

POLICY OF MEDIA OWNERS/ORGANISATIONS AND GOVERNMENTSTOWARDS JOURNALISTS IN PAKISTAN

Bashir Memon

Abstract

This paper presents findings and insights about the relationship between media owners and the governments and their attitude and policy towards journalists and the profession of journalism or news media in Pakistan. It is based upon the primary data which was collected through conducting six focus group discussions in various districts of Sindh province. The paper is an answer to the assumptions that the news media and the personal welfare of the journalists are neglected in Pakistan on the part of media organizations and the governments. Rather both media owners and the politicians prefer to serve each other's vested interests like profit-maximizing and publicity. In this way some of the key findings surfaced that first, the non-implementation of the wage board award for journalists is a classic example of the unison of media organization owners and the government or politicians. Second, the various means to deter the news workers to work freely include threats, arrests, torture, job insecurity and feudal influence, particularly in rural areas.

Keywords: *Policy, Media owners, Government, Journalists, Pakistan*

Introduction

This paper is an inquiry that first, what is the nature of relationship between the media owners/organizations and governments/state in Pakistan; then what, both the media organizations/owners and the government/state, policy or attitude is adopted by them towards journalists in Pakistan. In this way this study provided

insights into the plight of rank and file journalists. And to check that do government and media organizations/owners pay role to the personal welfare and professional development of individual journalists.

The ownership of media organizations itself and the nature of relationship between media organizations or owners and the state or governments anywhere in the world may matter and raise many questions in various respects to the public. Like, if there is a press subsidy system or state support for media, then what could be its probable effects upon the role of media? In other words, does government subsidy or state support for media have any damaging or beneficial impact particularly upon the objectivity characteristic of journalism and mass media? On the other hand, the clash between journalism as an ideology and media organizations' ownership, replete with the commercial interest, is also evident in the related research studies. Particularly due to the commercial interest of the media owners there creates a situation between governments and the media owners to be sided with each other, specifically in those countries where the government has control upon the flow of advertisement. However, against this backdrop positive publicity in the media is oxygen for the politicians/government policies to image building among the people. Hence, such nature of the relationship between media organizations/owners and governments/ states undoubtedly have an impact upon the personal and professional development of the individual journalists, and their working conditions and life.

Previous Literature

In the context of previous related literature first Hardt (2005) is deduced that journalists represent the intellectual workforce or unquestionably are brain workers; however they are depending upon their employing organizations which are almost industrial type and those determine the working and living conditions of journalists (See Hardt, 2005). While the control of editorial content is mainly a function of ownership and market forces (Galik M. and James B, 1999). Whereas, against it the press (media) is assumed to be a liberated monitor of the environment and cannot be an instrument of government; therefore the impact of media organization ownership has been an important concern in the news media (Jung and Kim, 2011). Because the ultimate power of organization-level lies in owners, who set policy and enforce it (Shoemaker and Reese, 1996). Even media organizations have been said as both political and economic actors, they can

influence public opinion, voting behavior, and government policy; simultaneously they are motivated to the goal of profit-maximizing (Napoli M. P., 1997). Media owners are said as concerned with issues of profit maximization as any other capitalist entity. Because, the survival of a media firm depends on its ability to make a satisfactory profit, says (ibid p.210, 1997).

On the other, according to Ray M., Proulx S. and Dahlgre P. (2003, p.324) ‘historically, the state has justified its attempts to influence the media by arguing that doing so is in the public interest’. In this way in the context of Pakistan throughout a history, a key reason due to which print media has not assumed its role as the Fourth Estate is because it has faced with a government committed to indirectly influencing over its content (Nadadur D. R, 2007). Pakistani governments have used unofficial means to limit the print media’s freedom. These include economic and advertising control, military intimidation and infiltration of media outlets through government spies (ibid). One such example as report Gillani (2005) that in 2003, the Pakistan government withheld advertisement from 12 Sindhi-language newspapers including the Nation and the Nawa-i-Waqt newspaper publishers. So in consequence, these 12 newspapers became out of the market. (See Gillani 2004).

