Greg (1995) “The British Media and the Gulf War”, in: Greg Philo (Ed.), *Glasgow Media Group. Oxford university press Reader*, Volume 2: industry, economy, war and politics, London: Routledge, pp. 146–56.
- Reese, S. (2001). Framing public life: A bridging model for media research. In S. D. Reese,
- O. Gandy Jr., & A. E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 7-31). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Reese, S. (2007). The framing project: A bridging model for media research revisited. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 148-154.
- Resse D.S. (2010). “Finding Frames in a Web of Culture: The Case of the War on Terror”. In D’Angelo, P. & Kuypers, J.A. *Doing News Framing Analysis: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*. Routledge: New York
- Rizvi, Hassan Askari (2011). *Pakistan India relations; Old Problems New Initiatives*. Pildate
- Ross, S.D. (2003). Framing of Palestine-Israeli conflict in thirteen months of New York Times editorials surrounding the attacks of 9/11. *Conflict & communication quarterly online*, 2(2).
- Ross, S.D. (2006). (De) constructing conflict: a focused review of war and peace journalism. *Conflict & Communication Online* 5(2): 1-12.
- Sam. (2010). *Water dispute fuel India Pakistan tension*. Retrieved from www.defence.pk/forum/current-events-social-issues/56211/-water-despute-fuel-india-pakistantention- html
- Sattar, Abdul. (2013).). *Pakistan’s Foreign Policy 1947-2012: A concise history*. Karachi. Oxford University Press.
- Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103-122.
- Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9-20.
- Schofield, V. (2003). *Kashmir in conflict: India, Pakistan and the unending war*. London: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd
- Sharp, S. (2013). Journalists must master conflict analysis; Conflict analysis in Indonesia. *The Peace Journalist*, 2 (2), 22-24

- Shinar, D. (2004). "Media peace discourse: Constraints, concepts and building blocks." In *Conflict and Communication Online*. 3(1-2). URL in January 2012 at www.cco.regeneronline.de/
- Shinar, D. (2007). Epilogue: Peace Journalism – The State of the Art. *Conflict and Communication Online*, 6(1)
- Shoemaker, P. & Reese, S. (1996). *Mediating the message: theories of influences on mass media content* (2nd ed.). New York. Longman.
- Siraj, Abdul. (2007), war or peace journalism in the elite US newspapers: Exploring news farming in Pakistan India conflict, retrieved on 10-10-2013, <http://www.issi.org.pk/>
- Siraj, Abdul., Hussain, Shabbir. (2010). Framing War and Peace Journalism on the perspective of Talibanization in Pakistani Media. *Asian journal of communication*, 37 (1)
- Straus, S. (2007). What is the relationship between hate radio and violence? Rethinking Rwanda's "Radio Machete". *Politics & Society*, 35(4), 609-637.
- Soroka, Stuart N. (2003). Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy. *Harvard College Publication. Press/Politics* 8(1):27-48 DOI: 10.1177/1081180X02238783
- Steuter, E. (1990). Understanding the media/terrorism relationship: An analysis of ideology and the news in Time magazine. *Political Communication and Persuasion*, 7, 257-278.
- Suleyman Irvan (2006). Peace Journalism as a Normative Theory: Premises and Obstacles *GMJ: Mediterranean Edition* 1(2), pp. 34-39
- Tankard, J. W., Hendrickson, L., Silberman, J., Bliss, K., & Ghanem, S. (1991, August). *Media frames: Approaches to conceptualization and measurement*. Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Boston, MA.
- Tehranian, M. (2002). "Peace journalism: Negotiating global media ethics." In *Harvard Journal of Press/Politics*, 7(2), pp.58-83.
- Thompson, M. (1999). *Forging war: the media in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia Herzegovina*. Luton, U.K.: University of Luton Press.
- Thompson, A. (2007). "The Verdict: Summary Judgment from the Media Trial." In Thompson, A. (Ed.). *The Media and the Rwandan Genocide*. Kampala: Fountain
- Tichenor, P.J., Donohue, G.A., & Olien, C.N. (1980). *Community Conflict & the Press*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news*. New York: Free Press.
- UNDESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). (2005). "Development challenges in sub-Saharan Africa and post-conflict countries." *Report of the Committee for Development Policy on the seventh session*. New York: United Nations Publishing Section. URL in December 2013 at www.un.org/esa/policy/devplan/
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Van Gorp, B. (2010). "Strategies to Take Subjectivity Out of Framing Analysis". In D'Angelo, P. and J.A. Kuypers. *Doing News Framing Analysis: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*. Routledge: New York
- Wimmer, D.R. & Dominick, J.R. (2006). *Mass Media Research: An Introduction*. 8th Ed., London & Belmont, CA: Thomson, Wadsworth

- Wolfsfeld, Gadi. (1997a). Fair weather friends: The varying role of the news media in the Arab-Israeli peace process. *Political Communication*, 14 (1), 29-48.
- Wolfsfeld, Gadi. (1997b). *Media and political conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfsfeld, Gadi. (2004). *Media and the path to peace*. Cambridge University.
- Yousafzai, Farish Ullah., Rawan, Bakht. (2009). How the Pakistani press framed the execution of Saddam Hussein. *Global Media Journal*, 2 (2)