

# **Coverage of India as Most Favored Nation (MFN) in editorial pages of Pakistani leading National dailies**

Shah Nawaz

## ***Abstract***

*The news contents of daily Jang and the daily Nation were analyzed on framing of “Most Favored Nation” (MFN) status to India by Pakistan. The study was done for testing empirically the perception of common Pakistani citizen about the daily Jang pro and the daily nation biased coverage of Indian trade relations. The framing of newspapers was analyzed through content analysis of editorials and columns of selected news papers in the timeline of six months from November 2011 to April 2012. Findings indicate that during whole period of study the daily Jang gave positive and the daily the Nation gave negative coverage to the issue.*

**Key words:** *Most favored nation, Daily Jang, Daily Nation, Framing, and Coverage*

## **Introduction**

The news of granting Most Favoured Nation (MFN) status to India becomes a central discussion among Indo-Pak relations experts from November 1, 2011, when Pakistan’s Information Minister Firdous Ashiq Awan stated that “the Federal cabinet had decided collectively to grant MFN status to India” ( Huma, 2011). All the Pakistan’s newspapers gave special space to the issue in their front and editorial pages. At November 3, it was the banner headline of the daily Jang “Federal cabinet has granted MFN status to India” (“Federal Cabinet has granted”, 2011). Similar coverage has given by other newspapers. The focus of all the coverage was whether Pakistan should grant MFN status to India or not.

After the partition of sub-continent both countries Pakistan and India fought three wars (1947-48, 1965, and 1971) and at least four occasions 1987, 1990, 1999 and 2002, they were at the edge of a major armed conflict. In the history of Indo-Pak relations, there is rare time period when bilateral relations are normal.

As Indo-Pak trade relations have passed through several phases and oscillations over the last six decade’s period. Bilateral Trade have held hostage to the politics of both nations. “Trade relations between India and Pakistan have been influenced to a large extent by their political relations” (Taneja, 2007). Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh said “If there is cooperation between Pakistan and India and not conflict, vast opportunities will open up for trade, travel and development that will create prosperity in both countries” (Flamenbaum & Neville, 2011).

After the 1965 war both countries minimize trade with each other, whoever it was technically a wrong decision. According to trade point of view, trade with neighboring countries is more beneficial as compare to the trade with other world. It is an international perception about regional trades that smaller countries have enjoyed more advantages

than larger ones, so the benefits of Indo-Pak trade will be in the favor of Pakistan. As both Pakistani and Indian have similarity in tastes and preferences, Indo-Pak trade will create some potential for trading domestic items those are not trading with other countries. Pakistani textiles and food processing items have a ready market in north India because of similarity in tastes and preferences (Sayeed, 2001).

Both are neighboring countries share maximum border with each other, it will minimize transport costs which will reduce the product price, compared to other world. Low product price will increase bilateral trade opportunities. Pakistani processed spices and garments, especially lawn equally famous in India it have huge market there. India is the fastest growing economy of the world, trading with India is not only case of huge inflow of investment in Pakistan but it will reduce unit value of industrial product (Sayeed, 2001).

Starting trade with India is very profitable for those who already export to Pakistan through third country routes. It will save their transportation costs. Trading with India in energy sector is need of time, Pakistan is facing energy crises, and this can be overcome by importing electricity from India. India wish to import gas from Central Asia and the Middle East it will open new opportunity for Pakistan generating profit by providing transit route to India.

In Pakistan there are many political, economic, and religious groups, who opposed trade relation with India; they express their views on the basis of their concern about Indo-Pak trade balance, which is in the favor of India. Pakistani exporters claim that Indian custom creates some discriminatory obstacles in Pakistani export, they delay clearing goods, and very hard checking of goods creates technical problems like uncovering, repacking etc. Critics argue that existence of NTBs (Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade) by Indian government on Pakistani export reduces the advantages of MFN status of Pakistan by Indian.

Under restriction and NTBs, in 2008, trade between both countries was \$2 billion; it was equal to the one percent of each country's overall trade. (Flamenbaum & Neville, 2011). According to an estimate the trade potential between both states is approximately more than \$20 billion. Experts of trade say if Pakistan grants MFN status to India, SAFTA and WTO (World Trade Organization) will force India to remove anti-trade practices. (Sayeed, 2001)

The two neighbors had nuance trade relations which has held hostage to the conflict. Although bilateral trade between the two countries has increased in recent years, obstacles remained in the realization of trade potential between both nations. India has already granted Pakistan MFN status in 1996, but events after that and particularly after 9/11, were against the spirit of bilateralism or even good neighborly relationship. In the Pakistan's side bilateral trade relations are taken in the light of basic conflicts and ideological clashes. However, the MFN is equally beneficial for both the nations.