Research Assumptions

- Media/journalism is a neglected, problem ridden profession
- The personal welfare of the individual journalist is neglected by media organizations and owners.
- Media owners/organization and government are in unison in causing the dismal conditions for journalists.

Methodology

The focus group discussions were used for data collection, as the nature of the research questions required qualitative data to be answered. Therefore, focus groups according to Puchta & Potter (2004) elicit participants’ feeling, attitudes and perceptions about a selected topic. The population of this study was working journalists in Sindh employed in both privately or state-run media outlets.

Location, Population, Sample and Sample Size

The location of the study was Sindh province which was administratively distributed in twenty three (23) districts during the data collection. A purposive sampling was applied, because according to Hansen et al. (1998) in focus groups the persons who are invited to participate must be able and willing to provide the required information (A. Hansen, Cottle, Negrine, Newbold & Halloran, 1998). Hence, out of a total of 23, six districts were chosen due to the following characteristics: First, compared to other districts, the membership of journalists in these district press clubs was larger. Therefore, it was easier to arrange the required number focus group discussions and to select the articulate journalists. Second, the researcher had more access to the journalists in these district press clubs. Third, it was determined to conduct at least six focus group discussions, because according to Hansen et al. (1998) 'it would be difficult to justify fewer than six groups' (A. Hansen et al., 1998, p.268). About the number of participants in each group, it was attempted to arrange at least six participants for each focus group, as Morgan (1998, p.1) suggests 'six to eight participants in each group'. However, in practice on average five participants could be arranged for each focus group discussion.

Data Collection and the Recruitment of Participants

The questionnaire for focus groups had a pre-determined agenda, which allowed the focus group participants to talk about the agenda as they wished, while a moderator kept seeking to elicit and measure the arguments, views and responses of the participants. The questions on the agenda were formulated as loose, broad and much more flexible; because owing to such formulation the discussion also suggests additional topics of inquiry to be followed, See (Alreck & Settle, 1995, p.397). The participants were recruited with the co-ordination and consultation of office-bearers and senior journalists of the selected press clubs. The selection was determined taking into consideration the fact that all the participants belong to different media outlets and must be willing and articulate. The timing of the focus group discussions was fixed at evening, except two. Finally, out of a total of six, the three focus group discussions were arranged at the press clubs of the concerned districts, two at district bureau offices of media organizations and one at the regional office of a news agency. See, Table below for exact details:

Date, Time, Location, Number of Participants and Duration of Focus Group Discussions

Sampling Unit	Date and time	Venue	Participants	Duration
District Karachi	06-4-2009-6:00 pm	District press club Karachi	05	59:34
District Sukkur	11-4-2009-1:00 pm	Office Daily Ibrat newspaper	05	47:39
District Khairpur	11-4-2009-6:00 pm	Office Sindh TV channel	06	46:52
District Larkana	12-4-2009-1:00 pm	District press club Larkana	04	50:28
District Hyderabad	13-4-2009-9:00 pm	Office APP news agency	06	01:15
District Thatta	14-4-2009-5:00 pm	District press club Thatta	04	57:49

Implementation, Recording and Analysis of the Focus Groups Data

The focus group discussions began with an introduction by the moderator which had three sections: Welcome statement, a brief overview of the subject matter to be discussed, and an explanation of the discussion rules. The principal data produced by focus groups are the verbal responses, statements, opinions, arguments and interactions of the participants (A. S. Hansen & Newbold, 1998, pp. 276-277). Hence, taking into consideration the nature of the data, all the focus group sessions were audio-recorded. Because, this is the most simple and inexpensive method and it can be transcribed verbatim or condensed into brief, written reports (Alreck & Settle, 1995, p. 404). In addition, audio-recording is considered the most common way of making the focus group conversations analyzable (Morgan, 1998, p.56). According to their nature ‘the fundamental data that focus groups produce are transcripts of the group discussions’

(Morgan, 1988, p.10). Thus, the analysis of focus group data involves the researcher’s subjective process of making sense of what was discussed in the

groups. Therefore, a final written report of the focus group data has been put together and discussed under the major themes and research question that took place across the full set of groups. Finally, in the consideration of ethical aspects the participants were informed that what the purpose of the focus group discussions was and where and how they would be conducted, with whom and who the researcher was and what they represent, and also they were told that the discussions would be audio-taped.

