

The Framing of War on Terror in Pakistan's Mainstream Urdu Press: A Comparative Analysis of Daily Jang and Daily Nawa-i-Waqt



Jan Muhammad	Assistant Professor, Department of Journalism & Mass Communication, University of Malakand, journalistjan81@gmail.com
Dr. Sajjad Ali	Assistant Professor, Department of Journalism & Mass Communication, University of Malakand, sajjadimc@uom.edu.pk
Shakir Ullah	Lecturer, Department of Journalism & Mass Communication, University of Malakand,

Abstract: This paper explores the editorial framing of the War on Terrorism" (WOT) by two prominent Urdu-language daily newspapers in Pakistan, namely Daily Jang and Daily Nawa-i-Waqt. The WOT, initiated globally after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, had significant implications for Pakistan, which not only became an active participant but declared itself a frontline state in the war. The study employs a quantitative and qualitative analysis of editorials published by Daily Jang and Daily Nawa-i-Waqt between the initiation of the WOT in September 2001 and the present. The central questions guiding the analysis include the framing of the WOT, the newspapers' stance on the official policy of Pakistan, and the potential similarities or differences in their editorial treatments. Both Daily Jang and Daily Nawa-i-Waqt, revealed that 89% of editorials were critical of the initiative, with varying degrees of intensity and tone. While both newspapers shared a critical stance, differences emerged in their qualitative framing. Daily Nawa-i-Waqt displayed a stronger and more consistent opposition, rejecting the very idea of the WOT and maintaining a harsh tone. Daily Jang, while critical, showed some flexibility and even contributed neutral editorials. Additionally, Urdu press maintained a critical stance (63%) toward Pakistan's official policy on the WOT, with only 32% expressing support. Both newspapers questioned the sincerity of the United States, framing the war as a "crusade against innocent Muslims" and a pursuit to "capture resources" of weaker nations. This study contributes to our understanding of how the Urdu press in Pakistan has framed and responded to the WOT. The findings highlight the positions of Daily Jang and Daily Nawa-i-Waqt, shedding light on the complex interplay between media and official state policies. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for comprehending the multifaceted impact of media in shaping perceptions of global events in the context of Pakistan's evolving role in the WOT.

Keywords: Framing, Urdu Press, Pakistan, Daily Jang and Daily Nawa-i-Waqt

Introduction

Pakistan's major Urdu media's framing of the war on terror demonstrates support for the government's counterterrorism efforts. Studies looking at Urdu publications published in Pakistan, such as Jang and Nawa i Waqt (Kasim, Sharif, Qasim, Mahmood, Attia, Zulfiqar, 2023)

reveal worries about military actions, preparations, and counterterrorism measures in the nation. Excellent financial explanation (Ihtasham, Ali. 2022). The government was also made aware of the National Action Plan to counter the terrorist threat via electronic and mainstream media (Safwan and Ali 2022). Additionally, it has been noted that British

publications' coverage of the Afghan Taliban's takeover of the country shifted from negative to favourable (Zaeem, Yasin, Farah, Saleem, Qureshi, Menahil, Farrukh. 2022). In general, the counterterrorism narrative in Pakistani media aligns with the government's. The case study examines terrorism news in Pakistan and conducts an analysis of articles from two prominent media outlets within the nation. Utilizing content analysis, the study delves into media coverage of terrorism in Pakistan to determine whether the reports demonstrate pro-Taliban or pro-American sentiments. The research timeline spans from the September 11 attacks to the subsequent anniversary, aiming to provide a comprehensive overview. The findings of the in-depth analysis reveal the American influences evident in the selected articles (Zafar, Ali. 2013). This scholarly article scrutinizes the narrative constructs developed by authors of the top ten US newspapers during a crucial month in the anti-terrorism campaign. These narratives advocate for military intervention in Afghanistan as an essential countermeasure against terrorism. The piece elucidates on the binary symbolism employed in the war on terror, depicting "good" Arabs, Afghans, Muslims, Americans, and their allies combating the "bad" Taliban, al-Qaeda, and Osama bin Laden, the foremost figure among the terrorists. Additionally, the article investigates the role of sources in shaping or challenging narratives concerning armed conflicts (Michael, Ryan. 2004).

We live in the media age. What we know about the outer world -the world lying out of our direct experience, is mostly shaped by the mass media for us. Mass media, in today's world are responsible for shaping or portraying realities for the audience. In the words of Walter Lippmann(1922) mass media are responsible for the pictures in our heads. Though mass media, in general, are responsible for constructing social realities for the audience but the pictures of social realities as drawn by one mass media are not necessarily the same as they are depicted by some other mass media .It is because every mass media tempt to see the world in terms of their own experiences and social frames (Rice et

al, 1982).

Due to these inherent diversities in the frames of different mass media, several newspapers may run precisely the same number of inches about an issue or incident but still provide a different picture of what has happened. Differences in the construction of social realities by different mass media are due to the biases they (mass media) have about the real world. To know as to how different mass media construct different images of the same reality can be determined by studying them over a substantial period of time.

It is centuries' old tradition of the mass media that they (mass media) give importance to one or some of the aspects of an event by portraying them frequently and in powerful position and marginalizing the other aspects of the same event by ignoring them or presenting them less advantageously and keeping them out of the mainstream. It is because of differences in the ideological biases of the mass media. For example, Stenly Cohen (1981) while writing about the bias of the British news media says that while dealing with deviant groups, they (British media) often over report by exaggerating the seriousness of events, the violence that occurred and the damage caused.

The present study deals with the question of how similarly or differently the two most prominent Urdu language daily newspapers of Pakistan (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) performed while treating or drawing the images of the same phenomenon i.e. "Global War on Terrorism" in their editorials. The global war against terrorism which, later on, adopted the name of "War on Terror (WOT)" was started globally by many of the world states under the leadership of the United States of America as a reaction to the terrorist attacks on US on September 11, 2001. Heavy losses and destruction had occurred in these attacks on the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon of the United States. Pakistan not only became an active member of the community of world nations to fight this war but also declared itself as a front line state in the war. Since then (the time of joining the world states to fight the war against terrorism in 2001, it (WOT) started ranking very

highly at the official levels of Pakistan. Being something of very high importance to the body politics of the country (Pakistan) the War on Terror (WOT) also became a hot issue on the agenda of the media of mass communication of Pakistan.

Significance of the study

Today people live in a world highly influenced by the mass media. Mass media organizations are busy day and night in portraying and mediating the world through their discourses in the light of their (mass media) every day experiences and frames. Mass media organizations thus, play an important role in making their audience believe the world as it is presented by them. The world we live in is of course real, interesting, beautiful, moral or otherwise. The mass media make it even more possible by attaching such meaning to the words. In other words the world we know about is constructed partly by mass media organizations such as newspapers, Radio, TV etc. and partly by the members of the society due to the presence of prevailing ideas. Therefore, it is very important to analyze what kind of interactions media contents set up among the people and the world, and among the powerful and the rest. It is also equally important to analyze how meanings are made differently by different media organizations.

As this study is mainly focused on knowing how did the mainstream Urdu newspapers (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) perform while drawing editorial images of the same phenomenon i.e. War on Terror (WOT) since it began in Sept., 2001. The phenomenon of WOT remained the major focus of attention of the official policy of Pakistan and also attracted attentions of the national and international media. It is generally believed that modern states in today's world have a great concern about how they are covered, pictured and as a result, made to be perceived by others. Editorial portrayal of the national policies are taken more seriously by the today's governments because, on the one hand, they (newspapers) explain positions of nations on certain issues and, on the other hand, show a sort of relationships the governments have with their respective mass media.

Daily Jang and Daily Nawa-i-Waqt ?