In the field of economics and international trade, (MFN) is a status of treatment accorded by one state to another in international trade. The term means the country which is the beneficiary of this treatment must, nominally, receive equal trade advantages as the

"Most Favoured Nation" by the country granting such treatment, these Trade advantages are low tariffs or high import quotas. In fact a country that has been accorded MFN status may not be treated fewer beneficiaries than any other country with MFN status by the promising country (Asad Sayeed, 2011).

Composite Dialogue Process between India and Pakistan started after the one year of Indian announcement of MFN status for Pakistan in 1996. The Nawaz Sharif regime had unique relationship with India from 1997 to 1999, except for the bad space of Kargil conflict. During this tenure Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee visited Pakistan and made a very strong Indian commitment for a better mutual relationship between India and Pakistan. Even being a businessman Pakistani Prime Minister having 2/3rd majority in the Parliament, Nawaz sharif did not grant MFN status to India. Indeed, India came closer to Pakistan for first time in the whole history of Indo-Pak relation in that period. What were the reservations and logics of government behind not giving India as MFN status, however, of that time, Pakistan also wanted to enhance trade and business with India?

When Foreign Minister Hina Rabbani Khar announced that Pakistan had made a principled decision to grant Most Favoured Nation (MFN) status to India from December 2012, it became a controversial issue among think tanks, different media groups and media analysts. Different reaction came after this decision as Firdous Ashiq Awan said, "We are fully stands by our principle stance on Kashmir issue. Despite granting MFN status to India, Pakistan will never move by its stance on Kashmir" (Pakistan raises India trade links, 2011). Some opposition leaders and local businessmen said, granting MFN status to India will destroy our local industry.

Life style of people, culture and language of both sides is similar. After the independence both states were depend on mutual trade and enjoy bilateral trade, As the time passes the distance between Islamabad and New Delhi increases. It affects the mutual trade and MFN status on both sides. Different analysts express that there are some issues between both states which affects mutual trade and MFN. These conflicts are the following.

Territorial conflicts

Water issue, Indian construction of more than 100 dams

Trade problems

### **Territorial conflicts**

Before the separation of Sub-Continent both states were combined, when in 1447, the region was divided in to two different independent countries both the sides have different point of view on some princely states and divide of province Panjab. This distribution give birth three main territorial disputes Sir Creek, kargil and Kashmir between Pakistan and India.

### **Sir Creek dispute**

Sir Creek is located in Rann of kutch marshlands, divide Pakistan's Sindh province and Indian Gujarat state. It's called 'Baan Ganga' by local Indian. It opens up into the [Arabian Sea](#) with 60 mil strip of water (Pokharel, 2009). Before the independence Kutch was a princely state of combine India. In 1914 agreement was sign between the government of Sindh and the sole ruler of kutch, Rao Maharaj. According to the agreement the region of katch became the part on Sindh. Now Pakistan claims that on whole region of kutch (Sir Creek, n.d.).

## **Kargil Dispute**

It was the part of Ladakh, the district of Baltistan before the partition of Sub-Continent of India. Now Kargil is the district of Kashmir, situated on the Line of Control (LoC). India and Pakistan fought first war in this region, right after their independence in 1948. Then in period of General Muhammad zia-ul-haq india move the solders on the peak of the mountain region. The new position can target Pakistan's civil and military area. In 1999 pakistan and india fought another war on totally ice covered and highest war field of the world (Kargil War, n.d.). As General (r) Pervez Musharraf has said that the Kargil War was to boosted the cause of Kashmir's people (Mir, 2013)

## **Kashmir issue**

Kashmir is considered as jugular vein of Pakistan, on the other hand India acknowledge Kashmir as its integral part (Atoot Ang). It is the root cause of insecurity and hostility in the region; both the nations fought two major wars and come across to war on several occasions. It has direct affects on economic and social development in one of the world's poorest regions. Solution of Kashmir dispute has become an immediate priority for better future of more than 1.5 billion human in South Asia. (Ganguly, 1998).