FINDINGS

Relationship Between Media Owners/Organisations And Governments

Regarding relationship between media owners and governments, one focus group participant speaking the mind of media owners regarding their relationship with government said that *'owners say that they are not to strain their relations with government'* (Karachi focus group). In this way, one of the reasons *'not to strain their relations with government'* was enumerated by another participant that *'media organisations have also some interests which are protected by the governments'* (Hyderabad focus group). Revealing further about the media organizations' interests, the participant exemplified that *'as wage board (for journalists in Pakistan) is not being implemented and governments are silent, because, governments have interests in media organizations'* (Hyderabad focus group). Whereas, regarding how media organisations serve the interests of government, one participant, justifying the existence of such a practice, elaborated that *'in this time if any reporter brings news or makes a documentary that is against the government persons is dumped, but that same stuff will run when government will talk for implementation of seventh wage award'* (Karachi focus group). Further, the same participant called such an attitude of media organisations as *'that is give and take policy between media owners, not media workers, media owners and state'* (Karachi focus group). Thus the nature of the relationship between media owners and the government was further boiled down by another participant in the words that *'both fight for each other's interest'* (Karachi focus group).

Moreover, the participants implied in the discussions that the policies of media organisations are changed in accordance with the nature of the relationship between media owners and government. As one participant stated *'if they (media*

owners) are friends with incumbent government, then they would have policy of adjustment with them' (Karachi focus group). The participant repeated a similar view in his second thought, but in a slight different form, that is '*media have various aspects: free media, slave media and partner media; I mean there is also a media partner with politicians or government*' (Karachi focus group). So above discussion reveals that both parties, that is media owners and government, seem disinterested about the development, rights and interests of newspeople. Unfortunately, in the current situation the newspeople are financially exploited. Rather it seems that both media owners and government are in collusion with each other, having agreed upon the policy of 'scratch my back and I will scratch yours'. Therefore, they have successfully been serving the interests of each other. The media owners benefit commercially and propagandize in favor of government or paper over the dark side of government. However, the policies of those media owners who become unfriendly with the governments of the time, due to some reasons, work in reverse. But again the very significant point to be made here is that those who suffer most in either situation are the news workers. Therefore, the focus group participants give the impression of being disgruntled in their spoken opinions. In addition, it seems that to develop a balance or a reconciliatory approach between media owners and the state the leverages which have been used by both are 'media regulations' on the part of state versus 'media agenda setting' from the side of media owners. As one participant, while highlighting upon the severity of grip of the media owners on the news content to be published and broadcast or not, told that 'what owners wish is published and broadcast, and what they do not wish is not published and broadcast' (Karachi focus group). The other point regarding media one participant shared that 'media itself is also categorized in classes, some media organisations are rich, and some at middle and some are lower. So, in particular, the lower media are absolutely slaves to local feudal lords, local governments and provincial governments'. The participant further pointed out that 'the conditions of Sindhi language newspapers are such that if an advertisement is not received from the Government Information Department or the advertisement payment cheques from the Information Department are not issued on time, then the salary to staff is not paid' (Karachi focus group). In this way, the financial positions of media organisations are also self-explanatory and an answer to the question that 'why media owners become inclined to develop the policy of quid pro quo with state or governments of the

time?'. Finally, the scenario drawn in the above discussion about the relationship between media owners and government of the time implies that both parties to a certain extent are in unison with each other, though with some exceptions.