In this age of media and mass communication almost every country has one or more newspaper(s) that stand(s) out as journalism of elite opinion. Such paper(s) also cater(s) to the intelligentsia and the opinion leaders. Though variously defined by various scholars, one characteristic is usually found to be very common in them-- they are taken seriously. They are the kind "which libraries and universities feel must be made available to their students"(Merrill, Bryan, and Alisky, 1970). Because of their (elite newspapers) importance they are indexed, microfilmed, content analyzed, and otherwise dissected by researchers in various discipline. John C. Merrill et al (1980) in their famous book, *The World Great Dailies: profile of fifty newspapers* while writing about the newspapers of the third world countries said though none of the newspapers from the third world countries includes in the list of "50 best" dailies because of varying degree of constraints of government control in almost all these countries, but the mere exclusion from the circle of Merrill's "elite papers" does not make these third world newspapers unworthy of study.

In Pakistan the two newspapers; daily *Jang*, and daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* are generally considered to be the most prominent dailies which are read by those influentials of the society who effect the policies and public policies in political, economical and cultural matters. Their readers include public officials, scholars, journalist, theologians, lawyers, judges and business leaders. The readers of these newspapers are generally better educated and have greatest interest in the public affairs than the average readers of other newspapers. According to the standard set for such prominent papers (Merrill, 1968; Merrill and Fisher, 1980) these newspapers too claim to have highest circulation and also have enormous influence at national and international levels. Government departments, politicians, businessmen, social and cultural organizations depend highly on these two newspapers due to their importance and prestigious positions. Despite the fact that variations always exist in their positions on the matters of day to day life but, according to many

scholars, there would be deterioration in the whole country if these two newspapers stopped publications and no other paper came forward to take their place.

1.5 Study Objectives:

Mass Media have tremendous ability to attract the attention of the people towards the incidents that are new, unusual, important and interesting. Mass media also have the potential to focus attention of the citizens on the issue and then, to divert it (attention) in the same particular direction. Generally the media can alter both citizens and officials, perception about what is important (Cohen, 1963).

Now –a- days it is the age of mass communication and public opinion. Most of the time people form their opinion on the basis of images and perception they got from the mass media. It is because of the reason that today perception has become more important than realities and newspapers are busy to influence the perception and opinion of their readers through regular interaction.

Main focus of attention this study is on examining relationship between the policy of a newspaper and official policy of Pakistan on the issue of war on terror, therefore selected editorials of the newspaper will be taken as unit of analysis. Many studies have been conducted world over, to examine the nature of the press – government relationship on the important issues, therefore, it has become extremely important to examine the same relationship on the important issue i.e. war on terror, through editorial treatment. This study is important because the government of Pakistan took a crucial step by adapting the role of frontline state and the non NATO ally in the US led global war against terrorism. How did the press respond to Pakistan's official position on becoming coalition partner in the US led war on terror will be subject of great importance to the government of Pakistan, its policy makers, people and its (Pakistan) press.

Research Questions:

RQ1. How did Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) frame the

phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT)?

RQ2. How did Pakistan's mainstream Urdu newspaper; daily *Jang* frame the phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT)?

RQ3. How did Pakistan's mainstream Urdu newspaper; daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* frame the phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT)?

RQ4. How did Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) frame the official policy of their (Urdu press) host country (Pakistan) on the issue of War on Terror (WOT)?

RQ5. How did the mainstream Urdu newspaper (daily *Jang*) frame the official policy of Pakistan on the issue of War on Terror (WOT)?

RQ6. How did the mainstream Urdu newspaper (daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) frame the official policy of Pakistan on the issue of War on Terror (WOT)?

RQ7. What similarities (if any) were there in the editorial treatment of WOT by Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*)?

RQ8. What difference (if any) were there in the editorial treatment of WOT by Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*)?

RQ9. What kind of relationship existed between Pakistan and its mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) with reference to the former's official policy on WOT?

Why Editorial Treatment?

Generally speaking, newspapers are social institutions and also work as separate entities. Editorials of newspapers are considered to be the mouthpiece of newspaper which reflects its policy. Policy of any of the newspapers in Pakistan seldom exist in written form, however it can be learnt as well as understood by reading editorials of that newspaper for substantial period of time. According to Merrill (1968) editorial policy of a newspaper has to do with consistency in outlook and publishing practices. It is the course of a newspaper to follow. Newspapers must choose one or more than one issue for its editorial comments. After selection the issues are then treated by the newspapers in

their editorials columns in the light of their respective editorial policies.

Editorials of Pakistan's mainstream Urdu newspapers are taken seriously by the government and readers. Much of the information about the issues of national and international importance are received by the government and others departments through the study of the editorials of the newspapers. Editorials of these newspapers offer unique opportunity to examine the development of a policy issue. In these editorials opinions are explicit and formulated from the point of view of the newspapers or its editors and set the character of the newspaper. The editorials treat issues in a special way in order to contribute to the readers formation of opinion about the issues. In editorials the newspapers defend their opinions through a series of arguments which in turn have a strong bearing on opinion leaders and their (newspapers) serious and scholarly readers. Several researchers have also made extensive use of editorials in their studies.

The goal of this study is to examine the way the mainstream Urdu press treated the issue of war on terror, and the official policy of the government of Pakistan on the issue of war on terror in order to examine the nature of relationship i.e. the Urdu press and the government of Pakistan. It is therefore, important to examine the interplay between the official policy of the mainstream Urdu press i.e. the editorials and the official announced policy of Pakistan on the issue on war on terror.

Since editorial of a newspaper is considered to be the core of its opinion (Malekzadeh, 1984), this is why the present study is different from all those studies in which the researchers have concentrated entirely on news coverage. Editorials are places in the newspapers in which countries and issues are discussed quite inline with the beliefs and understanding of the editors and publishers in the best interest of the papers and the country. Editorials of the mainstream Urdu press have an authoritarian voice in Pakistan, but they have rarely been studied with respect to important issue like the war on terror (WOT). The present study, therefore, is also helpful to the government of Pakistan in order to

know how did an important segment of its national press (the mainstream Urdu press) go along with it on one of the most important issues of the time.

The time period investigated in this study consist of 12 years, three months and 20 days starting from Sep11, 2001, the editorials published during this period in the two mainstream Urdu newspapers of Pakistan (daily Jang and daily *nawa-i-waqt*) which are fully focused on the issue of war on terror are included in this study. This time period is significant in that it starts with terrorist attacks on the United States and subsequently, the later announcement to start a worldwide campaign, mostly military, to deal with growing threat of terrorism. Many of the countries of the world came under the banner of the United States to fight against the menace of terrorism. Pakistan occupied a significant position by adapting the status of non NATO ally and the frontline state in the war against terrorism. The period is important because military, semi military and democratic government remained there on the political scene of the country including the military rule of Musharaf and followed by Zardari and Nawaz Sharif respectively. Though all these political regimes were different from one another in many respects but no structural change seemed to have been exhibited in their policies with respect to Pakistan position on WOT.

For the sake of simplicity two major areas i.e. under press policy towards the issue of war on terror referred to as issue 'a' and the editorial position of the word press on the official policy of Pakistan on WOT, referred to as 'b' the study also helps in examining the nature of relationship between and the government of Pakistan on the issue of WOT.

Literature on War on Terror- a background:

The war on terror which is , sometimes also called Global war against terrorism, refers to gigantic global campaign, mostly military that started after the 9/11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States . United States succeeded in bringing other NATO and non NATO nations as part of the campaign. According to the United States, the purpose of the campaign was to

destroy Al-Qaida and other militant organizations. The then US president George W Bush had used the word war on terror for the first time on September 20, 2001. Since the Bush administration and the western media has been using the term for their global military, political, legal and conceptual efforts to eliminate terrorism from the world.

Since the world terrorism has a very old history and has been used by different people for different situations but the present study is focused on the war that started with the collapse of the twin towers of the World Trade Centre as a result of terrorist attack on US and the US declared a war against terrorism. On September 20, 2001, during a televised address to the joint session of the US Congress George W Bush stated that “our war on terror begins with al-Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated”

Pakistan's decision to join US led war against terrorism has caused serious threat to the very existence of the country (Pakistan) and its institutions. WOT caused severe damage to economy, political stability, social sector and social fabric of the country and has also posed serious threat to its security and integrity. The war has also affected the country's image abroad and its relations up to an extent that the risk of being termed as a failed state due to excessive incidents of terrorism. Nevertheless, the increasing realization and resolve of the political, civil and military leadership to combat this threat with the iron hands of harbingers of a strong action to eradicate the menace of terrorism. Pakistan adopted the counter-terrorism strategy to cope with the problem.