More than six decades, mutual relations between Pakistan and India are strongly influenced by the Kashmir dispute. According to UN resolution People of Kashmir have right to choose India or Pakistan, this is the Pakistan stance on the issue (Group, 2012).

After the partition of sub-continent, peace between both neighbors has been challenged by different territorial issues. The Kashmir dispute is the main cause of hostility between Pakistan and India. The root of Kashmir issue started from independence of Pakistan and India, according to British rules for independence all the rulers of princely state have right either they join with India or with Pakistan or they remain independent. British Viceroy to India Lord Mount Batten made it clear to the rulers of princely state that they must join either India or Pakistan. He neglected the option of stay independent in the Congress pressure.

Hyderabad, Junagadh and Kashmir did not join either India or Pakistan before 15 August 1947. Now all these states were independent, but India forced Hyderabad and Junagadh to join with India (Ganguly, 1998). Nature of Kashmir was different from other, it was important for both countries because of its ideological and geo-strategic reasons. All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference leader Ghulam Abbas wanted to join Kashmir with Pakistan but All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference led by Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, was a secular party, they wanted to create a secular independent Kashmir. Maharaja Hari Singh, wished to become ruler of independent Kashmir, on other hand Pakistan and India claim on Kashmir; here the conflict started between the nations (Ganguly, 1998).

## **Water Distribution Dispute**

Distribution of water between Pakistan and India have done under Indus Waters Treaty (IWT), this agreement was sign between both states in 1960, according to the treaty India will exclusively use rivers Beas, Ravi, and Sutlej while Pakistan will use Indus, Chenab and Jhelum but “India violate agreement by constructing numerous dams in the Indus River Basin, they are using more of the shared waters” (Group, 2012).

## **Objective of the study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate framing of the issue “granting India as Most Favored Nation (MFN) and analyze the editorial policy of the Pakistani leading National English and Urdu dailies about the issue. This research has been designed to attain following objectives

1. To find out extent of coverage given to India as MFN in leading newspaper
2. To find out the framing of MFN issue in selected newspapers
3. To investigate slant given by each newspaper

## **Statement of the Problem**

The intention of the study is to investigate the amount of coverage given to the issue of granting MFN status to India in editorial page of leading four national Urdu (daily Jang, daily Express) and English (daily Dawn, daily nation) newspapers. How the issue has been framed by the selected newspapers from the timeline of the November 1, 2011 to April 30, 2012 by assessing the relevant contents of Editorial Page, sampled by purposive method of Sampling, through Content Analysis. The difference between the opinions will also be measured between the selected newspapers by using Chi-square statistical test.

## **Research questions**

The research topic posits the following research questions which will be answered after Studying relevant literature.

1. To what extent newspapers gave coverage to the issue?
2. How the newspapers framed India as Most Favored Nation?
3. What was the difference of the coverage of the selected newspaper in term of slant and frames?

## **Rationale for choosing Timeline**

The news of granting MFN-status to the India becomes a central discussion among Indo-Pak relation experts from November 1, 2011. In the given time period media give coverage to the issue at high level as compared to the previous time. Visit of president Zardari was very important in progress of the issue that is the reason April 30 data include in the study. The rationale for choosing the selected timeline is to find out how the events within six month have been treated and how much coverage has been

given to the issue in the selected newspapers. A short chronology of events in the selected timeline is given below

## **Literature Review**

This study is performing under the guide line of framing theory to measure the framing effect on the content of newspapers. According to framing theory reflection of realities in media is not like the reflection of image on mirror. (Paxton, 2004) Media, instead of presenting reality, constructs it (Tuchman, 1978). As framing is the extension of agenda setting theory. According to Tuchman “the act of making news is the act of constructing reality itself rather than the portrayals of reality”.

The notion of framing comes from the agenda-setting tradition. It makes the research more interesting by focusing on the soul of issues at hand. The main concept of this theory is that the media focus on specific issue and then give it a certain meaning (Framing, n.d.)

Walter Lippmann was the first person who gave vague idea of framing in 1922, while writing on media power to manipulate people. He said people have limited experiences and understanding of outer world. Media present image of event and public accept it. This was a basic and simplest concept of framing. Erving Goffman (1974) expands the idea of framing by publishing a book “The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life”. In his work, he explains how individuals construct the meaning of outer world on the bases of framing working in their minds. He called individual framing as “schemata of interpretation.” He stated that individuals “locate, perceive, identify, and label” any phenomenon in outer world (Salzburg, 2010).

