Examining perceptions towards war/peace journalism: A survey of journalists in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan

Shabir Hussain [iD]

Media Studies Department, Bahria University, Islamabad,
Pakistan

Araz Ramazan Ahmad [iD]

Department of Administration, College of Humanities,
University of Raparin, Ranya, Iraq; International Relations &
Diplomacy, Faculty of Administrative Sciences and
Economics, Tishk International University, Erbil, Iraq

Abstract

Following seminal study on journalistic attitudes towards wars and peace journalism, in this study we investigated the perceptions of conflict reporters in the three most deadly countries in the world including Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. A total of 317 journalists participated in this study. Though generally we found support for the earlier study, the analysis shows journalists engage in wider practices than predicted that overlap war and peace journalism approaches. A closer examination showed that journalists favored active war journalism practices and passive peace journalism practices. Finally, we did not find that journalistic experience and contextual factors influenced preferences towards war and peace journalism substantially.

Keywords

Afghanistan, deadly countries, Iraq, journalistic perceptions, overlapping, Pakistan, war and peace journalism

Corresponding author:
Shabir Hussain, Media Studies Department, Bahria University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
Email: Shasain2@gmail.com

Introduction

The academic approach of peace journalism has attracted a lot of attention in the past two decades. A valuable literature is available in the form of research articles, books and graduate theses on the subject (Fahmy, 2016; İnceoğlu and Tirşe, 2018; Lynch, 2015 to mention just few; Youngblood, 2016). This wealth of scholarship has contributed significantly to delineate the theoretical and methodological debates within this approach and helping it emerge as an influential academic approach (Lynch, 2015). The peace journalism scholars have identified an array of problematic issues within the existing conflict reporting practices that deviate from journalistic profession and at the same time have proposed corrective strategies in diverse journalistic cultures and geographic regions (Hussain et al, 2021; Fahmy, 2016; Kempf, 2017; Lynch, 2014; Mitra, 2016).

Though the exponents of peace journalism do not claim that media can or should do conflict resolution, they believe this approach has the ability to facilitate the peace process (Lynch and Galtung, 2010). By highlighting the structural and systemic issues that breed violence, peace journalism approach provides widest possible explanations of conflict scenarios and offer peace alternatives (Shinar, 2009). Through such an approach, others believe peace journalism help accentuate peace initiatives and reduce conflicts by encouraging reconciliation among the conflicting parties (Galtung, 2002).

Despite this work by the exponents, questions about its practicability and its relation with the existing norms of professional journalism are still raised (Hussain et al, 2021). Its impracticality is evident from the numerous studies where researchers found abundance of war journalism as compared to peace journalism (Fahmy and Johnson, 2012; Lee and Maslog, 2005). One better way to ascertain its tenability is to examine the journalistic perceptions and attitudes towards this approach. Surprisingly peace journalism scholars have paid little attention to survey approach except for two studies, one conducted by Neumann and Shahira (2016) and the second by Adegbola and Zhang (2020). In this study, we contribute to the existing literature by investigating journalists' perceptions in a cross-country survey. Additionally, we examine the various levels of war and peace journalism from active war or peace journalism where journalists openly support war or peace by indulging in advocacy and passive war or peace journalism where journalists deviate from or stick to the norms of responsible journalism (Kempf, 2017). A survey-based cross-country comparison would help strategizing for peace journalism in different conflict scenarios in particular and add to the journalism studies in general.

Alongside methodological contributions, this study also adds to the theoretical debates on the subject. Peace journalism theoreticians locate its philosophical and conceptual moorings in the critical realism (Lynch, 2008), sociological approach to media studies (Hackett, 2011) and critical pragmatism (Siraj and Mehmood, 2019). The first two these approaches are criticized for compromising journalistic agency (Hussain et al, 2021). Critical pragmatism on the other hand is considered more

suitable to analyze the structure-agency debate. In this study we apply a critical pragmatic approach by analyzing journalistic perceptions about a wide range of options on war and peace journalism that include both agential and structural determinants. A mixed response to war and peace journalism options would indicate that journalists constantly renegotiate their positions to be critical observers but at the same pragmatic in their approach.

We analyze the perceptions of journalists in three of the most deadly countries in the world—Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq towards peace journalism. According to Watson Institute at Brown University that has compiled data of the casualties in these three major war zones in the aftermath of 9/11 incidents, more than 5,00,000 people have been killed in total in these countries (Neta and Lutz, 2019). Separately, according to the report, more than 157,000 and 80,000 people have lost their lives between October 2001 and October 2019 in Afghanistan and Pakistan respectively while in Iraq more than 3,08,000 have lost their lives between years March 2003–October 2019 (Crawford and Lutz, 2019). The report says civilians are the worst sufferers in these three conflicts followed by the national army and police personnel and opposition fighters. More than 7000 US military personnel have also been killed in these countries and over trillion dollars loss to the national exchequer (Crawford and Lutz, 2019). The three countries have been involved in internecine warfare that engulfed the entire country in case of Afghanistan and Iraq and major areas in case of Pakistan. At present, despite cessation of deadly violent events, the three countries are suffering from structural maladjustments and unease tension between antagonistic groups.

Peace journalism approach

The prominent peace scholar Johan Galtung presented the approach of peace journalism in 1965 in a study on the reporting of international conflicts in the Norwegian press. Alongside Mari Holmboe Ruge, Galtung examined the coverage of Congo, Cuba, and Cyprus crises and found that media reporting was sensationalistic, overemphasized the visible aspects like casualties and damages to infrastructure, used demonizing language and ignored background and context of these conflicts (Galtung and Ruge, 1965). In another example, Galtung (2002) argued that the traditional war journalism was like sports journalism where win or loss is emphasized. On the other hand, he proposed peace journalism is like health journalism where media not only inform about the actual disease but also describe the disease's causes as well as the full range of cures and preventive measures (Galtung, 2002). Taking a cue from this approach, peace journalism highlight conflict transformation and focus on finding ways and means to creatively transform the conflict (Galtung, 2002).

Jake Lynch while building on the Galtung's work that argues peace journalism is not open advocacy for peace as its name might suggest. This is how he defines peace journalism: "Peace Journalism is when editors and reporters make choices – of what to report and how to report it – that create opportunities for society at

large to consider and value nonviolent responses to conflict" (Lynch, 2008: 17).
This definition equates peace journalism with good critical reporting that high-
lights all aspects of conflicts including the nonviolent approaches (Lynch, 2008).
Lynch (2014) considers peace journalism superior to war journalism because it
encourages a focus on proactive reporting and asking critical questions from the
elites about the conduct of war. In a nutshell, the two key exponents of peace
journalism—Johan Galtung and Jake Lynch propose peace journalism as a con-
structive journalistic endeavor to highlight peace initiatives, narrow down the
range of ethnic and religious differences, focus on the structure of society, and
promote conflict resolution (Lee, 2010).