Policy or Attitude towards Journalists

In addition to media owners/organisations and government, the other significant dimension of this profession is journalists, who have to deal and interact with both media owners and government due to the nature of their profession. Therefore, naturally the attitude of government and news media organisations towards journalists also came under focus group discussions that follow below.

3.2.1 Governments' Policy/Attitude towards Journalists

About the attitude of governments towards journalists various participants came up with similar opinions, although they expressed them slightly differently. Overall the participants were not satisfied with the attitude or policy of the government and media owners toward journalists. According to them the governments of Pakistan and media owners or organisations do nothing for the welfare and development of journalist community. As one participant referring to the various governments of the time described his thoughts in the following way that *'governments have done nothing for journalists..... The issues of journalists are not being paid attention to'* (Khairpur focus group). However, the other participant from the same focus group observed the attitude of the state towards journalists a bit differently: *'they (governments or state) have never thought positively that journalists should be facilitated and made absolutely free so they can report fearlessly'* (Khairpur focus group). As this participant implies, fear is a fact of life for journalists. Such a feeling has also been supported by a participant belonging to another district focus group that *'they (journalists) are under pressure from both the state and feudal lords'* (Larkana focus group). Thus the opinions of these participants showing the level of satisfaction with the attitude of state towards journalists have also mentioned another party (feudalism) to be responsible and involved in the maintenance of such an attitude which, further, was more clearly stated in the following words of another participant who said *'the attitude of government is bad and there is involvement of feudal lords and tribal chiefs'* (Sukkur focus group).

The above opinion of the participant implies that the government also comes to contain the newspeople through feudal lords as well. However, on the part of journalists they want to practice their profession by following the professional values as it was expressed by one participant, that *'journalists always try to report accurately and honestly, however, on publishing and broadcasting such news not only journalists even their families are intimidated and threatened. So the attitude of state towards journalists is not fair'* the participant concluded (Khairpur focus group).

Means of Government to Control the Newspeople

Regarding ways to control journalists by the governments the participants referred to many forms which are applied as tools to control the newspeople, which include even threatening to the journalists. As one participant belonging to urban area commented *'there are two sides one directly threatening and other by owners'* (Karachi focus group). In the context of direct threats the participants came up with various examples, first *'threats by intelligence and police'* (Hyderabad focus group); second, five participants from different district focus groups said *'implicating the journalists in bogus cases'*; third *'they hire goons to get the journalists attacked physically'* (Larkana focus group); fourth, two participants told that while baton-charging the public rallies police also *'targets, arrests, beats'* to journalists as well.

Moreover, in regard to restraining the journalists through owners, two participants belonging to rural area mentioned that by the government *'media owners are forced to fire the journalists'* (Larkana focus group) or the state seeks to *'influence and approach the media organisations to fire those journalists who do not follow the government policy'* (Larkana focus group). In addition, two participants pointed out some other means used to control the newspeople. So accordingly one participant said *'one of the tools is some good journalists are offered lucrative government jobs'* (Larkana focus group) and second participant from another focus group said that *'there is dominance of feudal lords, so they are given a task to control journalists either influencing them on community basis or family basis'* (Thatta focus group).

3.2.2 Media Organisations/Owners' Policy/Attitude towards Journalists

In the regard of media organizations and owners policy or attitude towards newspeople, it was found, as according to the views of the participants the attitude of media organisations/owners seemed very unfair. As one participant stated that *'if the advertisements are blocked, or the const of newsprint paper is raised media organisations protest; however, they do nothing for journalists'* (Sukkur focus group). Two other participants also painted the media organisations negatively in following words that *'here media organisations are unrewarding, and exploitative camps with the exception of a few'* (Thatta focus group) or *'here with the exception of a few media organisations, all others exploit the journalists in rural Sindh'* (Larkana focus group). Further, it was more pathetic to know in the words of a member of the Karachi focus group that journalists are *'bonded labour which is exploited by media organizations'* (Karachi focus group).