After the 9/11 attack, and when Pakistan entered in war against terrorism, the situation in Pakistan became more complicated. Pakistan's situation became bad to worse due to its strategic location, diverse cultures, weak religious orientation and a continued state of underdevelopment.

1.9 US objectives in the WOT

The authorization for use of military force against terrorist “AUMF” was made a law on

September 18, 2001, to authorize the use of United States armed forces against those responsible for the attacks of 9/11. It authorized the president to use all necessary and appropriate force against those, organizations, persons he determines planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorists' attacks that occurred on 9/11 or harbored such organizations or persons in order to prevent any future of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons. The then US president defined the following objectives in the war on terror.

1. Defeat terrorist such as Osama bin Laden, Abu Musab and al-Zarqawi and demolish their organizations.
2. Identify, locate and demolish terrorists along with their organizations.
3. Deny sponsorship, support and sanctuary to terrorists.
 - (i) End the state sponsorship of terrorism
 - (ii) Establish and maintain an international standard of accountability with regard to combating terrorism.
 - (iii) Strengthen and sustain the international efforts to combat terrorism.
 - (iv) Work with willing and able states.
 - (v) Persuade reluctant states.
 - (vi) Compete unwilling states.
 - (vii) Abolish terrorist sanctuaries and havens.
 - (viii) To become partner with the international community to strengthen weak states and prevent reemergence of terrorism.
 - (ix) Defend US citizens and interests at home and abroad.

Pakistan's official policy on War on Terror

All the governments in Pakistan since the attacks of 9/11 have remained committed to eliminate the menace of war on terror. Musharraf was the

main designer of Pakistan's post-9/11 foreign and internal policies as he was holding the positions of Chief of Army, head of the state, and head of the government at the time when the incident of 9/11 took place in 2011. He explained the position of Pakistan as a frontline state in the war against terrorism in these words” The tragedy of 9/11 transformed security policies and changed geopolitical calculations. Pakistan took a strategic decision, based on the principles of humanity and our national interest , to support the war on terror.... Pakistan will remain in the front... it is decisive moment in history. We must decide whether to flow with the currents that threaten confrontation and the collapse of our civilization, or muster the collective will to chart the course of history towards a peaceful and cooperative global society”.

Since 2001, Pakistan has been pursuing a policy of eliminating the extremist elements either by use of force or political dialogue. It has made peace deals with the militants and has also launched security operations against them. In 2008 alone, Pakistan arrested 4,113 militants and killed many others, launched 12 major military operations against the Taliban in its territory, killing over 3,000 and arresting more than 2,000 militants including Afghan Taliban.³ In the same year, 3,182 people were killed and another 2,267 injured in operations launched by Pakistani security forces.⁴ Pakistan's security forces have suffered 1,750 casualties⁵ in the course of the war on terror – twice the number of total casualties suffered by coalition forces of 41 nations in Afghanistan. But peace has not yet been restored in the country, particularly in the tribal region bordering Afghanistan and the NWFP. Deep rifts have always been present within the political, religious and even government circles on the issue of the war on terror and the government's policies in this regard. A severe skepticism on part of the people has also emerged parallel to these rifts. The official policy has neither brought peace nor evolved a consensus on the issue.

The political/religious leaders and the public have never been taken into confidence either on

Pakistan's Commitments and obligations in the anti-terror war. Resultantly, in an environment devoid of trust and consensus, ambiguity has constantly shrouded government initiatives for fighting terrorism and restoring peace in the country. One comes across a multitude of statements – by military chiefs, the diplomatic community, and political leaders – which are not only contradictory but also lack the commitment to resolve the issue. This gap has grown from the Musharraf era to the current PPP regime as Pakistan has traversed the trajectory of the war on terror. The only difference the PPP government has made is its effort to own the war on terror, perhaps to win support of the people who see the campaign as America's war. After repeated statements by President Asif Ali Zardari and Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani expressing commitment to the war on terror and to initiating a three-pronged strategy to win it, army chief General Kayani has also supported the wider matrix of the war on terror including political engagement, use of force and economic development. To quote Kayani:

The multi-prong approach, fully supported by the people of Pakistan will help us defeat the threat of internal terrorism... Military action alone cannot solve the problem. Political reconciliatory effort is required to go along with the military prong to win hearts and minds of the people... There are no quick fixes in this war.⁶ Reflecting on the Pak-US counter-terror equation, Kayani has repeatedly aired his apprehensions against the coalition forces' cross-border actions inside Pakistan's tribal regions:

Such reckless actions only help the militants and further fuel the militancy in the area. Pakistan Army has given huge sacrifices in this war and it is the presence of the army which has denied the freedom of movement and operation to Al Qaeda and the affiliates. Trust-deficit and misunderstandings can lead to more complications and increase the difficulties for all... To succeed, the coalition would be required to display strategic patience and help the other side the way they want it rather than adopting a unilateral approach which may be

counterproductive.⁷

To some extent, these statements also reflect the assessment of intellectuals, media persons, and Pakistani diaspora. However, what is lacking is how to nurture peace and stability in the long run. Unless issues in Afghanistan are settled, that is, the Pashtun majority is given representation, governance is improved and the Afghan economy revived, lasting peace in Pakistan cannot materialize. The way out is to iron out the perception gap between Kabul and Islamabad regarding the challenge terrorism poses. There has to be continued intensive bilateral cooperation, and an engagement based on mutual recognition that terrorism affects both countries. It is pointless to continue trading allegations against one another despite understanding the complexity of terrorism that threatens national cohesion in both Afghanistan and Pakistan. The need to have an integrated notion of peace within and beyond Pakistan was reiterated in the very first official statement of newly-elected president Asif Zardari:

Pakistan intends to work not only with Afghanistan but also for the entire region including other neighbouring countries. We look to the region and shall stand with neighbours. ... Pakistan and Afghanistan have been friends for a long time and they will stand with each other and not in the way of each other for the betterment of the peoples of the two countries. This is a message for not just Afghanistan but for all the neighboring countries.⁸

The need to understand and address the root causes of extremism is also highlighted in the official perspective. The strategy of using force is justified as means to restore the weakened writ of the government in the Tribal Areas.⁹ These areas have long been neglected in all aspects – including economic, social, educational, political and legal – of development and progress.

Despite official arguments in support of an integrated vision of peace at home and abroad, national consensus on the so-called war on terror and Pakistan's role in it has

not evolved. In this context, it would be beneficial to look at the two other broad clusters of discourse, the religious and political perspectives on peace and the war on terror.

Theoretical Framework

Framing theory lies on the borderline of three paradigms concerning media studies: cognitive, critical and constructivist (D'Angelo, 2002; Matthes, 2007). The framing describes how the complexity of issues that are difficult to understand can be reduced. This theory claims that news contains not only plain facts but also value frames that helps readers understand these facts. According to Entman (1993) the frame contains four fundamental components "problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation")

Entman (1993) states four locations where frames can be found i.e. "the communicator, the text, the receiver, and the culture". Framing must be perceived as a process in which frame building happens first, followed by frame setting, and this process has its consequences as well (de Vreese, 2005). Frame building takes place mainly in the interaction between journalists, elite, and social movements, and "the outcomes of the frame-building process are the frames manifest in the text. Frame-setting refers to the interaction between media frames and individual prior knowledge and predispositions" (de Vreese, 2005). In the framing process, many participants try to force their own perspective on the issue, so that it resonates with their needs (Trappota, 2006). However these participants have dissimilar capabilities to enforce their way of framing. Contemporary research deals with the minds intensively with the ability of media to set the frames in the mind of audience members and the consequences that such frame-setting brings interconnection of agenda setting and framing.