In 1972 two scientists Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw conduct a study on presidential campaign to measure the mass media effects on public opinion during the election 1968 of United State. They published their research in titled “The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media”. They study the effect of media information on voting decision of voters. This was the very initial and empirical study of framing theory.

Media persons (reporters and editors) sketch pattern of the news story for the readers (L K Tiung 2009). This pattern follows a theme that constructs each news item (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989; Pan and Kosicki, 1993). According to Pan and Kosicki (1993) these themes are “frames”. A very basic definition of framing is, a process fundamentally involves in selection and salience of topics. Goffman was the first who define framing as a “schemata of interpretation” that help individuals to “locate, perceive, identify and label” their life experiences (Goffman, 1974). Gamson (1989) states “A frame is a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and suggesting what is at issue” (p.157). According to Scheufele (1999) definition framing is “an idea that supplies a context and suggests what the issue is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion and elaboration” (p. 523).

A flood of Information reach to the media persons in raw form, before organizing Information in a frame it is meaningless, frame give meaning to the facts. Journalist arranges facts in a way that they produce meanings according to his/her perception. In framing research it is essential to understand how a media persons frame reality and

shape public opinion (Andsager & Smiley, 1998). A journalist's Presentation of issue depend upon the choice of frame, same issue can be differently frame. For example, "Life of the child" and "choice of the mother" are two different frames of same social issue "abortion" (Tankard, 2001).

Media shape public opinion by framing certain issues in specific way. (Claes H.de Vreese, 2005). This way of framing issues influences how audiences of the news came to understand those issues (Price, Tewksbury & Powers, 1995). Every person developed frames of reference to understand fresh information and he respond to every event according to it. In this way he organizes and defines the world around him. This block the process of redefining of experiences. According to Friedland and Zhong (1996) it is "the bridge between larger social and cultural realms and everyday understanding of social interaction" (p. 13).

Framing is a complete methodology of organizing and presenting issues in mass media (Dimitrova & Stromback, 2005). Entman (1993) believe that every communicator involves consciously or unconsciously in framing process to deliver his message. In this process Selection and salience are very important. First communicator selected some aspects of perceived reality and then makes them more prominent in a message (p.52).

### **Hypotheses**

1. **H.1a** The daily Nation will give more coverage to the issue in term of total number of stories (a larger number of stories) as compare to the daily Jang.
2. **H.1b** the daily Nation's slant will more unfavorable but the daily Jang's slant will favorable toward MFN.
3. **H.2a** Over all framing of the study will appear unfavorable toward MFN.

### **Methodology**

All columns and editorial of the daily Nation and the daily Jang were content analyzed from November 1, 2011, when Pakistani government announced their willing to grant MFN status to India to April 30, 2012, April 2012 visit of president Zardari to India was important in progress of issue. The rationale for choosing the selected timeline is to find out how the events within six month have been treated and how much coverage has been given to the issue in the selected newspapers.

Jang and Nawa-i-waqt, are the leading print and electronic media moguls of Pakistan. The daily Jang and the daily Nation (a representing newspaper of Nawa-i-waqt) are considered two rival newspapers have opposite editorial policy toward Indian relation with Pakistan. The reason for selection of these newspapers was to understand the editorial policy of major media organizations and what is the general trend of Pakistan's media toward MFN. The daily Nation a representing newspaper of Nawa-i-waqt is in English while the Jang is Urdu language newspaper.

All stories on editorial pages that mentioned MFN and Trade between Pakistan and India at once are the Unit of analysis for the study. Variables for this study were Topic, Slant,

Frames, and Wordage. Headline and intro were combine coding unit for topic. Topics of the papers are categories into seven categories i.e. Bilateral trade, Threat to the local industry, Non tariff barriers, Bilateral relation, Territorial conflict, Water issue and Typical enemy.

Slant and topic are interdependent in content analysis (Siraj, 2006). Media coverage may refer either to topic or to the slant in the news reports (pinch, 1978). Topic tells what the issue has been accounted, and slant point out how it has been narrated or what the tone of topic is i.e. whether positive or negative. In this study slant was analyzed in term of favorable, unfavorable and neutral. The slant was measure by analysis the coding unit of analysis that is paragraph.