The case for peace journalism is further strengthened by the scholarship on war-
media nexus where researchers found that traditional media promoted patriotism by
simply reproducing elitist propaganda and their inability to do objective and factual
reporting (Allan and Zelizer, 2004; Carruthers, 2011; Peleg, 2007; Wolfsfeld, 2004).
Likewise, peace journalism studies showed that media reporting of conflicts in the
Middle East, Eastern Europe and Africa was fundamentally escalatory and propa-
gandistic (Fahmy, 2016; Lee, 2010; Lynch, 2015; Youngblood, 2016). War reporting
in these studies was restricted to elitist perspectives and the media failed to highlight
the broader structural and politico-economic factors responsible for these conflicts
(Lynch, 2014).

Research on peace journalism

In the past two decades, numerous research articles, books and training programs
have been conducted on the theoretical underpinnings of peace journalism, meth-
odological approaches to studying peace journalism, and the practice of peace
journalism (Lynch, 2014; Lynch and Galtung, 2010; Ross and Tehranian, 2008;
Shaw et al., 2011; Youngblood, 2016 and many more) that is often cited as evi-
dence for its potential to emerge as a sound practicable alternative to the existing
journalistic practices (Fröhlich, 2019; İnceoğlu and Tirşe, 2018).

Theoretically, peace journalism was criticized for lacking the explanatory power
of a theory (Lyon, 2007; Fawcett, 2002). The proponents have attempted to
address this deficiency by borrowing from diverse theoretical approaches like
media sociology, critical realism and critical pragmatism to analyze the complex
questions of agency-structure and theory-practice debate (Hackett, 2011; Lynch,
2008; Hussain et al, 2021). Hackett (2011) for example suggests the media socio-
logical approach consisting of a range of hierarchies from the micro level (indi-
vidual) to the macro (ideology) better explain the peace journalism approach.
Lynch (2015), on the other hand, believes that it is based on critical realism,
which allows for good journalism to be distinguished from bad journalism.
Critical realism acknowledges that reality exists independently of our knowledge
of it and that although this knowledge is always fallible it is possible through
discussion and deliberation in public spheres to recognize that all knowledge is
not equally fallible (Lynch, 2015). Siraj and Mehmood (2019), on the other hand,

opine that peace journalism is better explained by critical pragmatism. They trace its agenda to pragmatic philosophy that deals with achievable part of reality that can be accessed through existing tools of enquiry (that are imperfect and hence repairable) for solving human problems. While delineating on its philosophical components, they add that peace journalism is real not idyllic (ontology), believes in the professional journalistic excellence (epistemology) and retains peace as a value not principle (axiology).

Similarly, the methodologies adopted in peace journalism studies were criticized for being merely descriptive (Hanitzch, 2007). In the one past decade, scholars have conducted multitudes of empirical and critical studies to develop this approach. These include content analyses (see for example Fahmy, 2019; Fahmy and Eakin, 2014; Lee, 2010), critical discourse analyses (Nohresdet and Ottosen, 2015; Thomas and Ross, 2011;), studies applying experimental designs (Lynch et al., 2014; Lynch and McGoldrick, 2012; McGoldrick and Lynch, 2016; Thiel and Kempf, 2014), interviews with conflict reporters (Abunales, 2016; Armoudian, 2017; Mitra, 2016; Rodny-Gumede, 2016) and survey (Neumann and Fahmy, 2016). The qualitative interview-based studies are useful addition but these are limited to certain conflict areas and hence there exists a need for more empirical evidence about the journalistic perceptions towards peace journalism.

In the studies cited above, researchers have mainly relied on the war and peace journalism model developed by Galtung (1998). The model includes four frames of war coverage—violence oriented, propaganda oriented, elite oriented, difference oriented and four frames of peace coverage—peace oriented, truth oriented, people oriented and solution oriented. The 17-point agenda for peace journalists outlined by Lynch and McGoldrick (2005), Tehranian's 10 commandments (2002), Shinar's agenda for peace journalism (2009) and the 13 dichotomous indicators of war and peace devised by Lee and Maslog (2005) are mainly the reflection of the Galtung model. Of all these models, the Lee and Maslog (2005) scheme of categorization has attracted more attention. In their survey study, Neumann and Fahmy (2016) have adopted the approach-based criteria developed by Lee and Maslog (2005). These include nine indicators of war journalism (1) reactive reporting (2). No post-conflict reporting (3) reporting casualty counts (4) reporting material damage (5) focusing on elites (6) discussing differences (7) presenting a zero-sum game (8) framing dichotomies (9) presenting the status quo and nine indicators of peace journalism (1) proactive reporting (2) post-conflict reporting (3) reporting socio-cultural damage (4) reporting psychological damage (5) focusing on non-elites (6) discussing similarities (7) explaining the past (8) projecting the future and (9) presenting diversity.

Based on the quality of these attributes to promote war or peace, a numbers of researchers (Kempf, 2017; Lee, 2010; Lynch, 2008) have classified war journalism either into active war journalism or passive war journalism. Similarly, peace journalism can be found either in active peace journalism or passive peace journalism. While active war journalism openly advocate war by producing elite orientated coverage that only focus on differences between groups where they are pitted

against each other and winning remains the only option, passive war journalism just falls short from the notions of responsible journalism like waiting for violence for occur and focusing and then reporting on the visible effects of violence (Kempf, 2017; Lee, 2010; Lynch, 2008). Similarly, active peace journalism is proactive reporting of conflicts where solution is empathized and conflicting parties are facilitated to communicate with each other (Lynch, 2008). Likewise, passive peace journalism as form of responsible journalism focuses on the invisible effects of violence where voices and opinions of common people get due coverage (Kempf, 2017; Lee, 2010; Lynch, 2008).

Several empirical studies on the peace journalism model have criticized its dichotomous nature for it ignores the typical traits of journalism profession (Tenenboim-Weinblatt et al., 2015; Hussain, 2020a and Hussain, 2020b). These critics argue that most of the media content lie somewhere in-between these two extreme categories and alternatively have developed more nuanced models to capture the main thrust in terms of war and peace frames. Neumann and Fahmy (2016) study also found that journalists opted for common practices from the war and peace journalism approach.

Research hypotheses

Neumann and Fahmy (2016) found that despite conceptual distinctiveness, certain practices of war and peace journalism could not be practically disentangled. For example, journalists considered reporting on psychological and sociocultural damage (invisible effects) and casualty counts and material damage (visible effects) equally important. These finings are also supported by a number of content analyses studies where researchers found noticeable amount of peace journalism despite the dominance of war journalism coverage (Fahmy and Eakin, 2014; Fahmy and Neumann, 2012; Lee, 2010). For example, Siraj (2019) found the Taliban conflict was predominantly reported in war journalism fashion in Pak-Afghan press though the peace journalism stories were not altogether absent. So our first research question is:

R.Q.1: To what extent, the various practices of war and peace journalism are correlated with each other?