McComb and Shaw (1993) were the first to try connecting the theory of agenda setting and framing. They assumed that news carries information about an issue – this is how agenda-setting takes place. At the same time news emphasizes or conceals some attributes of the

issue-this is how farming of the issue takes place (McComb & Shaw, 1993). The efforts of McComb & Shaw is disapproved by Scheufele (2000) who claims that frame is a complex pattern and guideline for a casual interpretation which can be substituted only through offering an alternative complex pattern. Today, the effect described by McComb & Shaw is better indicated by the terms second level of agenda setting or attribute agenda setting (e.g. McCombs, 2004). Now McComb (2004) understands the frame according to Enman's definitions, but still insists the frame is an attribute of a respective issue. On the other hand, Lecheler, de Vreese, and Slothuus (2009) work with a different idea: they consider the 'issue importance' to be the moderator of the 'framing process'. They measure individual evaluation of the issue importance (i.e. personal agenda) before participants are exposed to the manipulated impulses – variously framed messages. Their results show that if an issue is important, it blocks the possible effect of framing, while if an issue is not very important even then a strong effect of the framing process can be observed. The evaluation of importance definitely does not lead to framing. The authors only declare that if we consider an issue to be not very important, we incline to change frame if there is an appropriate impulse from outside.

In the light of Scheufele's critique and subsequently the approach of Lecheler et al. (2009), it can be inferred that the framing process creates conditions for the agenda-setting process. I don't feel it fair to say that the framing process leads directly into the agenda-setting process. In agreement with Scheufele (2000), it can be claimed that these are cognitively different and parallel processes. At the same time, I believe that although the processes are separate, they interact whereby one creates conditions for the other. It can be presumed that if some frames establish themselves in public discourse, the agenda-setting of the given issue is more successful than if some other frames do. Different frames have a different ability to support the process of agenda-setting. This idea is in consensus with McCombs (2004) proposing that "certain ways of describing an

object may be more compelling than other ways in creating object salience among the public". Cobb and Elder (1983) emphasize the key role of a problem definition for a public support of an issue. A similar idea was given already by Wanta and Hu (1993), but they expressed too strong a hypothesis that frames determine the effect of agenda-setting.

To explain the relationship between framing and agenda-setting theoretically, one should apply theory of cognitive dissonance (Festinger 1957). If a person is exposed to frames that are not in compliance with his/her cognitive elements (knowledge, opinion, and reflection of own behavior), it causes a state of cognitive dissonance. The extent of cognitive dissonance is directly proportional to the number and importance of cognitive elements that are in contradiction with the frame. The pressure to reduce the present dissonance is then directly proportional to the extent of cognitive dissonance. A substantial way of reducing this pressure is drawing on new information or a confrontation with new opinions.

In other words, the frames in media messages could evoke a cognitive dissonance that motivate more intensive reception of information regarding the issue and intensified reception leads to setting the issue on the personal agenda. Iyengar and Kinder (1987) clarify the relationship between the intensity of information reception and importance of the issue by the memory-based model of information processing. The importance of an issue is connected with the easiness of recall and the amount of information we receive and store in our memory. The more information about issue we receive the easier we recall the issue and the more important the issue is for us.

6) We should make several remarks on use of cognitive dissonance theory. The origin of dissonance is usually connected with a behavior (Cooper, 2007). But Festinger (1954/1999) originally assumes that information could evoke cognitive dissonance. Festinger does not exclude other sources of dissonance than behavior, though his examples concern only a behavior as a source of dissonance. Also in later work, he further highlights idea the dissonance

evoked by behavior is only special case. Several empirical findings prove the cognitive elements could evoke cognitive dissonance as well (Dias, Oda, Akiba, Arruda, & Neuder, 2009; Donohew & Palmgreen, 1971).

The effect of one dissonant piece of news is incomparable with the effect of dissonant behavior. But a bigger sum of dissonant news could evoke cognitive dissonance, at least in weaker form. The plain facts in the news are not only the source of dissonance but also the frames of the news. Frames that invoke cognitive dissonance in audience members stimulate the attention given to an issue, since it is unimaginable to discuss the frame and not to mention the issue itself at the same time. Through coping with cognitive dissonance (i.e. drawing on new information), a person strengthens the memory traces to the framed issue. And doing so, s/he increases the chance to set the issue on the personal agenda (according to the memory-based model).

The theory distinguishes several typologies of frames and we will demonstrate how different types of frames should differ in the effect they have on the agenda-setting process. Iyengar (1991) defines thematic and episodic frames. Thematic frames provide a deeper insight into the context, emphasize general trends, and describe mainly the process. Therefore, they lead to attributing responsibility to society. Episodic frames focus on concrete events, and situations and they lead to attributing responsibility to individuals. We assume that episodic frames are more likely to invoke cognitive dissonance. Their more concrete and, hence, more seizable form is more likely to be in contradiction with individual's cognitive elements. It leads toward a more significant effect of episodic frames.

Frames can be also divided into issue-specific and generic. Issue-specific frames "are pertinent only to specific topics or events" (de Vreese, 2005, p. 54) while the generic ones are much more general. Generic frames "transcend thematic limitations and can be identified in relation to different topics, some even over time and in different cultural contexts" (de Vreese, 2005, p. 54). Five types of generic frames are

distinguished here as; conflict, human interest, economic consequences, morality, and responsibility (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). We anticipate a stronger effect of issue-specific frames because they focus the effect of invoked cognitive dissonance directly on the framed issue. Generic frames have the potential to focus attention on an issue different from the framed issue since they can be applicable to other such issues from the audience's point of view, due to their generic character.

The last typology is strategy and value frames. "A strategy frame organizes a policy conflict as a clash of political interests and competing strategies, typically highlighting political machinations of the contending parties, related to their objectives, strategies, and tactics" (Lee, McLeod, & Shah, 2008, p. 700). A value frame depicts policy conflict as a clash of moral principles or basic values where the parties enter the conflict on the basis of a different set of values. This type of frame is not very common, but when it occurs, it is "powerful and efficient in shaping audience reasoning processes, as values provide individuals with easily accessible heuristics that guide the understanding of complex policy issues without recourse to detailed information" (Lee, McLeod, & Shah, 2008, p. 701). It is presumed that the value frame ranks very high on the agenda of Pakistan's Urdu language newspapers. Disillusion invoked by strategy frames should lead to an impression that the framed issue is not significant for a common member of audience. Thus, disillusion reduces the weight of cognitive elements (frame, issue, and framed information) and dilutes the degree of cognitive dissonance. Therefore, strategy frames inhibit agenda-setting effect. In case of Pakistan a more substantial effect of value frames is anticipated because they emphasize moral principles and values which are always highly regarded in Pakistan.

Methodology

In this study, the methodology employed to examine the relationship between Pakistan and its mainstream Urdu press, specifically daily Jang and daily Nawa-i-Waqt, regarding the global war against terrorism (War on Terror or

WOT) is based on a comprehensive content analysis approach. The research focuses on two major areas: the response of the national mainstream Urdu press to the issue of WOT and the response of the press to the official policy of Pakistan on WOT. The research questions are designed to measure the phenomenon of press-government relationship through the editorial treatment of the WOT and Pakistan's official policy on WOT.

The universe of the study encompasses unsigned editorials related to WOT and published in daily *Jang* and daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* from September 11, 2001, to December 31, 2013. These editorials serve as the units of analysis for the content analysis. The information about WOT and the government of Pakistan's policy is obtained from the archives of the newspapers at the Main Library of the Islamia University, Bahawalpur, and the official website of the Foreign Office of Pakistan.

The study is divided into two broad topic areas: the response of the mainstream national Urdu press to the issue of WOT and the response to the official policy of Pakistan on WOT. Content analysis, a research technique developed before World War II, is adopted for this study. This

technique involves defining the universe of communication, selecting units of analysis (editorials), and coding their content based on predefined categories. Both quantitative and qualitative methods are employed in the content analysis to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the research problem.

The coding and reliability of the study involve two M.phil students who were assigned to read a sample of editorials, identify issues, evaluate directions, and ensure reliability through discussion. The content analysis includes quantitative measurement of the amount of coverage of WOT in the editorials and their direction, measured on a three-point scale (supportive, opposite, neutral). Qualitative analysis is conducted to interpret the latent meanings and frames within the editorials, using an approach that involves preliminary reading, cultural context analysis, and the development of frames based on themes and ideologies. The combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods aims to provide a thorough understanding of the relationship between Pakistan and its mainstream Urdu press on the issue of WOT.