The Frames of the news stories was measure in terms of anti-MFN, pro-MFN, neutral or Beneficial. To identify these frames, whole story was analyzed from contextual point of view because the entire story is the contextual unit. Each story would be considered favorable / pro MFN story if the ratio of favorable slant would be greater as compare to the unfavorable and neutral slants. This story was labeled as favorable story. Similarly if the ratio of unfavorable slants would be greater as compare to the other slants. The story will be coded unfavorable story. As frame and slant is interdependent, so the rules for coding frames in story are given below in this chapter.

## **Data analysis**

### **Frequencies of news stories**

Total 132 news items are publish in the study period, 43 (32.6%) being from the Jang, and 89 (67.4%) from the Nation. chi-square test was applied on the variables to understand the difference between them. The results of the chi-square test were significant,  $\chi^2 = 16.030$ ,  $p = .000$ . This value indicate that the difference between the variables were significant. The breakdown of the sample by stories types is following: 78(59.1%) are editorials and 54(40.9%) ( $\chi^2 = 4.364$ ,  $p = .037$ ) are opinions, 11(%) editorial come from the Jang, 67(%) from the Nation. Similarly 32(%) opinions come from the Jang and 22(%) from the Nation (Table 1). The issue of Territorial conflicts cover maximum in the study (N=41, %) the daily Nation cover 36(%) stories and only 5(%) stories were cover by the daily Jang. The daily Jang almost ignored the topic of Territorial conflicts at the same time the daily Nation gave maximum coverage. The result of Chi-square test, ( $\chi^2 = 84.242$ ,  $p = .000$ ) indicate that the difference between the coverage of topics is significant.

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of stories coverage in the newspapers of the study by Type of stories, Topics, and Mean Story length**

Newspapers Variable	Jang N (%)	Nation N (%)	Total N (100%)	Chi square
<b>Frequency of story</b>	43(32.6)	89(67.4)	132	
<b>Type of story*<sup>1</sup></b>				
Editorial	11 (14)		78	
Opinion	32 (59)	67 (86)	54	
<b>Topics*<sup>2</sup></b>		22 (41)		
Bilateral Trade				
Territorial Conflicts	13(41)	19 (59)	32	
Typical Enemy	5 (12)	36(88)	41	
Bilateral Relation	7 (35)	13(65) 8(45) 4(50)	20	
Non Tariff Barriers	10 (55)	5 (100)	18	
Threat to the Local Industry	4 (50)	4 (50)	8	
Water	0	605.20	5	
<b>Mean Story length*<sup>3</sup></b>	4 (50)		8	
	1091.82		845.5	

**Note:**

\*<sup>1</sup> Chi square: 3.175; p: .075    \*<sup>2</sup> Chi square 84.242; p: .000    \*<sup>3</sup> F = 3.801; p: .000

**Slants and Frames of stories**

Most of stories 92(70%) are unfavorable towards MFN status to India, followed by 34(26%) as favorable and 06(4.5%) as neutral (Chi-square = 72.995; p: .000). Total 92 stories are ‘unfavorable to MFN’; maximum of stories 77(84%) come from *the Nation*, followed by, 15(16%) from *the Jang*, (Chi-square = 105.083; p: .209).

The slant of 34(26%) stories are ‘favorable to MFN’; most of stories 26(77%) come from *the Jang*, and 8(6%) from *the Nation* (Chi-square = 12.791; p: .005) (Table 2).

Out of 06 Neutral stories toward MFN'; most stories 4(67%) from *the Nation*, and only 2(33%) story from *Jang* (Chi-square = 4.538; p: .021) (Table 2).

In the study a single story was also put in more than one frame, so 132 stories were studied in 180 frames. Most of stories 67(%) are framed Anti- MFN, followed by 57(%) are framed as Loss, 31 stories are framed as Pro-MFN and only 25(%) are framed as beneficial (Chi-square = 105.083; p: .209).