Neumann and Fahmy (2016) found that in the war journalism approach, the more salient indicators were focus on elites; focus on differences between groups and reporting on casualties while in the peace journalism approach, the more salient indicators were focus on sociocultural damage, psychological damage and focus on non-elites. Lynch (2008) argues that elitist, zero-sum oriented and differences oriented coverage represent active form of war journalism while focus on invisible effects represented passive peace journalism. Similarly, they categorize reporting on casualty counts, material damage and reactive approach as passive war journalism and consider proactive approach, finding similarity among conflict parties

and calling for peace as active peace journalism. A number of other scholars (Tenenboim-Weinblatt et al, 2015; Lee, 2010) have figured out that active war journalism reflected disinformation and a breach of journalistic profession while passive war journalism occurred due to negligence on the part of journalists and it can be corrected by adhering to professional ethos. Likewise, active peace journalism is advocacy for peace and not tenable with professional journalism whereas passive peace journalism is responsible reporting (Kempf, 2017). In a detailed analysis, Lynch (2018) found that Pakistan media applied active war journalism and passive peace journalism while reporting on conflicts. In a nutshell, active war or peace journalism openly call for war or peace and involves advocacy. On the other hand, passive war or passive peace journalism indirectly promote the cause of war or peace due to failure on part of journalists to provide additional contextual information about a conflict scenario. Based on the above findings, our first research hypothesis is:

R.H.1a: Journalists are more likely to engage in active war journalism as compared to passive war journalism.

R.H.2b: Journalists are more likely to engage in passive peace journalism as compared to active peace journalism.

Neumann and Fahmy (2016) found that experienced journalists favored peace journalism. This is in line with Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) argument that journalists who spent more time in the profession develop some agency to do comparatively better reporting. Similarly, Lynch and Galtung (2010) believe experienced journalists who spent more time in conflict arena are aware of the complex nature of a conflict and better equipped to produce peace journalism. Likewise, Abunales (2016) found that senior journalists produced more peace journalism as compared to the junior journalists during the Mindanao conflict in Philippine. Building on these findings, we hypothesize that those journalists in our sample who had more than 10 years of experience in reporting conflicts would potentially produce more peace journalism as compared to those who had lesser experience in conflict reporting.

R.H.2a: Experienced journalists are more likely to engage in peace journalism practices as compared to less experienced journalists.

R.H.2b: Experienced journalists are less likely to engage in war journalism practices as compared to less experienced journalists.

Finally, we were interested in the cross-countries comparison towards perceptions about war and peace journalism. A number of researchers have identified that Western model journalistic practices are not well suited to peace journalism as compared to the Asian and Islamic settings (Lynch, 2008). Since Pakistani

journalists follow a more Western paradigm for reporting (Pintak et al., 2016) as compared to Afghanistan and Iraq, we believe Pakistani journalists would favor war journalism as compared their counterparts in the other two countries. Alongside the almost two-decade long deadly insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan that have resulted in the destruction of the entire structure of national institutions including media, the two countries have been ruled by authoritarian regimes before that did not allow free media. Likewise, unlike Pakistan having strong national media system (XXX), both in Iraq and Afghanistan journalists are more influenced by ethnic, religious and regional interests and hence we predict more variations in their perceptions towards peace journalism (Al-Rawi, 2012; Khalvatgar, 2019; Relly et al., 2015). So the final research hypothesis is:

> R.H.3: Journalists in Pakistan are more likely to engage in war journalism practices as compared to journalists in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Method

As mentioned earlier, in this study we have adopted the Neumann and Fahmy (2016) model to investigate the perceptions of journalists towards war and peace journalism in Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iraq. Based on the total of 18 indicators (nine for war and nine for peace), Neumann and Fahmy (2016) developed 18 statements dealing with various practices of peace and war journalism. Five-point Likert scales ranging from 'Strongly Disagree' ('1') to 'Strongly Agree' ('5') were utilized to measure participants' agreement. This purposive sample included a total of 317 journalists from the three countries. The questionnaire was of one page in which first the peace journalism indicators were arranged and then the war journalism indicators. To be included in the survey, a journalist had to had minimum one-year experience in conflict reporting.

Both the authors of the study had careers in journalism—one covered the Taliban conflict in Pakistan and the second covered conflict in Iraq. In these two countries, we had good contacts with journalists and we met hem in press clubs and in their offices to fill the questionnaire. We preferred the printed questionnaires to ensure maximum response rate (Bhattacherjee, 2012). Similarly, to distribute questionnaires among journalists in Afghanistan, two of assistants had handled such assignments in the past and favored printed questionnaires for maximum response.

Since in Pakistan, the northwestern region closer to Afghanistan was affected in the war on terror, so the journalists affiliated with the press club of provincial capital Peshawar were selected for this study. Through purposive sampling, 124 journalists who were reporting terrorism related incidents for mainstream national media were identified with the help of press club administration. One of the authors of the study personally visited Peshawar and with the help of local

acquaintances, distributed questionnaires in the bureau offices. The researcher was able to retrieve 63 questionnaires in the first two days. Next, the remaining journalists were contacted again and 34 more questionnaires were received. So a total of 97 journalists were able to participate in the study, thus making the response rate slightly over 78 percent. The questionnaire was in English though translated version in the national language Urdu was also available which was done by one of the authors of this study and checked with two senior journalists who were reporting for foreign media in English and for local media in Urdu. However, the Urdu versions were not utilized, as all the journalists preferred the English version. This whole process took 12 days from April 4 to April 16. The questionnaire was neatly filled and no response was rejected. Three respondents needed some clarifications and these were addressed through telephonic calls.

Similarly, two students from Afghanistan studying at a Pakistani university helped us to distribute questionnaires in Kabul. They visited the Kabul press club and got data about the journalists registered with press club. Next, 150 journalists who were regular visitors to the press club were selected to be included in the study based on their experience as conflict reporters. The two students visited the press club for three consecutive days and were able to catch up 113 journalists, thus making the response rate slightly over 75 percent. The questionnaire was translated both in Pashto and Dari languages. Services of a professional editor were hired for translations both in Pashto and Dari. These were cross-checked by two senior journalists who suggested minor corrections and were incorporated. In terms of medium of questionnaire, 22 percent opted for English version, 52 percent opted for Pashto version and the remaining opted for Dari version. Eight responses were rejected due to various mistakes like incomplete information or ticking all the options under a given question and hence a total of 105 responses were included in the sample. The data was collected between 10–13 April, 2020.

For Iraq, one of the authors in this study had been a journalist in Baghdad before joining academia, prepared a list of 150 conflict reporters with the assistance of Iraqi Press Association. Using personal contacts and good offices of the Iraqi Press Association, the questionnaire was administered to the reporters in their offices. 17 questionnaires were emailed to the reports that were out of Baghdad for professional or personals reasons. As many as 121 responses were collected in a week (response rate 80 percent), of which 6 responses were discarded either due to incomplete information or ticking all the given options for one question. So a total of 115 responses were included in this study. The questionnaire was translated in Arabic by the author himself and reviewed by two senior editors. 63 percent of journalists opted the Arabic version and the remaining number filled the English questionnaire.

For the purpose of conceptual equivalence between languages, the translators were advised to consider the journalistic expressions and senior journalists as well as the authors crosschecked the translated versions. Minor changes were made and suggestions incorporated to ensure that respondents in the three countries were asked about the same concepts.