Results

Table 1. Topical Editorial Coverage Of The Issue Of ‘War On Terror’ (Wot) By The Pakistan’s Mainstream Urdu Press (Daily Jang, Daily Nawa-I-Waqt)

Newspaper’s name	Frequency of editorials on ‘War on Terror’ in the main stream Urdu Press	Percentage
Daily <i>Jang</i>	754	45.56%
Daily <i>Nawa-i-Waqt</i>	901	54.44%
Total	1655	100%

A total of 1655 editorials were published on “War on Terror” (WOT) by Pakistan’s mainstream Urdu press from Sept. 11, 2001 till Dec. 31, 2013. The table shows that daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* devoted more editorials i.e. 901 (54.44 %) to the phenomenon of WOT than its counterpart daily *Jang* which published 754 (45.56 %) editorials on the subject. Daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* has shown greater interest in WOT by

publishing more editorials as compared to daily *Jang*.

Table No.1 shows enthusiasm of Pakistan’s mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-waqt*) in coverage of the issue of WOT during the study period comprising on 12 years 3 months and 20 days. The mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) published 1655

editorials collectively on the phenomenon of WOT during the study period. It shows that daily *Nawa-i-waqt* took more interest in the issue as compare to its counterpart daily *Jang* because the former had published higher number of

editorials i.e. 901(54.44 %) as compared to daily *Jang* which had published 754 editorials (45.56 %) on the phenomenon of WOT during the same study period from Sept.11, 2001 to Dec.31, 2013.

Table No.2: Editorial Portrayal of the phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT) by Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Naw-i-Waqt*) during the study period.

Newspaper's name	Supportive (+ve)	Critical (-ve)	Neutral (0)	Total
Daily Jang	8(16%)	39(78%)	3(6%)	50(100%)
Daily Nawa-i-Waqt	0(0%)	50(50%)	0(0%)	50(100%)
Total	8(8%)	89(89%)	3(3%)	100(100%)

The table shows that Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Nawa-i-waqt* remained highly critical to the phenomenon of WOT by Publishing 89 (89 %) editorials against it during the study period from Sept.11, 2001 to Dec.31st ,20013. The table also indicates that the mainstream Urdu press exhibited eight percent support to the phenomenon of war on terror by writing 8 editorials friendly to it whereas it (mainstream Urdu press of Pakistan) showed three percent neutrality to the phenomenon by publishing three editorials neutral to the phenomenon.

Table No. 2 shows the collective direction of the national mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) on the issue of War on Terror (WOT). Overall the mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) showed a critical attitude by publishing 89 (89%) editorials against the issue of WOT. The mainstream Urdu press, however, gave 8 % support by writing 8 editorials in support of Phenomenon of WOT. Overall the mainstream Urdu press remained only 3% neutral by devoting only three editorials to the issue.

Table No.5: Editorial Portrayal of Pakistan's official policy on the phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT) by its (Pakistan's) national mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Naw-i-Waqt*) during the study period.

Newspaper's name	Supportive (+ve)	Critical (-ve)	Neutral (0)	Total
Daily Jang	22(44%)	24(48%)	4(8%)	50(100%)
Daily Nawa-i-Waqt	10(20%)	39(78%)	1(2%)	50(100%)
Total	32(32%)	63(63%)	5(5%)	100(100%)

The above table shows that Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) remained highly critical to the country's official policy on the phenomenon of

WOT by devoting 63 (63%) editorials against it during the study period from Sept.11, 2001 to Dec.31st , 20013. The mainstream Urdu press also showed 32 % percent support by devoting

32 editorials in favor of the official stance taken by the government of Pakistan on the phenomenon of WOT. The press remained only 5% neutral by contributing five editorials neutral to the phenomenon.

Research Questions Findings

Question No.1. How did Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily Jang , daily Nawa-i-Waqt) frame the phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT)?

Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press while framing the phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT) in their editorials exhibited an enthusiastic opposition to it. Quantitatively, the press published 89 % editorials against it (See Table No. 2). This opposition, however, was observed to be more serious and, sometimes, harsh in tone and language in the qualitative framing of the phenomenon. Both of the mainstream Urdu newspapers (daily Jang, daily Nawa-i-Waqt) took strong negative stances against the very concept of US- initiated war on terror. Though both of the mainstream Urdu national dailies remained strongly critical to the very concept of WOT but their degree of opposition and tones varied in intensity. Qualitative and quantitative analysis of data in this study showed a very feeble correspondence between the ideology of the national mainstream Urdu press and ideology of the War on Terror (WOT).

Question No.2. How did Pakistan's mainstream Urdu paper (daily Jang) frame the phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT)?

Framing the phenomenon of WOT, daily Jang took a strong critical editorial stance on the issue by publishing 78 % editorials critical to the War on terror (See Table No. 3). Qualitative analysis of the study support the critical stance of the paper through the use of language and by adopting a sharp critical tone against the phenomenon of WOT.

Question No.3. How did Pakistan's mainstream Urdu paper (daily Nawa-i-Waqt) frame the phenomenon of War on Terror (WOT)?

Daily Nawa-i-Waqt, while framing the phenomenon of War on Terror in its editorials,

quantitatively took a very strong critical stance by contributing 100 % of its editorials opposite to it (phenomenon of WOT) (see Table No. 4). Qualitative analysis of the data also indicated that a strong as well as a sharp element of reaction towards the phenomenon of WOT persistently dominated the contents of its editorials. The paper was also consistent in its serious critical stance against the phenomenon of WOT.

Question No.4. How did Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily Jang , daily Nawa-i-Waqt) frame the official policy of their host country (Pakistan) on the issue of War on Terror (WOT)?

Overall Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily Jang , daily Nawa-i-Waqt) took a critical stance towards the official policy of their host country (Pakistan) on War on Terror (WOT). Quantitative study of the data shows that the mainstream Urdu press took 63 % editorial stance which was critical to the official policy of Pakistan on WOT(see Table No 5). The Urdu press also gave 32 % editorial support by contributing 32 editorials in support of the official policy of Pakistan on War on Terror. Quantitative analysis of the data showed that both the papers took varying editorial stances on the official policy of Pakistan towards the issue (WOT).

Question No.5. How did the mainstream Urdu paper (daily Jang) frame the official policy of Pakistan on the issue of War on Terror (WOT)?

Framing Pakistan's official policy on War on Terror the mainstream Urdu newspaper daily Jang exhibited a mixed reaction in its editorials towards it (Pakistan's official policy on WOT). In quantitative terms daily Jang showed 48% critical response to the official policy on WOT and 44 % supportive response to the official policy on WOT (see table NO. 6). Qualitative analysis of the data showed that a strong correspondence existed in the supportive and opposite approaches in the editorials towards the government policy on WOT,

Question No.6. How did the mainstream Urdu paper (daily Nawa-i-Waqt) frame the official

policy of Pakistan on the issue of War on Terror (WOT)?

Framing the official policy of Pakistan on the issue of War on Terror the daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* took a highly critical stance on it (government policy on WOT). The paper devoted 78 % of its editorials against the official policy of Pakistan on WOT (see Table No. 7). The paper, however, wrote 20 % of its editorials in support of the government policy on WOT.

Qualitative analysis of the data indicates that daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* adopted a harsh language and serious tone to ridicule the official policy of Pakistan on the issue. Distinctive feature of the daily while framing the official policy on WOT was consistency observed by it (*Nawa-i-Waqt*) throughout the years under study.

Question No.7. What similarities (if any) were there in the editorial treatment of WOT by Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*)?

A degree of similarity was noted in the topical coverage and the editorial treatment of the phenomenon of War on Terror between daily *Jang* and daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*. Both of the papers gave high topical coverage i.e. *Nawa-i-Waqt* had published 901(54.44 %) editorials and *Jang* published 754 (45.56 %) editorials, to the issue during the study period. Both of the dailies took critical editorial stances while treating the phenomenon of WOT (see Table No.3 and Table No.4). Both the papers showed strong reservations about the sincerity of the United States as a leading power to wage and to carry out global war against terrorism. The papers also declared the war as a “ crusade against innocent Muslims” and also a plea “ to capture resources” of the weaker nations.