**Table 2**

**Distribution of stories in the newspapers of the study by Slants and Frames**

<b>Newspapers</b>	<b>Jang</b>	<b>Nation</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Chi square</b>
<b>Variables</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (%)</b>	<b>N (100%)</b>	
<b>Slant*<sup>1</sup></b>				
Favorable to MFN	26(77)	8 (23)	34	9.529;p:.002
Unfavorable	15(16)	77(84)	92	41.783;p:.000
Neutral	02(33)	4 (67)	06	.667;p:.414
<b>Frames*<sup>2</sup></b>				
Pro-MFN	19 (61)	12 (39)	31	37.121;p:.000
Anit-MFN	10 (15)	57 (85)	67	.030;p:.862
Loss	18 (72)	07 (28)	25	2.455;p:.117
Beneficial	57(32)	123(68)	180	50.939;p:.000
Total				

**Discussion on results**

This study has been designed to understand editorial policy of two major media organizations (the *Jang* media group and *Nawaiwaqt* ) of country on the issue of granting MFN status to India by Pakistan. The *Jang* consider Pro-Indian but the *Nation* is Anti India. The *Daily Nation* frame MFN issue under the territorial conflict, especially Kashmir issue. They relate trade agreements to the India with Kashmir issue. They believe that without solving Kashmir issue trade is not possible.

Both the dailies the *Nation* (*Nawai waqt* group) and the *Jang* have been working before the independence of sub-continent and all were pro All India Muslim League. This research shows that the *Jang* have change their policy toward the India, like they support the MFN status for India. The *Nation* editorial policy is against the MFN for India. They don't change their policy toward the India since the independence.

MFN is a pure economic agreement. India gave MFN status to Pakistan in 1996 but Pakistani governments still hesitate to grant same status to India. Both countries have

nuclear weapons and there is still possibility of nuclear confrontation between both nations. MFN is an opportunity to close state and people on both sides. It is the beginning of normalization of hostile attitude of both states.

To minimize mutual trade potential both countries imply Non tariff barriers (NTBs) on bilateral trade. A very common barrier in bilateral trade is negative list approach. Both the countries introduce a negative list of items that cannot import in the country from each other. In the beginning, it includes nearly two thousand products but with passage of time this list has reduced. Another barrier in mutual trade is strong visa restriction between both countries. Both sides do not allow people to visit their country. Introducing additional taxies on mutual import is important barrier in trade. Different traders said complex and long time airport checking process is also a hurdle in trade.

Both dailies including in sample has a specific approach in discussing the issue of MFN. *The daily Jang* takes issue as trade agreement between two neighbor countries so their focus was on technical aspect of the issue. They discussed NTBs, trade potential between the states, nature of market, advantages and threat to the local industry from MFN. The daily Nation covers the issue according to Kashmir issue and considering India as enemy of Pakistan. They don't give importance to the trade between both countries.

Both sides (Pakistan and India) understand without resolving disputed issues through talk process, any road map for regional peace didn't prepared. Taking a side the fact that Pakistan and India fought three major wars between each other. Pakistani government wants to improve friendly relation with India. It is a historical movement that Pakistan government decided to grant MFN status to India. Indian Lok Sabha speaker Ms Meira Kumar said "instead of being caught up in the past, we should look towards the future" (Regional peace, February 28, 2012 by From the Newspaper).

## **Test of hypotheses**

**H.1a** The daily Nation will give more coverage to the issue in term of total number of stories (a larger number of stories) as compare to the daily Jang.

The total number of stories published by the daily Nation was (89 or 67.4%) but the daily Jang published only (43 or 19.55%) stories. H (1a) is supported

**H.1b** the daily Nation's slant will more unfavorable but the daily Jang's slant will favorable toward MFN.

Total 92(%) stories are 'unfavorable to MFN'; maximum of stories 77(84%) come from the Nation, followed by 15(16%) from the daily Jang. Similarly total 34(%) stories are 'favorable to MFN'; maximum of stories 26(77%) come from the Jang *and only* 8(23%) stories are from the daily Nation (Table 2). H (1b) is supported

**H.2a** Over all framing of the study will appear unfavorable toward MFN.

In this study 132 stories were framed in 180 different frames. The frames (Pro-MFN=31 and Beneficial=25) are considered favorable frames toward MFN. Total 56

frames are in this category. The frames (Anti-MFN=67 and Loss=57) are considered unfavorable frames toward MFN. Total 124 frames are in this category. Maximum framing are unfavorable (Table 2). H (2a) is supported.

### **About the Authors**

---

Shah Nawaz is PhD Scholar in Gomal University, DI Khan Pakistan.