Description of sample

A total of 317 journalists participated in this study with 97 journalists from
Pakistan, 105 from Afghanistan and 115 from Iraq. In terms of gender, just 23
journalists were females, which make up to 7 percent of the sample. This is not
surprising because conflict reporting is mainly a male-dominated area even in the
Western countries and figures go down significantly in the case of the three selected
countries. Most of the journalists (76 percent) were between the age brackets of 25–
50 years. Similarly, 40 percent of journalists had more than 10 years of experience
and 46 percent had up to 5 years of experience in the field. Thus just 14 percent of
the respondents in the survey had over five years of experience but les than
10 years. Since we were also interested to investigate whether or not experience
was related with the options of war and peace journalism (as in RH 2 b and
RH2b), we created two dichotomous groups of journalists—those whose experi-
ence was less than five years in journalism were considered as less experienced and
those with more than 10 years of experience were considered as experienced jour-
nalists and excluded those who fall in-between. As discussed in the description part
of the study, 40 percent of journalists had more than 10 years of experience and 46
percent had up to 5 years of experience in the field. Thus just 14 percent of the
respondents in the survey had over five years of experience but les than 10 years.
This enabled us to exclude this smaller number to analyze the preferences towards
war and peace journalism in terms of experience. Likewise, slightly more than 10
percent had experience of working with some international news organizations as a
stinger or correspondent. These four measures (gender, age, experience and work-
ing with international media) appeared as open-ended options and journalists had
to write the answer in the questionnaire.

Research findings

R.Q.1: Correlations within and between peace and journalism practices

Correlations within peace journalism practices. As shown in the Table 1, within peace
journalism indicators, those who were interested in reporting on the socio-cultural
aspects also highlighted the psychological harm dome to people ($r = .63$), reporting
on post-conflict scenario ($r = .57$), reporting on non-elites ($r = .53$). Those journal-
ists who believed psychological aspects of the conflict was important to report also
considered that stories of historical context of the conflict ($r = .65$), post-conflict
reporting ($r = .65$,) and non-elites ($r = .63$) were important. Likewise, journalists
who opined that stories of non-elites were important also give significance to the
history of the conflict ($r = .53$) and presentation of diversity ($r = .49$). Moreover,
those who give salience to discussing commonalities among the conflicting parties
also regarded pro-active reporting ($r = .62$) and multi-perspectival approach
($r = .59$) as important. There were strong correlations between post-conflict

Table 1. Correlation between the attributes of war and peace journalism.

Conflict reporting	Peace journalism practices									War journalism practices								
	Socio-cultural damage	Psychological Damage	Focusing on non-elites	Discussing similarities	Explaining the past	Projecting the future	Presenting diversity	Proactive reporting	Post-conflict reporting	Reporting casualty	Reporting material damage	Focusing on elites	Discussing differences	Presenting the status quo	dichotomies	Zero-sum game	Reactive reporting	No post-conflict reportig
Socio-cultural damage	1	.633 (**)	.513 (**)	.237 (*)	.453 (**)	.21	.08		.574 (*)	.433 (**)	.388 (*)	.584 (**)	.373 (**)	.12	.217 (*)	.14	.26	.19
Psychological damage		1	.634 (**)	.13	.658 (**)	.441 (**)	.56	.327 (**)	.655 (**)	.382 (**)	.415 (**)	.429 (**)		-.28	.38	.25	-.43	.23
Focusing on non-elites			1	.261 (**)	.534 (*)	.372 (**)	.491 (*)	.52	.428 (*)	.462 (*)	.629 (**)	.524 (**)	.428 (*)	.462 (*)	.392 (**)	-.29	-.24	.08
Discussing similarities				1	.377 (**)	.273 (*)	.592 (**)	.621 (*)	.31	.25 (**)	.45	-.47	-.21	-.62	-.42	.47	.15	.15
Explaining the past					1	.471 (**)	.373 (*)	.582 (**)	.67	.273 (**)	.358 (**)	.693 (**)	.396 (**)	.283 (*)	.464 (**)	.26	.37	.29
Projecting the future						1	.522 (**)	.22	.35	.388 (*)	.216 (*)	.294 (*)	.29	.41	.33	.44	.26	.36
Presenting Diversity							1	.573 (**)	.582 (**)	.293 (**)	.36	.475 (**)	.59	.36	.29	.58	.14	.36
Proactive reporting								1	.448 (**)	.137 (**)	.584 (**)	.386 (**)	.61	.11	-.12	.24	.31	.48
Post-conflict reporting									1	.582 (**)	.273 (*)	.533 (**)	.33	-.63	.284 (*)	.18	.28	.15
Reporting Casualty										1	.502 (**)	.327 (**)	.43	.21	.31	.218 (*)	.408 (*)	.43
Reporting material damage											1	.544 (**)	.219 (*)	.13	.391 (**)	.233 (*)		.61
Focusing on elites												1	.548 (**)	.26	.24*	.22	.65	.25
Discussing Differences													1	.43*	.28	.614 (**)	.39	.17
Presenting the status quo														1	.21	.64	.427 (*)	.34
dichotomies															1	.51*	.311*	.29
zero-sum game																1	.52	.51*
Reactive Reporting																	1	.18*
No post-conflict Reportig																		1

*p value < .05, **p value < .01.

reporting and reporting on past (r = .67), reporting diversity and psychological aspects of a conflict (r = .56) and proactive reporting and focusing on non-elites (r = .52).

Correlations within war journalism practices. Similarly, the various war journalism practices are correlated with each other to a greater extent. Journalists who considered it important to report on casualties also thought it was important to report on damages to infrastructure (r = .52) and highlight the perspectives of elites (r = .42). Likewise, journalists who believed that reporting on material damage was essential also considered that elitist perspectives were important for them (r = .54). Similarly, journalists who were likely to adopt an elite-dominated approach also favored to report on the existing scenario in a conflict (r = .58). Similarly, journalists who were likely to stop reporting when conflicts were over also indicated to report more material damage (r = .61). Those who focused more on reactive reporting were likely to focus on elites (r = .65) and present conflicts in winning and losing terms (r = .51). Finally, those who were likely to reduce conflicts to wining-losing scenario were more likely to report on the status quo (r = .64)

Correlations between war and peace journalism practices. As the Table 1 shows, a number of war and peace journalism practices have statistically significant correlation with each other. For example, the peace journalism practice of willingness to report on the sociocultural practices is related with four war journalism practices including highlighting the perspectives of elites (r = .58) and reporting on casualties in the conflicts (r = .43). Similarly, the peace journalism practice of reporting on the psychological issues is moderately related with the war journalism practices like elite-oriented approach (r = .42), reporting material damage (r = .41) and reporting casualties (r = .38). Those journalists who considered reporting on non-elites important also valued five war journalism practices including reporting on elites (r = .52), reporting deaths and injuries (r = .46), reporting on events as these occur (r = .46) focusing on the differences among the antagonists (r = .42). Moreover, we found from strong to moderate correlations between the journalists' desire to report on the past and a number of war journalism practices like reporting on elites (r = .69), adopting a dichotomous approach (r = .46) and reporting on the material damages (r = .35). Likewise, presenting diversity is strongly correlated with zero-sum approach (r = .58) and proactive reporting positively and moderately related with no past conflict reporting (r = .48). Moreover, there are a number of negative but strong to moderate correlations between the various practices of war and peace journalism. As shown in the table, reporting on similarities among conflict stakeholders is negatively correlated with focusing on elites (r = −.47), presenting the status quo (r = −.62) and reducing conflict to just two groups (r = −.42).