Question No.8. What difference (if any) were there in the editorial treatment of WOT by Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang*, daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*)?

Though both the papers of Pakistan's mainstream Urdu press (*Jang* , *Nawa-i-Waqt*) took critical stances in their editorial framing of the War on Terror but with a varying degree of opposition. Daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* showed a very

strong opposition to WOT by out rightly rejecting the very idea of it. Another distinctive feature of the *Nawa-i-Waqt* was its persistent critical stance to the American and western concepts of the War on Terrorism. Anti US stance taken by the paper in the context of War on Terror was yet another unique feature of the daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* which made it distinct from its contemporary (daily *Jang*).

Though daily *Jang* also acknowledged some of the dimensions pointed out by the ‘world community’ for the justification of the WOT and gave 16 % editorial support to it but its contemporary (daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) remained totally indifferent to all possible interpretations given by the US-led coalition states for the justification of the war. It may be due to this reason that the *Nawa-i-Waqt* did not contribute a single editorial in support of the WOT or neutral to it.

Daily *Jang* also showed some flexibility in its editorial framing of the WOT and contributed some (6 %) of its editorials which were neither in support of nor against the phenomenon of terrorism. Neutral editorial stance of daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* toward the WOT was nil i.e. zero per cent.

Question No.9. What kind of relationship existed between Pakistan and its mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) with reference to the former's official policy on WOT?

Overall the national mainstream Urdu press (daily *Jang* , daily *Nawa-i-Waqt*) framing the official policy of Pakistan on WOT remained twice (63 %) as critical to its host country (Pakistan) as compared to its 32 % supportive (friendly) treatment to the situation. The Urdu press also remained neutral but only for 5 % in its editorial framing of the official policy of Pakistan on the issue of War on terror.

Conclusion

Pakistan is an Islamic state that came into being in 1947 on the basis of Muslim ideology. Constitution of Pakistan provides that it (Pakistan) is Islamic Democratic Republic but history bears testimony to the fact that it

remained under a military rule for more than half of its life. Democratic culture could not properly flourish in Pakistan like a truly democratic country of the world. Though Pakistan enjoys having one of the largest press systems of the world but, at the same time, it (press system) is confronted with many challenges; strain in its relationship with the government being one of them. Press-government relationship in any part of the world is not only a delicate phenomenon but it is also volatile because it changes from time to time and on subject to subject. As political landscape of Pakistan is more or less a mix of authoritarian and democratic rules, therefore, the performance of Urdu Press in the context of press-government relationship on the issue of 'War on Terror' in it (Pakistan) is also reflective of its (press) independent ideological leaning and interactive relationship with the government i.e. sometimes adversarial/critical and sometimes advocative/supportive. The performance of the national mainstream Urdu Press, as examined in this study, seems to be shaped more by the socio-political environment of the country as well as by strong ideological commitment of the press to the state than to the governments of Pakistan. The government of Pakistan may not be solely responsible for the particular shade observable in the course of editorial treatment of the phenomenon of 'War on Terror' (WOT) by the Urdu Press.

In this study, on the whole the mainstream Urdu Press of Pakistan showed a highly critical stance on the very concept of 'War on Terror' (WOT) and more critical than supportive stances on the official policy of its base country (Pakistan) on the issue, therefore, it (study) is different on many counts from all those studies carried out in 1960s and 1970s in support of advocative model (e.g., Kriesburg, 1964; Liu, 1969; and Mills, 1969). In pre 1970 era the cold war ideology and anti-communist feelings not only prevailed but also ranked high on the political scenes of many countries specially in the non-communist world, therefore, in all these studies the thinking of scientists were guided more by 'advocative' model than the 'adversarial' one. As the war against terrorism was a gigantic war but its objectives were not crystal clear to many of the

countries fighting it. Pakistan was made to join this war on strong insistence from the United States. It could be a sufficient cause for Pakistan's Urdu press not to acknowledge it. The press went against terrorism and never acknowledged it but it showed strong reluctance to approve the way it was carried out under the US leadership. Uniqueness in the coverage given to it by daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* is indicative of the fact that it did not accept the very concept of WOT for a single day despite the fact that fighting against it (WOT) had become a joint venture of many a world states under the US patronage.

While dealing with the Pakistan's official policy on WOT in their editorial treatments of this study, the mainstream Urdu press gave a mixed response to it by supporting some of the features of the phenomenon at one time and disapproving some other features. Thus this study partly support studies carried out by (Becker, 1977; Ramaprasad, 1983; Brown, 1980; and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 1983) which says that the press does not necessarily support their respective government policies.

Pakistan's Urdu press is not only making the biggest part of its whole press system but also enjoy greater freedom. This study supports Shoemaker et al view of the ideology of media organization according to which media contents reflect the ideology of the financiers. In Pakistan media organizations do not keep their policies in written form but the organizations usually observe them in their editorial contents. The news organizations are usually found to follow the traditional approach in toeing their policy outlines in a persistent way on important issues. The journalists learn it (organizational policy) by experience and observation and, after learning it, they put down the contents according to the learnt policy and probably according to the hidden will of the organizations' owners. The overall direction of the contents of the editorials shows that the mainstream Urdu press has specific view on the issue of terrorism and Pakistan's policy on this important issue may be in the larger interest of the state. Seen in this perspective, the two most prominent members of the mainstream Urdu press i.e. daily *Jang* and

daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* adopted different ideological positions on the issues; terrorism, and, on Pakistan's official policy on terrorism.

In-depth analysis of the study further reveals that the Urdu press, in general, took a critical stance against the very concept of terrorism and also against the war being fought against it globally or inside Pakistan but this adversarial position always remained marginal as the study of Herman and Chomsky (1988) says. According to this study the media opposition was not structurally against the system and the spirit of pluralistic ideology of the country. Herman and Chomsky's study suggest that in pluralist systems mass media are encouraged to carry out debates, criticisms, and dissent as long as these remain faithful to the system or when they are not contrary to the system.

The study can be summarized that Pakistan's mainstream Urdu Press in their editorial treatment of the phenomenon of 'war on terror' and 'Pakistan's official policy on it' exercised freedom to an extent when it was tolerable to the powers that be i.e. to the powers holding political control of the country and its co-partners (sponsors) in fighting the War on Terror. At times a substantial agreement was also found between the press and the government on the issues. Both the papers remained firm and consistent in their (critical) editorial positions on the issue of WOT and Pakistan's position on WOT.

Media-government relationship is a complex process and is characterized by an interplay between the dominant forces (political powers) and the resistance forces (mass media) on the issues of national interest. The relationship cannot be termed as a "monolithic" one. None of the theoretical models seems to be totally fit to describe press-government relationship. Due to the complex nature of relationship between media and their respective government (Pakistan) by virtue of differences in their outlooks about day to day issues, the situation cannot be generalized on the basis of the present study. Generalization of this study is also impossible to be done on the basis of findings of the present research which studied only the mainstream Urdu press of Pakistan. Therefore,

there is need to develop a "broader model" which is more flexible to explain the complex phenomenon of relationships between the press and their respective governments.