Various Forms of Exploiting Journalists by Media Organisations/Owners

Further, the focus group data explained that how in various ways journalists are exploited by media organisations and owners. First, journalists are made scapegoats by the media organisations in order to escape from the anger of the government. As two participants were quoted in this regard, according to one participant *'politicians sitting on treasury benches ask the media organisations that the journalist who has reported against them be fired'* (Khairpur focus group), the second one also stated almost in a similar way that *'it happens that if any reporter brings an important news that is against any minister, as result other day the reporter is fired from the job, that why did he publish such news?'* (Karachi focus group). If the other party is a feudal lord instead of government the same thing happens. As one participant noted *'sometimes it happens that if a journalist having taken a risk digs out an important story or catches snaps, same feudal lords who have relations in media organisations just make one phone call and that news is not published'* (Larkana focus group). In any conflict with powerful state or non-state media organization owners try to protect themselves, and the journalists are caught in the middle. The second way that journalists are exploited by media organisations and owners is that journalists in addition to reporting are made to collect advertisements. As one participant said *'media organisations just demand for advertisements, those who collect more advertisements are supposed to be more efficient journalists than those who dig*

more news stories and collect less advertisements' (Khairpur focus group). Another participant agreed: *'they (media owners) remember well the national days and politically celebrated days. So they remember well how to get the journalists to beg? They tell us, this is your training how to beg advertisement, how to ask for money'* (Khairpur focus group). This participant also mentioned that the journalists are called to the head offices of their media organisations particularly for training in collecting advertisement rather than training them in the professional skills of journalism. Moreover, the participant refers to advertisement collection as begging, because the participant seems to realize that as a reporter it is against journalistic professionalism; however, journalists are compelled to do it due to lack of job security or to get some percentage of amount as a commission from the rate of that advertisement. Moreover, the participant told a harrowing narrative of a colleague who was fired in an extremely disgraceful way because of advertisement collection. The participant stated that *'a week back I watched a slide on one Sindhi language TV channel showing frequently the announcement of one journalist being fired by that channel'*. Regarding the reason for firing that journalist from his job the participant further stated *'the director told me, because in a year that journalist had just collected the advertisements ofthousand rupees and compared to him the other journalist has collected the advertisements oflacs rupees'* (one lac equals to one hundred thousands). Moreover, in a personal conversation, one journalist explained the current situation of journalists in the following way that *'media organisations give us a task to earn advertisements so when we report some news against those persons or departments who give us the business of advertisements they say to us that they are giving us advertisements and we are reporting news against them'*. In summary, this practice of using journalists to collect advertisements makes it very difficult for them to report truth objectively.

Thirdly one participant who was a member of the broadcast media said that *'unfortunately, particularly in electronic media, the professional attitude has not yet developed'* (Larkana focus group). And that *'unprofessional attitude'* on the part of the electronic media was interpreted by three participants belonging to two different district focus groups in the following way: *'even journalists have to buy video cameras from their own pockets'* (District Thatta focus group). Surprisingly a participant from another district said that *'even video-cameras are not provided*

by media organisations, and journalists purchase their own' (Larkana focus group). The participant added that *'as a result, yellow journalism is getting existence'* (Larkana focus group). The other participant, speaking about both print and electronic media organisations, said that *'media organisations do not provide journalists even still cameras, video cameras, recorders, faxes, or expenses to setup and maintain offices'* (Larkana focus group). Finally, one participant said of the print media that *'it is great misfortune of media that many newspapers do not follow the wage board'* (Hyderabad focus group). (Wage board is a committee to be formed by the Pakistan government to fix the wage rates for journalists).

However, things like *'unprofessional attitude'* on the part of electronic media organisations and *'not following the wage board'* by newspapers proved just the tip of the iceberg when the participants straightforwardly stated that the journalists are underpaid, unpaid and appointed in a way that is unrecognizable and unchallengeable in the court of law if needed so. First, as three participants said about the financial position of the journalists in Sindh *'journalists work on low wages, so if they go on strike their news would not be published in any paper, or broadcast on any TV channel'* (Hyderabad focus group). We can see here not only the financial condition of the journalists but also cooperation of media owners with each other: an item in favor of journalists and against media owners would not be publicized, either in print or broadcast media. The other two participants had this to say about the underpayment of journalists: *'media organisations do not pay a salary to their journalists according to their necessities'* (Sukkur focus group) and *'media organisations prefer new entrants because they are willing to work on a low salary'* (Karachi focus group). Finally, the point here is that journalists being underpaid are relevant to those journalists who work in urban or media cities of Sindh i.e. Karachi and Hyderabad.

