UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THREATS TO SAFETY OF JOURNALISTS IN PAKISTAN – RISK ASSESSMENT

BY JOURNALISTS AT HIGH RISK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

AISHA MASOOD
Norman, Oklahoma
2017

THREATS TO SAFETY OF JOURNALISTS IN PAKISTAN – RISK ASSESSMENT
BY JOURNALISTS AT HIGH RISK

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
GAYLORD COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

BY

_____
Dr. David Craig, Chair

_____
Dr. Joe Foote

_____
Dr. Doyle Yoon

I dedicate my thesis to the most important people in my life:

My mom, my lifeline - who taught me to believe in myself and to never give up. Her unconditional love, support and prayers made me what I am today. She showed me the real meaning of success and happiness that comes from compassion and bringing happiness to others.

My husband, my better half, Mashiur Rahaman - who has helped me recognize my potential that could make me achieve anything in the world. He inspires me every day in a whole new way, and gives me the positive vibe and energy I always need in life. He is my role model, and has taught me how to celebrate even small things in life. I dedicate all my achievements to him.

My teacher and mentor, Kamal Siddiqi, who's the reason why I took up journalism as my profession. His passion for journalism and education inspires me to follow in his footprints. His continuous guidance and confidence in me made me achieve things initially seemed impossible to me.

Acknowledgements

This study could not have been possible without the continuous guidance and support of my thesis committee chair Dr. David Craig, who believed in my research capabilities and helped me from scratch in conducting this important study.

I am also very grateful to my thesis committee members: Dr. Joe Foote, who encouraged me to highlight the importance of risk assessment by journalists in Pakistan and guided me throughout the study, and Dr. Doyle Yoon, who helped me improve the study design.

I would like to specially thank the Centre of Excellence (CEJ), which is located in Karachi, Pakistan, for their help to develop the study sample that focused Pakistani journalists at high risk.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

Designed in the light of UNESCO's academic research agenda on the topic of safety of journalists, the study examines opinions and actions of Pakistani journalists at high risk: how they view safety issues, and if they minimize risk at work. It also includes their recommendations on how journalistic practices could be improved to protect their safety better. The study findings suggest that harassment (pressure from state and non-state actors) and psychological threats (mental stress, trauma) are the most common threats faced by the journalists. Balochistan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Federally Administered Tribal Areas were considered more dangerous and riskier than other regions of the country. The study also depicts that even though the journalists said they minimize risk at work, the reported actions suggested they did not take some steps to do so. The journalists recommended training of journalists as well as of media employers, policymaking and implementation of guidelines, risk assessment, counseling, and other recommendations to protect journalists' safety better.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Journalism has turned into one of the most dangerous professions around the globe in the last couple of decades. News and data from around the world show that journalists are being targeted every day for their work. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) -- which has a specific mandate to promote free flow of ideas and expression, and has been working to support free and independent media -- recognizes different forms of violence against journalists that include murders, abductions, harassment, intimidation, and illegal arrests and detentions (UNESCO, C&I, 2016).

According to the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ), 1228 journalists have been killed since 1992, and the ten deadliest countries for journalists are Iraq, Syria, Philippines, Somalia, Algeria, Pakistan, Russia, Colombia, India, and Brazil (CPJ, 2017). The data show that a total of 800 journalists have been murdered, 272 killed in crossfire/combat, and 152 have been killed on dangerous assignments since 1992, while 452 journalists have been forced into exile since 2010. The CPJ data for the year 2016 indicate a total of 48 journalists were killed worldwide, and 259 journalists jailed worldwide. Similarly, the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) has reported a total of 93 killings of journalists and media professionals in 2016 (IFJ, 2016). According to UNESCO, more than 800 journalists and media workers have been killed in the past 10 years, while the majority of them were not war correspondents (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). The organization believes that attacks on journalists are often carried out in non-conflict situations, and that the attackers vary from organized crime groups to militia, security personnel, and even local police, making local journalists

among the most vulnerable (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). CPJ research shows that many journalists go missing during work. It also suggests that cases of journalists who disappeared in conflict zones or areas under control of militants – such as Syria, Iraq, Libya, and Yemen – are difficult to track because of scarce information, the constantly changing situation, and because many cases go unreported.