## References

- Andsager, J. & Smiley, L. (1998). Evaluating the public information: Shaping news coverage of the silicone implant controversy. *Public Relations Review*, 24(2): 183-201.
- Dimitrova, D. V., & Strömbäck, J. (2005). Mission accomplished? Framing of the Iraq War in the elite newspapers in Sweden and the United States. *Gazette*, 67(5), 399-417.
- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43 (4), 51-58.
- Federal Cabinet has granted MFN status to India. (2011, November 3). *The Daily Jang*, p. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.columnpk.com/pakistan-approves-most-favoured-nation-status-for-india/>
- Flamenbaum, S., & Neville, M. (2011). Optimism and Obstacles in India-Pakistan Peace Talks. *United States Institute of Peace*. Retrieved from <http://www.usip.org/publications/optimism-and-obstacles-in-india-pakistan-peace-talks>
- Framing. (n.d.). University of Twente Retrieved march5, 2012, from <http://www.utwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/Theory%20clusters/Communication%20Processes/Framing/>
- Friedland, L.A., & Zhong, M. (1996). International television coverage of Beijing Spring 1989: A comparative approach. *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs*, 156, 1-60.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *AJS*, 95(1), 1-37.
- Ganguly, R. (1998). India, Pakistan and the Kashmir Dispute. *Asian Studies Institute*, 1, 1-20. Retrieved from [http://books.google.com.pk/books/about/India\\_Pakistan\\_and\\_the\\_Kashmir\\_Dispute.html?id=vBueAAAACAAJ&redir\\_esc=y](http://books.google.com.pk/books/about/India_Pakistan_and_the_Kashmir_Dispute.html?id=vBueAAAACAAJ&redir_esc=y)
- Group, I. C. (2012). Pakistan's Relations with India: Beyond Kashmir? *International crises group*. Retrieved from <http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/asia/south-asia/pakistan/224-pakistans-relations-with-india-beyond-kashmir.aspx>
- Huma, Y. (2011). Pakistan Grants India Most Favored Nation Trading Status?. *Asia Pacific Bulletin*.
- Kargil War. ( n.d.) *Wikipedia*.Retrived March 22, 2013, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kargil\\_War](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kargil_War)
- Mir,A. ( 2013, February 02). Musharraf planned Kargil to scuttle Indo-Pak peace process. *The News* Retrieved from <http://www.thenews.com.pk/Todays-News-6-157624-Musharraf-planned-Kargil-to-scuttle-Indo-Pak-peace-process>
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse.
- Pokharel, K. (2009, January 13). Attacks stir another india-pakistan boarder dispute. *The wall street journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123180504307175401.html>

- Pokharel, k. ( 2009). *Attacks Stir Another India-Pakistan Border Dispute*. Retrieved April 5, 2013, from <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123180504307175401.html>
- Price, V., Tewksbury, D., & Powers, E. (1995, November). Switching trains of thought: The impact of news frames on readers' cognitive responses. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, IL. Retrieved January 5, 2013 from <https://sites.google.com/site/salzburg2010framing/social-map/history>
- Salzburg. (2010). A Short History of Framing. Retrieved from <https://sites.google.com/site/salzburg2010framing/social-map/history>
- Sayeed, A. (2001). Indo-Pak Trade: What to Expect? *Think India Quarterly*, 14. Retrieved from <http://www.thinkindiaquarterly.org/ArticleDetails.aspx?ArticleId=407&Id=43>
- Scheufele, D.A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103-122.
- Sir Creek. ( n.d.) *Wikipedia*. Retrieved March 25, 2013, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sir\\_Creek](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sir_Creek)
- Taneja, N. (2007). India Pakistan Trade Possibilities and Non-tariff Barriers. *INDIAN COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS*, 200. Retrieved from <http://www.icrier.org/pdf/Working%20Paper%20200.pdf>
- Tankard, J. W. Jr. (2001). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S.D. Reese, O.H. Gandy, Jr. & A.E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*, 95-106.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). Making news. *New York: Free Press*, 2(1). Retrieved from [http://scholar.google.com/citations?view\\_op=view\\_citation&hl=en&user=-Ah8teUAAAJ&citation\\_for\\_view=-Ah8teUAAAJ:u5HHmVD\\_uO8C](http://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=-Ah8teUAAAJ&citation_for_view=-Ah8teUAAAJ:u5HHmVD_uO8C)