References

- Ahmad, I. (2011). "*Pakistan Role in the War on terror*". Paper presented at conference on A F Pak: Ten years since operation Enduring Freedom, Organized by Asia Pacific Foundation George C Marshal Center for European security, London, 5 October 2011 Retrieved on 25 February 2012 From ishtiaqahmad.com/item-display-papers.aspx
- Altschull, J.H. (1984). *Agents of power, the role of the news media in Human affairs*. New York: Longman.
- Anderson, R. (1988). *Vision of Instability: US law and order news of El Salvador, Media, Culture and Society*, 10:239-264.
- Ashraf, J. M. (2008). *Is the US-Pakistan Alliance Against: Terrorism Coming to an end*, in Shahid, M. I (Edt). *Advanced Contemporary Affairs Book Fifty Seven*. Lahore: Advance AP Publishers.
- Atkin, Charles. (1981). *Communication and Political Socialization*. In Dan D. Nimo and Keith.
- Becker, Lee B. (1977). *Foreign policy and press performance, Journalism Quarterly*, 54:364-368.
- Berelson, Bernard. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: America Book.
- Berkovitz, Dan. (1990). *Melding the quantitative and qualitative in newsroom research*. (Unpublished paper presented at Annual Convention of the AEJMC, August, 1990, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Berry, Nicholas O. (1990). *Foreign policy and the press: An analysis of the New York Times' coverage of US policy*. New York/London: Green Wood Press.
- Brown, Les. (March 1980). *White house sought to bar '60 Minut' segment*. *The New York*

- Times*, p A 11.
- Buclay, M., & Fawn, R. (2003). *Global Responses to Terrorism: (/11, Afghanistan and Beyond*. New York: London Press.
- Cassidy, R. M. (2006). *Counter Insurgency and the Global War on Terror. Military Culture and Irregular war*. ISBN 0-275-98990-0. United States of America
- Chadwick, B., Bahr, H., and Albrecht, S. (1984). *Social science research methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chomsky, N. (1980). Rules and representations. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 3(01), 1-15.
- Chossudovsky, M. (2008). *Pakistan and the Global War on Terrorism*. Global Research. Ca, Center for Research on Globalization website Retrieved from www.globalresearch.ca/index.php
- Cindy C. Combs. (2003). *Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Cindy, C. C., Combs, C. C. (2003). *Terrorism in the 21st century*. (3rd edition). New Jersey: Parsons Educ. Inc.
- Cirino, Robert. (1971). *Don't blame the people*. Los Angeles: Diversity Press.
- Cobb, R. W. (1983). *Participation in American politics: The dynamics of agenda-building*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cohen, Bernard C. (1963). *The Press and Foreign Policy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cohen, S. (1981). Modes and Rockers: The inventory as manufactured news. In S.Cohen & J. Young (eds). *The manufacture of news: Deviance, social problems and the mass media* (pp. 263-279). Beverly Hills. CA: Sage.
- Cohen, S. p. (2011). *The Future of Pakistan*. Washington, Dc. Harrisonburg, Virginia.
- Cohen, S. p. (2011). *The Future of Pakistan*. Washington, Dc. Harrisonburg, Virginia.
- Communication and News Diplomacy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Cooper, C. (2007). An industry partnerships approach to tourism education. *Journal of hospitality, leisure, sport & tourism education*, 6(1), 66-70.
- Creating Communication: Content, Control, Critique, San Francisco, CA.
- D'Angelo, P. (2002). News framing as a multi-paradigmatic research program: A response to Entman. (1993) *Journal of Communication*, 52, 870–888.
- de Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal + Document Design*, 13, 48–59.
- Dearing, J. W., & Rogers, E. M. (1996). *Agenda-setting*. London, England: Sage.
- Donohew, L., & Palmgreen, P. (1971). A reappraisal of dissonance and the selective exposure hypothesis. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 48(3), 412-437.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of*
- Fair, C.C., Crane, K., Chivis, C. S., Puri, S., spirits, M. (2010). *Pakistan: Can the United States Secure and insecure State? Project Air Force*. USA: Rand Corporation
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human relations*, 7(2), 117-140.
- Feyyaz, M. (n.d). *The Global War on Terrorism in South Asia in Mehmod, Dr, S. (Edt). Current Affair Digest*. Lahore: A.H. Publishers.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1979). *Deciding what is news?: A study of CBS evening news, NCB nightly news, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Vitage Books
- Gardner, H. (2007). *The War on Terrorism*:

- Antonio Rowe Ltd, Chappenhem, Wiltshire.
- George, Alexander, L. (1959). Quantitative and qualitative approaches to content analysis (pp. 7-32). In Ithiel de Sola ed., Trends in content analysis, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the New left*. Berkley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Giustozzi, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Decoding the New Taliban, Insight from the Afghan Field*. New York: Colombia University Press.
- Giustozzi, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Decoding the New Taliban, Insight from the Afghan Field*. New York: Colombia University Press.
- Gramsci, A.(1971). *Selection from the prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.
- Guilford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gupta, K. (2002). Characterization of pore structure of filtration media. *Fluid/Particle Separation Journal*, 14(3), 227-241.
- Habeck, M. (2006). Knowing the Enemy, Jihadist Ideology and the War on Terror. New Haven: Yale university of Press.
- Hall, Stuart, (1975) Introduction in A. C. H. Smith et al eds., Paper Voices: The Popular Press and Social Change, 1935-1965.
- Hallin, D.C (1986a). *The Uncensored War: The media and Vietnam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harwood, Richard (1974) Lessons from the Pentagon Papers and the War Reporters' "Missio", of the press by the press, and for the press. Wshington: Washington Post.
- Hasnat, S. F. (2011). *Global Security Watch Pakistan*. United States of America
- Helmes, S. (2005). Al-Qaida, 11 September 2001, in making sense of Suicide Missions. Oxford: Oxford University of press.
- Herman, Edward S. and Chomsky, Noam C1988), *Manufacturing Consent*. New York :Pantheon Books.
- Hibert, R. E., Reuss, C. (1988). *Impact of Mass Media, current issue*, 2nd edition. New York & London: Longman.
- Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (Original work published 1974).
- Hirsh, p. (1977). Occupational, Organizational and Institutional Models in Mass Media Research: Toward an integrated framework in P. M. Hirsch, P, V. Miller., & F, G. Kline (Eds.), *Strategies For Communication Research*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 13-40
- Holmes, Deborah. (1986). *Governing the press*. Colorado: Wetview.
- Hussain, Z. (2007). Front line Pakistan. The Struggle with Militant Islam. New York: Columbia University Press
- Hussain, Z. (2010). The Relentless Rise of Islamic Militants in Pakistan, and How it Threatens America, the Scorpion's Tail. New York: FB Press
- Hussein, I. S. (2003). *Terrorism in Action: Why Blame Islam*, ISBN: 969-8373-02-0. London: Bonn
- Hussein, T. (2009).). US-Pakistan Engagement, The War on terrorism and Beyond, *United States Institute of Peace Special Report*. Washington DC 20036.
- Ilahi, N. (2010). *The External Threat: Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) and Al-Qaida in*
- Ilahi, N. (2010). *The External Threat: Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) and Al-Qaida in Pakistan?* In Butt, U. (Ed.). Pakistan's Quagmire, security, Strategy, and the Future of the Islamic Nuclear nation. United State: Sheridan Books, Inc in the marketplace of ideas. *Journal of Communication*, 43(2), 58-65.
- Ihtasham, Ali. (2022). Framing of Counter-