The focus of this research will be Pakistan, which has been listed among the deadliest countries for journalists for several years now. According to the CPJ, Pakistan tops the list of those who were killed on dangerous assignments since 1992 with a number of 23, followed by India (13), Iraq (8), Egypt (8), Russia (8) and others.

As the literature suggests, although safety of journalists is considered to be an important requirement for unhindered practice of journalism and for the freedom of expression, journalists' safety has not been a very popular topic of academic research and has rarely been discussed as a research question (Poyhtari & Berger, 2015). The little scholarly work available that is relevant to this topic (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017; Aslam, 2011; Bhattacharya, 2015; Feinstein, 2014; Hughes & Marquez-Ramirez, 2017; Jamil, 2017;) will be discussed in the next chapters. UNESCO emphasizes raising awareness and promoting academic research, as research could reveal patterns in the societal conditions, legal frameworks, journalistic practices, and actions of media institutions -- all crucial for the safe practice of journalism (UNESCO, 2015). The organization promotes academic research on the journalist safety issue because the organization believes it is a complex issue and academic research can significantly increase the understanding of the issue, and can consequently help in creating safer working conditions for journalists and media professionals worldwide (UNESCO,

2017). It is not until lately that academic research on this topic has started. There have been a few research projects in progress for the past few years in relation to the UNESCO's Journalist Safety Indicators (JSIs) in different countries. However, there is only one report on this topic that has been published so far, in June 2016, and that focuses the situation in Kenya (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). Other JSI pilot assessments conducted in Pakistan, Guatemala, and Honduras have not been published yet (UNESCO, JSI, 2016).

Therefore, this study is aimed at helping to fill the gaps in the academic research on journalists' safety and elevate the existing research work by various NGOs. The purpose of this study is to examine and highlight the issue of Pakistani journalists minimizing risk at work in order to practice journalism in a safe manner. The study aims at examining if Pakistani journalists at high risk assess and minimize risk at work, and how journalistic practices could be improved to safeguard their safety better.

Operational Definitions

The key words "safety" and "risk" have been used frequently in this study. The words have been defined in the light of the previous literature available on work-related safety and risk topics.

Safety. Maurice and colleagues (2001) define "safety" as a state in which dangers, and situations resulting in physical, psychological or material harm are controlled in order to preserve the health and well being of an individual or a community. Safety is one of the fundamental human rights, and an essential resource that an individual or a community needs in order to realize their aspirations in their daily life (WHO, 1998).

In the present study, the term "safety" has been used within the context of journalists in Pakistan as a community. Hence, "safety" in this paper refers to, and is confined to, a state in which hazards, and situations resulting in physical, psychological and material harm to journalists in Pakistan are controlled to preserve the health and well being of the journalists.

This definition of safety has been chosen for this paper because first, this definition relates the safety issue to human rights that also comprise rights of journalists; second, it is relevant to work related safety issues; and third, it applies to both unintentional injuries or accidents and intentional injuries or violence (Maurice et al., 2001).

Safety is the result of a dynamic balance that is established between the different components within a specific setting (WHO, 1998). In the context of this study, the balance needs to be established among different components (such as work responsibility, organizational pressure, socio-economic influence, religious and political factors, and so on) within the specific media environment in Pakistan.

Risk. The term "risk" is used in daily language to refer to the chance or probability of a disaster. However, in the process of risk assessment, it has been explained as the combination of two things: first, the probability of a specific hazard that can occur, and second, the magnitude of the effect or consequences of that hazard if it occurred (EEA, 2016).