Comparison with Neumann and Fahmy study (2016). When compared with the past study, we found more significant correlations in the present study. Within peace

journalism category, our study showed 25 significant correlations as compared to 14 correlations in the Neumann and Fahmy study (2016). Similarly, within war journalism practices, the present study found 14 significant correlations when compared to the just 8 correlations in the past study. Moreover, between war and peace journalism practices, we found 33 significant correlations as compared to 23 significant correlations. However, it could not be interpreted that journalists in our sample engaged in more diverse practices. It occurred mainly due to the larger sample that we applied as compared to the past study. When we conducted item-by-item comparison of the r-coefficients between the two studies, generally we found strong correlations between practices that were statistically significant in both studies as compared to practices that were not significant either in the present or past studies. For example, the correlation between socio-cultural and psychological damage is statistically significant in both studies and show strong correlation. Similarly, the correlation between socio-cultural damage and similarities among groups is weak because it is not statistically significant in the past study.

However, there are few exceptions to this pattern. For instance, within peace journalism practices, two correlations (proactive reporting and presenting diversity and post-conflict reporting and presenting diversity) are strongly correlated in our study despite statistically not significant in the previous study (see Table 1). Similarly, within war journalism practices, except for one strong correlation between material damage and focusing on elites, for rest of all the correlations, there are weak to moderate correlations among practices that are not significant in the previous study. Finally, between war and peace journalism practices, except for three strong correlations in our study (post-conflict reporting and casualty reporting, reporting material damage and post-conflict reporting and framing dichotomies and reporting on past) which were statistically not significant in the past study, for rest of all the correlations, we found weak or moderate correlations even if these were not significant in the Neumann and Fahmy study (2016).

R.H.1a: Journalists are more likely to engage in active war journalism as compared to passive war journalism.

R.H.2b: Journalists are more likely to engage in passive peace journalism as compared to active peace journalism.

As shown in the above Table 2, the five dominant peace journalism indicators include highlighting the perspectives of non-elites (Mean = 4.83, SD = .49), focusing on trauma and psychological effects in the aftermath of violent conflicts (Mean = 4.67, SD = .53), sociocultural impact of violence (Mean = 4.47, SD = .59), reporting on post-conflict scenario (Mean = 4.38, SD = .68) and presenting diverse viewpoints (Mean = 4.12, SD = .76.). These practices are usually included in the passive peace journalism framework because these do not impose or iterate a peace advocacy rather these are mere parts of responsible journalism practices (Lynch, 2008). Such practices are important in the overall scheme of peace journalism but

Table 2. Preferences for active and passive war and peace journalism.

Peace journalism practices		War journalism practices	
Indictors	Mean (Standard deviation	indicators	Mean (standard deviation)
Focus on non-elites	4.83 (.49)	Reporting casualties	4.90 (.41)
Psychological damages	4.67 (.53)	Material damage	4.82 (.46)
Socio-cultural damages	4.47 (.59)	Focus on elites	4.50 (.64)
Post-conflict reporting	4.38 (.68)	Framing dichotomies	4.03 (.78)
Presenting diversity	4.12 (.76)	Reporting differences	3.88 (.83)
Proactive reporting	3.89 (.82)	No post-conflict reporting	3.72 (1.07)
Reporting past	3.72 (.87)	Reactive reporting	3.59 (.92)
Projecting future	3.57 (.92)	Presenting status quo	3.31 (1.13)
Discussing similarities	3.53 (.94)	Reporting zero-sum-game	3.24 (.97)
Average agreement	4.26	Average agreement	4.14

these do not constitute the core of the approach (Lee, 2010). On the other hand, the four remaining practices including proactive reporting (Mean = 3.89, SD = .82), reporting historical context (Mean = 3.72, SD = .92), projecting future scenario (Mean = 3.57, SD .92) and reporting on the commonalities among the conflicting parties are more directly related with active peace journalism (Lee, 2010; Hussain 2020b).

On the other hand, among the five dominate war journalism practices, reporting on casualties (Mean = 4.90, SD = .41), damages to infrastructure and property (Mean = 4.82, SD = .46), highlighting the perspectives of political and military officials (Mean = 4.50, SD = .64), reporting on conflicts in terms of us versus them (Mean = 4.03, SD = .78) and reporting on the differences between the conflicting parties (Mean 3.88, SD .83) are included. Apart from the first two indicators that are part of professional reporting (Kempf, 2017), the last three categories represent deviation from professionalism to propaganda and have the potential to escalate conflicts and hence agents of active war journalism (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005; Siaj et al., 2020). The least dominant indicators included no post-conflict reporting (Mean = 3.72, SD = 1.07), waiting for the violence to occur (Mean = 3.59, SD = .92), representing the status quo (Mean = 3.31, SD = 1.13) and reporting conflict as zero-sum oriented (Mean = 3.24, SD = .97). Apart from the last indicator that represents active war journalism, rest of the three indicators are part of the existing professional practices (Lynch, 2008, 2013).

Overall, both the war and peace journalism practices received almost equal treatment by the journalists as indicated by the average agreements. Interestingly, as the Table 2 shows, both the four key indicators of war and peace journalism indicators are fairly equally distributed. For rest of the indicators, peace journalism practices enjoy more favorable attitude as compared to the war journalism practices. RH1a and RH1b are supported.

Table 3a. Preferences for peace journalism in terms of experience.

Indictors	Less-experienced journalists (146) Mean (Standard deviation	Experienced journalists (126) Mean (standard deviation)	t Test p Values
Focus on non-elites	4.77 (.44)	4.67 (.57)	NS
Psychological damages	4.69 (.49)	4.84 (.47)	P <.05
Socio-cultural damages	4. 52 (.56)	4.42 (.54)	NS
Post-conflict reporting	4.43 (.71)	4.33 (.62)	NS
Presenting diversity	4.06 (1.07)	4.17 (.71)	P <.05
Proactive reporting	3.76 (.96)	3.92 (1.02)	NS
Reporting past	3.64 (.84)	3.66 (.81)	NS
Projecting future	3.45 (.98)	3.46 (.88)	NS
Discussing similarities	3.38 (.1.03)	3.43 (1.11)	NS
Average agreement	4.21	4.32	NS

R.H.2a: Experienced journalists are more likely to engage in peace journalism practices as compared to less experienced journalists.

R.H.2b: Experienced journalists are less likely to engage in war journalism practices as compared to less experienced journalists.

As shown in the Table 3A, overall, the two groups of journalists shared similar perspectives towards peace journalism. Based on the *t test,* just two practices showed significantly difference results. Journalists having more than 10 years of experience indicated to emphasize the psychological aspects in the conflicts (Mean = 4.84, SD = .47) as compared to those who had lesser experience (Mean = 4.69, SD = .49). Similarly, experienced journalists indicated to report on the diverse issues in the conflicts (Mean 4.17, SD = .71) as compared with the less experienced journalists (Mean = 4.06, SD = 1.07).