- Terrorism Activities in the Leading Pakistani English and Urdu Newspapers: Post Army Public School Peshawar Attack (2014-2019). *Journal of development and social sciences*, doi: 10.47205/jdss.2022(3-iii)27
- Iyengar, S. (2008). A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication. *Journal of Communication*, 58(4), 707-731.
- Iyengar, S. and Donald R. Kinder. 1987. *News That Matters*.
- Jafferlot, C. (Ed.). (2002). *Pakistan nationalism without a Nation*. New York: Hardson Publishers.
- Jenson, K. Bruhn. (1991). "Introduction: The qualitative turn" in K. B. Jensen and N. W. Jankowski. (eds) *A handbook of qualitative methodologies for mass communication research*: London, New York. Routledge. *Journalism Quarterly*, 41, 430-432.
- Keelty, M. (2007). Counter-terrorism and capacity building.
- Key, V.O. (1967). *Public opinion and American diplomacy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Koshy, N. (2003). *The War on Terror: Reordering the World*: Leftward books
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Beverly Hills. Kasim, Sharif., Qasim, Mahmood., Attia, Zulfiqar. (2023). Print media agenda for the government stance on composite dialogue with india. *Pakistan journal of social research*, doi: 10.52567/pjsr.v5i01.1030 CA: Sage.
- Lansford, T., Watson, R. P., Covarrubian, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Americas War on Terror*. (2nd edition). London: MPG Book Group UK.
- Larson, James F. (1990). Quiet diplomacy in a television era: The media and US policy toward the republic of Korea, *Political Communication and persuasion*, 7(2):73-96
- Lecheler, S., de Vreese, C., & Slothuus, R. (2009). Issue importance as a moderator of framing effects. *Communication Research*, 36(3), 400-425.
- Lee, N. J., McLeod, D. M., & Shah, D. V. (2008). Framing Policy Debates Issue Dualism, Journalistic Frames, and Opinions on Controversial Policy Issues. *Communication Research*, 35(5), 695-718.
- Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. Transaction Publishers.
- Lynch, Marvin D. & Effendi, Atiya, (1964) Editorial treatment of India in *The New York Times*
- Mahmood, Dr. S. (Ed.). (2011). Pakistan after 9/11 in Mahmood, Dr. S. *Current Affair Digest*. Lahore: A. H. Publishers.
- Maning, R. (1968). International News Media in Arthur S. Hoffman (ed) *International*
- Marger, Marin. (1981). *Elites and masses*. New York: D. Vanostrand.
- Matthes, J. (2007, May). Looking back while moving forward. Paper presented at conference
- McCombs, M. (2004). A look at agenda-setting: Past, present and future. *Journalism studies*, 6(4), 543-557.
- McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. (1993). The evolution of agenda-setting research: Twenty-five years
- McLeod, J. M., Becker, L. B., & Byrnes, J. E. (1991). Another look at the agenda-setting.
- McQuail, D. (1987). *Mass Communication theory: an Introduction*. 2nd edition, London: Sage Publication.
- McQuail, D. (1987). *Mass Communication theory: an Introduction*. 2nd edition, London: Sage Publication.
- Michael, Ryan. (2004). Framing the War Against Terrorism US Newspaper Editorials and Military Action in Afghanistan. *International*

- Communication Gazette, 66(5):363-382.
doi: 10.1177/0016549204045918
- Merrill, J. C., Bryan, C. R., Alisky, M. (1970). *The Foreign Press: A Survey of the World's Journalism*.
- Merrill, John C. 1968. *The elite press: great newspapers of the world*. New York: Pitman
- Merrill, John C. and Harold A. Fisher, 1980. *The world's great dailies: profile of fifty newspapers*. New York: Hastings House.
- Mockaitis, T. R., Rick, p. B. (2003). *Grand Strategy in the War against Terrorism*: London Press. Bergen, P.L. (2011). *The Enduring Conflict between America and Al-Qaida*. New York: Ny10020.
- Mughees-uddin. (1993). *Elite Press Editorial Framing of US Foreign Policy: The Case of Pakistan and the New York Times, the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times (1980-1992)* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa).
- Nimmo, Dan and James, E.C. (1980) *Subliminal politics: Myths and Myth-makers in America*. Eaglewood Cliffs, New Jersey :Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Pakistan?* In Butt, U. (Ed.). *Pakistan's Quagmire, security, Strategy, and the Future of the Islamic Nuclear nation*. United State: Sheridan Books, Inc
- Pande, A. (2011). *Explaining Pakistan's foreign policy, Escaping India*. US & Canada: Rutledge Fair, C.C., Crane, K., Chivis, C. S., Puri, S., spirits, M. (2010). *Pakistan: Can the United States Secure and insecure State? Project Air Force*. USA: Rand Corporation.
- Pande, A. (2011). *Explaining Pakistan's foreign policy, Escaping India*. US & Canada: Rutledge *Washington Quarterly* 34(1): 149-162.
- Pape, R. A. (2005). *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*. New York: Random Home.
- Parenti, Michael. (1986). *Inventing reality*. St. Martin Press: New York. P.189.
- Pauly, John J. (February, 1991). *A beginner's guide to doing qualitative research in mass communication*, Journalism Monographs. No. 125. Columbia: AEJMC Publication.
- Ramaparsad, Joytika. (1984). *Foreign policy & press coverage: A study of The NYT' coverage Of India from 1973-1980*. Southern University of Illinois, Carbondale.
- Rehman, A. (2011). *The Nature of Pak-US relations in Hameed, T. (Edt). Current Affairs Digest, Book 205, September 2011, Lahore*
- Rice, Micheal and Coony, James A. (eds), (1982): *Reporting US European relations*: NY, Oxford: Peramon Press.
- Robinson. (1989). *International Encyclopedia of communication*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rogers, E. M., Dearing, J. W., & Bregman, D. (1993). *The anatomy of agenda-setting research*. *Journal of communication*, 43(2), 68-84.
- Rosenfeld, Stephen S. (1990). *In the Gulf: The Wars of the press (pp.241-355)*. In Serfaty (1990), Ed. *The Media and foreign policy*. New York and London: Macmillan.
- Rothstein, H., Arqulla, J. (2012). *Strategy and Policy Choices for American Long War, Afghan Endgames*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. Ed
- Roy, O. (2004). *Globalized Islam: The Search for a new Ummah*. New York: Columbia. University Press.
- Ruchman, p. (Ed.). (2005). *The War On Terror*: New York press
- Sanders, eds. *Hand Book of Political Communication*. Beverly Hill: Sage. p.299-328.
- Safwan, Ali (2022). *News Reporting of Pakistan and the War on Terror*. doi: 10.4324/9781003174790-33.

- Scheffele, D.A.(2001). Agenda Setting, Priming, and Framing revisited: and other look at Cognitive effects of political communication. *Communication abstract*,24(1).
- Scheffele, D. A. (2000). Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at Cognitive effects of political communication. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3, 297–316
- Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European Politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2), 93-109
- Shoemaker, Pamela & Rees .S.D. (1995). *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influence on Mass Media Content*. New York: Longman Publishers.
- Sibert, W. O. et al (1999). *U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900*. Washington, DC: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.
- Siddiq, A. (2011). Pakistan Counter Terrorism Strategy: Separating Friends from enemies. *The Washington Quarterly* 34(1): 149-162.
- Siddiq, A. (2011). Pakistan Counter Terrorism Strategy: Separating Friends from enemies. *The*
- Stone, P. J., Dunphy, D. C., Smith, M. S., and Ogilvie, D. M. (1966) *The General Inquirer: A Computer Approach to Content Analysis*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Szykowny, R. (1990, November/December). The humanist interview: Bewildering the herd, *The Humanist*. pp.8-17
- Tankard, James W. & Hendrickson, Siberman, Jackie, Kris Bliss & Salma Ghanem. (1991). *Media; Approaches to conceptualization & measurement*. (Unpublished paper presented at association for Education in Journalism & Mass Communication convention, Boston, Massachusetts in August, 1991).
- Tellis, A. J. (2008). *Pakistan and the War on Terror: Conflicted Goals, Compromised Performance*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace website www.carnegieendowment.org/files/telis_pakistan.final
- Trampota, T. (2006). *Zpravodajství*. Portál.
- Wade, M., & Malijevec, A. (Eds.). (2010). *A War on Terror, the European Stance on a New Threat, Changing laws and Human Rights Implications*. New York: Springer New
- Wanta, W., & Hu, Y. W. (1993). The agenda-setting effects of international news coverage: An examination of differing news frames. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 5(3), 250-264.
- Weber, Robert Philip (1990). *Basic Content Analysis*: California: Sage.
- Wimmer, Roger, D and Dominick Joseph R. (1991). *Mass Media Research: An introduction*: California. Wadsworth.
- Zadidi, Nayar. (1992, June) Islam, Muslim and the US media. *The Message International*. New York: ICNA Publications.
- Zeb, R. (2002). War Against Terror: Lessons for Pakistan in Hameed, A. (Edt). *Current Affair Digest, Book 97*, September 2002. Lahore.
- Zafar, Ali. (2013). Counter terrorism activities in pakistan: comparative study of the editorials of elite newspapers. 29(02).
- Zaeem, Yasin., Farah, Saleem, Qureshi., Menahil, Farrukh. (2022). Framing of pakistani media regarding afghan taliban: before and after their takeover. *Pakistan journal of social research*, doi: 10.52567/pjsr.v4i03.714