As far as the journalists working in the rural part of Sindh are concerned their financial narrative is filled with the worst, most horrifying and mindboggling adjectives. According to four participants rural journalists are unpaid. First *'in the interior of Sindh journalists are not paid any salary, all work free of charge'* (Hyderabad focus group); second *'media organisations do not even pay salary to local journalists'* (Khairpur focus group); third, *'at local level journalists do not draw any salary'* (Sukkur focus group); and fourth *'at local level, media organisations do not pay any salary'* (Sukkur focus group).

Two participants gave a slightly different version of the financial condition of rural journalists. *‘90% of journalists are working voluntarily for newspapers and TV channels, they are not offered any salary’* (Thatta focus group). According to one other participant *‘almost all journalists in rural Sindh are working in unrewarding and exploitative camps. Just there may be four or five channels in Pakistan who might be paying their reporters to some extent’* (Larkana focus group). In summary, according to these participants few of the journalists are paid. One of them said that just *‘four or five channels’* in Pakistan might be paying their reporters. Further, regarding the TV channels who might be paying their reporters one other participant added that *‘those few which pay a salary to journalists, however, they have not a similar policy for all journalists. They have different policies for those who work in Karachi (Urban and the media city) and those who work in rural part of Sindh’*, (Larkana focus group). According to this participant even the few media organisations which do pay their journalists, discriminate and pay a larger salary to urban than to rural journalists.

Appointment Criteria of Media Organizations or Owners for News people

Some of the participants also explained the appointment criteria of the media organisations or owners. One participant said *‘they (media organization and owners) will prefer an unskilled person who agrees to work free of cost compared to an M.A degree holder demanding salary’* (Hyderabad focus group). Another participant belonging to another focus group expounded that *‘media organizations appoint reporters also on the approach of politicians and feudal lords; because one day they would become MPAs (Members of Provincial Assembly) and MNAs (Members of National Assembly)’* (Khairpur focus group). However, the participants also commented that such an appointment would have no legal recognition. In the words of one participant who explained in detail: *‘in Pakistan with the exception of a few media organizations no journalist can prove that he has been an employee of any media organization even just for a day, though he has been working for fifteen years with no authority letter, no proof, particularly in Sindhi media’* (Karachi focus group). On enquiring by moderator *‘no appointment letter?’*, the participant repeated his answer in the following way *‘no appointment letter, no contract letter, no daily wages letter’* (Karachi focus group). In a similar vein another participant from another focus group also shared

a similar fact that *'all journalists in the media organizations are appointed without issuing any letter'* (Hyderabad focus group).

The result of a situation in which journalists are either underpaid or unpaid and in any event not given a written contract of employment, according to one participant, is that *'as a result definitely there will be corruption'* (Hyderabad focus group). And it was admitted by some other participants that corruption is found among journalists. As one participant said that *'there are some journalists who are playing their role honestly, however, there are other who practice corruption in the name of journalism; they blackmail people and various departments and in the name of press clubs they have set up little business shops and are damaging the reputation of press'* (Thatta focus group). The statement of the above participant implies that one of the purposes to establish separate press clubs by the groups of journalists is to extort money individually and not share the received amount with a large number of journalists. Another participant said that *'there are so many examples that journalists extort monthly fixed amounts from various places. If it is complained against them to their media organizations, there is no use of it, because, the media organizations also need money, nothing else'* (Khairpur focus group). In other words, such a practice takes place under the nose of the journalists' employer media organisations. Another participant, acknowledging the practice of corruption among journalists, justified it in the following way *'the first thing is the salary journalists draw monthly. Does it suffice to meet the expenses of the journalist's family? Absolutely not, therefore, when journalist goes to the field he puts away the profession and tries to earn unfairly'* (Hyderabad focus group).