Similarly, as shown in the Table 3B, overall the two groups of journalists shared similar perspectives towards war journalism. Based on the *t test,* out of the total of nine war journalism practices, we found only significant differences only among three indicators. Experienced journalists said they would not report on the good versus bad framing (Mean = 4.24, SD = .63) as compared to the less experienced journalists (Mean = 4.43, SD = .72). Interestingly experienced journalists favored reporting on the differences among the conflicting parties (Mean = 4.56 SD = .57) as compared to their less experienced counterparts (Mean = 4.08, SD = .87). The third significant difference between the two categories of journalists was found in the status quo practice. Less experienced journalists frequently indicated to concentrate on the present situation (Mean = 3.54, SD = .95) as compared to experienced journalists (Mean = 3.27, SD = 1.05). The hypothesis is not supported.

Table 3b. Preferences for war journalism in terms of experience.

War journalism practices for under 5 years of experience (146)		War journalism practices for 10 years of experience (126)		
Indictors	Mean (Standard deviation	Indicators	Mean (standard deviation)	t Test p Values
Reporting casualties	4.88 (.43)	Reporting casualties	4.94 (.47)	NS
Material damage	4.85 (.52	Material damage	4.87 (.53)	NS
Focus on elites	4.79 (.68)	Focus on elites	4.85 (.61)	NS
Framing dichotomies	4.43 (.72)	Framing dichotomies	4.24 (.63)	P <.05
Reporting differences	4.08 (.87)	Reporting differences	4.56 (.57)	P <.05
No post-conflict reporting	3.95 (.88)	No post-conflict reporting	4.12 (.72)	NS
Reactive reporting	3.77 (1.09)	Reactive reporting	3.45 (.98)	NS
Presenting status quo	3.54 (.95)	Presenting status quo	3.27 (1.05)	P <.05
Reporting zero-sum-game	2.83 (.93)	Reporting zero-sum-game	3.03 (1.14)	NS
Average agreement	4.37	Average agreement	4.28	NS

Table 4a. Peace journalism indicators across the selected countries.

PJ indicators	Pakistan (97) Mean (SD)	Afghanistan(105) Mean (SD)	Iraq (115) Mean (SD)	ANOVA (P values)
Focus on non-elites	4.51 (.51)	4.82 (.50)	4.79 (.58)	NS
Psychological damages	4.46[a] (.58)	4.76[b] (.60)	4.77[b] (.61)	P <.05
Socio-cultural damages	4.30 (.67)	4.71 (.62)	4.67 (.66)	NS
Post-conflict reporting	4.11[a] (.73)	4.54[b] (.70)	4.58[b] (.71)	P <.05
Presenting diversity	3.99 (.86)	4.48 (.73)	4.43 (1.06)	NS
Proactive reporting	3.72 (.89)	4.19 (.79)	4.36 (.77)	NS
Reporting past	3.45[a] (1.12)	4.07[b] (.86)	4.03[b] (.88)	P <.05
Projecting future	3.28 (.94)	3.52 (1.10)	3.76 (.93)	NS
Discussing similarities	3.11 (.98)	3.73 (.91)	3.44 (.95)	NS
Average agreement	3. 53 (4.22)	3.62 (4.38)	3.74 (4.47)	NS

Note. Higher means represent more adherence to peace journalism. Standard deviations are noted in parentheses. Different superscripts (a, b, or c) indicate statistically significant differences in Tukey's post hoc tests. Differences in means with the same superscript are not statistically significant.

R.H.3: Journalists in Pakistan are more likely to engage in war journalism practices as compared to journalists in Iraq and Afghanistan

As shown in the Table 4A, overall the three groups of journalists in the countries shared similar perspectives towards peace journalism approach. Based on a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), we found three out of nine practices were significantly different. Journalists in Pakistan were less frequently inclined to

Table 4b. War journalism indicators across the selected countries.

Wj indicators	Pakistan (97) M(SD)	Afghanistan (105) M(SD)	Iraq (115) M(SD)	Significance ANOVA
Reporting casualties	4.92 (.58)	4.88 (.62)	4.85 (.67)	NS
Material damage	4.46 (.66)	4.72 (.64)	4.81 (.69)	NS
Focus on elites	4.43^a (.69)	4.13^b (.76)	4.04^c (.83)	P<05
Framing dichotomies	4.31^a (.74)	3.88^b (.84)	3.98^b (1.17)	P<05
Reporting differences	4.16^a (.82)	3.58^b (1.03)	3.43^b (.92)	P<05
No post-conflict reporting	3.86 (1.12)	3.24 (.91)	3.36 (.95)	NS
Reactive reporting	3.79 (1.04)	4.16 (.75)	3.99 (.93)	NS
Presenting status quo	3.28 (.92)	3.85 (1.09)	3.67 (.88)	NS
Reporting zero-sum-game	3.14 (1.13)	3.12 (.89)	3.31 (.84)	NS
Average agreement	3. 67 (4.36)	3.76 (4.48)	3.81 (4.52)	NS

Note: Higher means represent more adherence to war journalism. Standard deviations are noted in parentheses. Different superscripts (a, b, or c) indicate statistically significant differences in Tukey's post hoc tests. Differences in means with the same superscript are not statistically significant.

emphasize the psychological aspects of the violence (Mean = 4.46, SD = .58) as compared to journalists in Afghanistan (Mean = 4.76, SD = .60) and Iraq (Mean = 4.77, SD = .61). Similarly, journalists in Pakistan were less inclined to report on the aftermaths of conflicts (Mean = 4.11, SD = .73) as compared to journalists in Afghanistan (Mean 4.54, SD = .70) and Iraq (Mean = 4.58, SD = .71). Finally, journalists in Pakistan considered reporting on the historical context of conflicts (Mean = 3.45, SD = 1.12) as compared to journalists both in Afghanistan (Mean = 4.07, SD = .86) and Iraq (Mean = 4.03, SD = .88). According to Tukey's post hoc test, the mean comparisons of the Pakistani group with each of the Afghani and Iraqi groups were statistically significant, but the difference was not significant between Afghani and Iraqi journalists. Barring these differences, cumulatively, however there is no significant difference among the three groups in terms of inclination towards peace journalism practices. So, the hypothesis is partly supported.

Finally, as the Table 4B shows, overall the three groups of journalists shared similar perspectives towards war journalism approach. Based on *a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)*, we found just three out of nine practices that were significantly different. Journalists in Pakistan were more likely to emphasize the activities of elites (Mean = 4.43, SD = .69) as compared to journalists in Afghanistan (Mean 4.13, SD = .76) and Iraq (Mean 4.04, SD = .83). Moreover, journalists in Pakistan favored a more dichotomous approach towards conflicts (Mean = 4.31, SD = .74) than Afghanistan (Mean = 3.88, SD = .84) and Iraq (Mean = 3.98, SD = 1.17). Likewise, journalists in Pakistan were more likely to report on the differences among conflicting parties (Mean = 4.16, SD = .82) as compared to Afghanistan (Mean = 3.58, SD (1.03) and Iraq (Mean 3.43, SD, .92). According to Tukey's post hoc test, for the elite orientation coverage, differences among all the three groups were significant. However, for rest of the

indicators including dichotomous approach and differences-oriented coverage, the mean comparisons of the Pakistani group with each of the Afghani and Iraqi groups were statistically significant, but the difference was not significant between Afghani and Iraqi journalists. Despite these differences, cumulatively, however there is no significant difference among the three groups in terms of inclination towards war journalism practices. So, the hypothesis is partly supported.