Two other participants said that governments also bribe journalists to control them and to have an influence over the news media. One of them said *'journalists are bribed, this is also an indirect tool to influence the media'* (Karachi focus group). Another explained the kind of bribes offered by governments: *'journalists are offered reliefs in the form of government jobs and financial packages'* (Sukkur focus group). Finally, in the words of one participant: *'unless there is change in media organisations the conditions of journalists would not improve'* (Thatta focus group). But it seems improbably that such a change will take place because *'there is no accountability of media organizations'* (Hyderabad focus group) in regard to their attitude or policy towards newspeople.

Conclusion

As the purpose of this research was an inquiry about the nature of relationship between the media organization/owners and governments in Pakistan and then their attitude towards journalists. So it was found that media owners and the government serve the purpose of each other on the cost of journalists and journalistic ideology; the classical example of this is the non-implementation of 'wage board for journalists in Pakistan'. In addition media organization owners influence upon the publication and broadcast of the content. And the main reason to do this is to maximize the margin of profit. In this way in the consequence of such practice journalists are unable to report and write news freely. Somehow they have to work according to the wishes of media owners. The other means to deter to the journalists from working freely include threats, arrests, physically beating, job insecurity, and particularly in rural area the feudal influence. Among others one of the problems for journalists caused by media owners is that they have collect advertisements also newspapers and TV channels. This practice on the part of journalists then damages to the journalistic credibility related characteristic of report and writing honestly and objectively. As for as professionalism is concerned so particularly in the context of Sindhi-language electronic media not to talk about the on-the-job professional training, even professional equipment is not provided to the journalists by their employing media organizations. So while interviewing to the journalists for employing them even it is considered and asked directly that could journalists buy or arrange themselves the video cameras and the other related equipment and maintain district level offices. Moreover the financial conditions of rural journalists were found worse compared with urban journalists. The rural journalists were more under-paid and unpaid. Finally according to the findings to some extent journalists also appointment on the approach of feudal-cum politicians; however, in all cases mostly no journalist gets appointment letter.

References

- Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1995). *The Survey Research Handbook*. Chicago, III: Irwin.
- Galik, M.& James B. (1999) *Ownership and Control of the Hungarian Press*, The Public, 6:2, p. 75-92.

- Gillani, W. (2004, May 10). *Pakistan- Vibrant Press under Constraint since 2003*, Daily Times.
- Hansen, A., Cottle, S., Negrine, R., Newbold, C., & Halloran, J. D. (1998). *Mass Communication Research Methods*: Macmillan.
- Hardt, H. (2005). *International Labour Office: Conditions of Work and Life of Journalists*, The Public, (12)1 p.5-14.
- Jung, J. and Kim, H. (2011). *A Clash of Journalism and Ownership: CNN's Movie Coverage*, Journal of Media and Communication Studies, 3 (2), p. 71-79.
- Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, Calif. London: Sage Publications.
- Morgan, D. L. (1998). *The Focus Group Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, Calif. London: SAGE.
- Nadadur, D. R. (2007). *Self-Censorship In The Pakistani Print Media*, South Asian Survey 14:1, p. 45-63.
- Napoli, M. P. (1997). *A Principal-Agent Approach to the Study of Media Organizations: Towards a Theory of the Media Firm*, Political Communication, 14:2, p. 207-219.
- Puchta, C., & Potter, J. (2004). *Focus Group Practice*: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Rayboy, M., Proulx, S. & Dahlgren, P. (2003). *The Dilemma of Social Demand: Shaping Media Policy in New Civic Contexts*, Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies, 65(4-5): p. 323-329.
- Shoemaker, PJ, & Reese, SD (1996). *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content*. (2nd ed.). White Plain, NY: Longman.