Discussion and conclusion

In this study we investigated the perceptions of conflict reporters towards war and peace journalism approach by applying the measuring index developed by Neumann and Fahmy (2016). Barring minor exceptions, overall we found support for the key findings of their study that journalistic perceptions were spread across the practices within war and peace journalism approach. For example journalists are likely to report on the visible aspects of a conflict like deaths and injuries but also believe reporting on the invisible aspects like socio-cultural and psychological conditions is important. Similarly, journalists think including the voices of common people is important but at the same time they would give due coverage to the perspectives of elite sources. Likewise, journalists are likely to explore diverse options for reporting that have the potential to bring closer the antagonistic groups and at the same time may further them by focusing on differences and presenting a conflict in terms of winning as the only option.

    As discussed in the findings section, the present study found an extensive range of correlations between the various practices but it was mainly due to the larger sample. In item-by-item comparison of correlation strength and direction, we found strong correlations for practices, which were significant in both studies and weak to moderate correlations for practices, which were not significant in the past study. This indicates there exist a range of practices that are generally applied by journalists. However, we found six additional strong correlations (as discussed in the findings) that are not patterned in this line.

    Overall, these findings support the arguments of several researchers (Tenenboim-Weinblatt et al., 2015: XXX, 2020) who criticized the dichotomous nature of war and peace journalism frames. They argued that unlike as outlined in the Galtung model, most of the attributes of conflict journalism are spread somewhere in-between that highlights both war and peace journalism. In a number of content analyses studies, scholars found presence of both war and peace journalism (Fahmy and Eakin, 2014; Lee, 2010; Lynch, 2018). In analyzing the Taliban conflict, Siraj (2019) found that though war journalism was dominant in the Pak-Afghan press, there was a significant amount of peace journalism as well. In fact in an earlier essay, Galtung (2006) agreed that most of the conflict coverage lie somewhere in-between the contending categories of war and peace journalism. This is generally ascribed to the particular nature of journalistic profession where researchers are concerned to report on the incidents in a conflict as well as its impact on the people (İnceoğlu and Tirşe, 2018; Youngblood, 2016). Shoemaker

and Reese (2014) have outlined the whole range of factors that influence media content including individual factors, media routines, organizational structures, extra-media forces, and ideological factors. Similarly, a number of other researchers (Bläsi, 2004; Hussain and Siraj, 2019; Tenenboim-Weinblatt et al., 2015) have debated on the context-specific factors that influence reporting of conflicts either towards escalation or de-escalation.

These findings have important theoretical and practical implications for peace journalism. Theoretically, it supports the critical pragmatic perspective where journalists actively negotiate with the structures to perform their duties. While most of the times, the structure dominates over the agency; the journalistic agency is still relevant. Journalists enjoy considerable influence by maneuvering through uncharted territories to pose challenges to the authorities but at the same time are pragmatic enough to not to violate redlines enforced by the elites.

Similarly, for the implementation of the peace journalism, the study suggests some of the practices of war journalism can be adopted to make it compatible with the considerations of professional journalism. For example, it is for hard for a journalist to resist reporting on casualties and damage to infrastructures even if one subscribes to the peace journalism approach. Likewise, during violent conflicts, people usually look to elites and officials to handle the situation. In this case, omitting elite voices from public discourse do not seem feasible. But this comes with a cost—elites usually dominate the discourse due to their superiority in producing news. Journalists can be trained in asking good critical questions to ward against official propaganda (Lynch and Galtung, 2010).

In the same vein, depending on the context of a conflict, some of the other practices of war journalism can be borrowed that do not deviate much from the core objectives of peace journalism. An important contribution of this study is the distinction between various types of war and peace journalism. As discussed in the first two related research hypotheses, the salient peace journalism indicators are passive in nature as compared to the salient indicators of active war journalism. The emphasis on sociocultural and psychological aspects during conflict are very much part of the journalistic values of highlighting the human-interest aspects and are not limited to peace journalism. Though the people-oriented coverage is important in the overall scheme of peace journalism (Lynch, 2008) but it not equal to the other indicators like proactive reporting, multi-perspectival approach and calling for peace by focusing on the commonalities among the conflict stakeholders. On the other hand, three of the preferred war journalism indicators including highlighting the perspectives of political and military officials, dichotomous approach and emphasis on differences between conflict parties have the potential to escalate conflicts due to their propagandist tendencies (Lynch, 2008; Lee, 2010; in press). Active war journalism is a clear departure from the tenets of good professional journalism (Kempf, 2017) and usually occurs due to pressures on journalists from the powerful elites and their own ethnocentric approach (Baden and Tenenboim-Weinblatt, 2018). In this regard, despite journalists' preferences for certain indicators in both war and peace journalism, we found that the journalists

perceived active war journalism more valuable as compared to passive peace journalism that ultimately put the balance in favor of war journalism approach.

We also investigated the relationship between journalistic experience and perceptions about peace journalism. As the findings suggests the two groups of journalists did not significantly differ from each other in terms of war and peace journalism. This challenges the optimism expressed by peace journalism scholars that more time in profession would convince journalists to opt for peace journalism practices (Abunales, 2016; Lynch and Galtung, 2010; Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005; Neumann and Fahmy, 2016). For example, Lynch and Galtung (2010) argued that experienced journalists develop influential agency over time in the news organization and extensive time in the conflict arena help them better understand the complex nature of a conflict scenario to produce more peace journalism. However, this did not happen in this case. One major reason is journalists as members of a society imbibe the same socio-psychological dispositions as others. In case of conflicts, the professional roles are dominated by the societal roles to become patriotic citizens and hence journalists community more or less behave in similar ways (Hanitzch and Vos, 2017).

Finally, we found that despite no clear differences among the journalists in the three countries towards war and peace journalism practices, journalists in Pakistan were more inclined towards war journalism in few respects. For example they showed relatively higher preference for elite-oriented and dichotomous approaches. Being a former colony, Pakistan inherited a British style of objective journalism. Peace journalism scholars maintain that objectivity leads to war journalism due to its preferences for artificial balancing, elite sources and event based reporting (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005). Additionally, the contexts of the three countries are important. Unlike Afghanistan and Iraq that were saw bloody civil wars after the US invasions, terrorism in Pakistan was limited to just northwest of the country. Mainland Pakistan was not affected to a greater extent. Being a nuclear power and having strong military, Taliban were defeated soon and the center was able to establish its writ. Public opinion was strongly anti-Taliban and they were considered enemy group and hence the journalists openly taking us versus them approach (XXX).

This study has a number of limitations. First, we relied on purposive sampling to select respondents due to lack of funds, shortage of time and more importantly busy schedules and at times unsupportive attitudes of journalists. A well-representative sampling is needed to enquire about journalistic war and peace performances. Second, we used just one questionnaire item for each of the 18 constructs in the war and peace journalism model. Measures could be expanded and refined to more holistically capture the indicators. Journalists usually give exaggerated opinions about their profession. Methodological innovations like reconstructed interviews and differentiation between role orientation and role performance should be introduced for more robust analysis of journalistic attitude. This study could be conducted in other countries with similar media environments to analyze how and to what extent various practices of war and peace overlap and how these are influenced by media system and contextual factors in conflicts. For

example, conflicts vary to a greater extent in terms of perceived threats to national security and constraints on journalists. It would be interesting to compare the war and peace attributes in less violent and more violent conflicts and relate these with the production process for a more comprehensive study on the potential of peace journalism. In this study, we analyzed active and passive types of peace journalism. Future studies can further deconstruct these attributes from low to medium to high potential in terms of their war and peace potential. Furthermore, in our study we did not analyze war and peace journalism preferences with respect to gender, as our sample was heavily male. A more gender-balanced sample might produce different results from ours. Likewise, familiarity with peace journalism approach should be examined. Those familiar with the concept might perceive it differently as compared to those who are unfamiliar with it despite having good amount of experience in conflict reporting. Last but not the least, future studies should also take some macro-level variables as independent variables into account to determine the distribution of war and peace journalism indicators. A good starting point would be to apply the scholarship on role perception and role performance on peace journalism. Some scattered evidence in the literature suggests that despite best intentions of journalists to do peace journalism, they are unable to practice it (Siraj, 2018; Lynch, 2019; XXX). However, more systematic analysis is required. In this connection, studies on journalistic role conceptions by scholars like are relevant. Hanitzch (2017) distributes journalistic roles in four categories—normative, cognitive, practiced, and narrated roles that are based on distinct conceptual foundations: what journalists ought to do, what they want to do, what they really do in practice, and what they think they do (Hanitzch, 2017). Studies based on these formulations would significantly contribute to the peace journalism scholarship as a valuable academic approach and practicable strategy for journalists in conflict areas.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

ORCID iDs

Shabir Hussain 🔟 https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6485-0942
Araz Ramazan Ahmad 🔟 https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4350-1086

References

Allan S and Zelizer B (eds) (2004) *Reporting War: Journalism in Wartime*. London, Routledge.

Armoudian M (2017) The frame changers: Journalists, the conflict, and peace process. *Irish Political Studies* 33(3): 354–380. DOI: 10.1080/07907184.2017.1411345

Baden C and Tenenboim-Weinblatt K (2018) The search for common ground in conflict news research: Comparing the coverage of six current conflicts in domestic and international media over time. *Media, War & Conflict 2018* 11(1): 22–45.

Bläsi B (2004) Peace journalism and the news production process. *Conflict & Communication Online* 3(1,2): 10–11.

Carruthers SL (2011) *The Media at War*. Chichester: Palgrave Macmillan.

Crawford N and Lutz C (2019) Human cost of post-9/11 wars: Direct war deaths in major war zones, Afghanistan and Pakistan (October 2001–October 2019) Iraq (March 2003–October 2019). Available at: https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/files/cow/imce/papers/2019/Direct%20War%20Deaths%20COW%20Estimate%20November%2013%202019%20FINAL.pdf (accessed 23 April 2021).

Fahmy S and Eakin B (2014) High drama on the high seas: Peace versus war journalism framing of an Israeli/Palestinian-related incident. *International Communication Gazette* 76(1): 86–105.

Fahmy S and Johnson T (2012) Invasion vs. occupation: A trend analysis of how embeds assess influences and performance in covering the Iraq war. *International Communication Gazette* 74(1): 23–42.

Fahmy S, et al. (2016) *DAESH Information Campaign and its Influence*. Riga, Latvia: NATO StratCom Centre of Excellence.

Fawcett L (2002) Why peace journalism isn't news. *Journalism Studies* 3(2): 213–223.

Fröhlich R (2019) *Media in War and Armed Conflict: The Dynamics of Conflict News Production and Dissemination*. London: Routledge.

Galtung J (1998) High road, low road: Charting the course for peace journalism. *Track Two* 7: 7–10.

Hussain, S. (2020a). Peace journalism for conflict reporting: Insights from Pakistan. *Journalism Practice, 14*(1), 1–16.

Hussain, S. (2020b). Analyzing media -government relations on policy issues in the semi-democratic milieu of Pakistan. *Journalism*, 1464884920969086.

İnceoğlu YG and Tirşe EF (2018) *Journalism 'a Peacekeeping Agent' at the Time of Conflict*. Netherland: Brill.

Kempf W (2017) Towards a theory and (better) practice of peace journalism. *Conflict & Communication Online* 16(2).

Lee ST (2010) Peace journalism: Principles and structural limitations in the news coverage of three conflicts. *Mass Communication and Society* 13(4): 361–384.

Lynch J (2014) *A Global Standard for Reporting Conflict*. New York: Routledge.

Lynch J (2015) Peace journalism: Theoretical and methodological developments. *Global Media and Communication* 11(3): 193–199.

Lynch, J., & Galtung, J. (2010). *Reporting conflict: New directions in peace journalism*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Lynch J and McGoldrick A (2005) *Peace Journalism*. Stroud: Hawthorn Press.

Mitra S (2016) Socio-cultural contexts and peace journalism: A case for meso-level comparative sociological investigation of journalistic cultures. *Journalism* 25(4): 1–17.

Neumann R and Shahira F (2016) Measuring journalistic peace/war performance: An exploratory study of crisis reporters' attitudes and perceptions. *International Communication Gazette* 78(3): 223–246.

Peleg S (2007) In defense of peace journalism: A rejoinder. *Conflict and Communication Online* 6(2): 1–9.

Rodny-Gumede Y (2016) Awareness towards peace journalism among foreign correspondents in Africa. *Media and Communication* 4(1): 80–93.

Ross SD and Tehranian M (2008) *Peace Journalism in Times of War, Peace and Policy*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Shaw I, Lynch J and Hackett RA (2011) *Expanding Peace Journalism: Comparative and Critical Approaches*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Shinar D (2009) Can peace journalism make progress? The coverage of the 2006 Lebanon war in Canadian and Israeli media. *International Communication Gazette* 71(6): 451–125.

Siraj S (2019) Coverage of Taliban conflict in the Pak–Afghan press: A comparative analysis. *International Communication Gazette* 81(5): 1–22.

Tehranian M (2002) Peace journalism: Negotiating global media ethics. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 7(2): 58–83.

The Express Tribune (2015) 80,000 Pakistanis killed in US 'War on Terror'. Available at: https://tribune.com.pk/story/860790/80000-pakistanis-killed-in-us-war-on-terror-report/ (accessed 23 April 2021).

Wolfsfeld G (2004) *Media and the Path to Peace*. Cambridge: University Press.

Youngblood S (2016) *Peace Journalism Principles and Practice: Reporting Conflicts, Reconciliation, and Solutions*. London: Routledge.