In this paper, the term "risk" refers to the probability of a hazardous or dangerous situation that a journalist in Pakistan may come across at work, and the

magnitude of the effect or consequences of that danger in case the journalist falls into that situation.

Some of the possible risks to journalists that the Committee to Protect Journalists has listed in its Journalist Security Guide include terrorist bombings, abduction for ransom or political gain, interactions with potentially hostile or undisciplined armed groups, and dangers posed by crowds such as sexual assault (CPJ, 2012).

The terms "safety" and "risk" are closely linked to each other. Experts on the safety of journalists suggest that an assessment of risk can lead to a journalist minimizing the risk (through careful planning and wise decisions), hence staying safer at work (CPJ, 2012).

Risk Assessment by Journalists

Journalists in Pakistan have to make a lot of compromises and put their lives at risk to continue reporting (Rehmat, 2014). Now, why do journalists take risk? Pulitzer Prize-winning photographer for *The New York Times* Tyler Hicks (2013) said people asked him why he took the risks that he did to do his job. His answer was that journalists take risks because they want to validate things that are happening around the world. Journalists hope that being in the risky situation to document it firsthand would bring truth and hopefully positive change (Hicks, 2013). The Committee to Protect Journalists, in its Journalist Security Guide, highlights the importance of assessing and responding to risk during work in detail, pointing out that the decisions journalists make in the field have direct impact on their safety. It reiterates that work-related risks can never be eradicated, however assessing the risk and preparing accordingly can reduce

the danger (CPJ, 2012). In the backdrop of the journalist safety situation in many countries including Pakistan, it becomes important to determine how well-prepared journalists are to manage their work in risky environments. There has been great hue and cry from journalists over inadequate safety measures from media employers and the government (APP, 2011), but it would also be helpful for the media industry and for other relevant stakeholders to know how journalists themselves assess the work-related risks and take safety measures on their own rather than depending only on their organizations.

The next chapter discusses the scholarly and other works on the safety of journalists around the globe and specifically with the context of Pakistan. It also includes a background of the most vulnerable regions (Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), FATA, and Balochistan) in the country. The chapter also lists the three research questions posed in this study in the light of UNESCO's plan of action and the research agenda on the safety of journalists.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter will examine the literature on the safety of journalists issue with the context of Pakistan as well as elsewhere in the world. There is extensive work done by NGOs worldwide that provide information and data on the topic. However, there is little scholarly work available on this topic. Organizations working for the safeguard of journalists' rights worldwide -- such as Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ), International Federation of Journalists (IFJ), International News Safety Institute (INSI), Reporters Sans Frontiers (RSF), and others -- regularly publish reports providing information and data on violation of journalists' rights and threat to their safety. This chapter will discuss data and information, provided by such organizations, on various kinds of violence against journalists around the world. It will also include scholarly work (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017; Aslam, 2011; Bhattacharya, 2015; Feinstein, 2014; Hughes & Marquez-Ramirez, 2017; Jamil, 2017) relevant to the topic of journalist safety.

Safety of Journalists a Global Issue

Human Rights Watch Director Communications Emma Daly (2016) suggests that the issue of journalists' safety has become a burning issue more than ever today. Daly (2016) writes:

> Killing a journalist for their work isn't just a crime but also a human rights abuse, because an attack on the press is an attack on our freedom of expression. If those in power can muzzle the media, then they can get away with more than murder. (p. 7)

Reporters are at risk around the world for they expose corruption, report conflict, and affect the comfortable, Daly emphasizes as she calls for accountability for attacks on the media.

An International News Safety Institute (INSI) report suggests 115 journalists were killed around the world in 2016 for doing their job, and there were mass tragedies involving media workers in Afghanistan, Colombia, and Russia (INSI, 2017). The report lists Colombia, Mexico, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Russia among the top five deadliest countries for journalists in 2016. The Committee to Protect Journalists data suggest that 1228 journalists have been killed since 1992, while the ten deadliest countries for journalists are Iraq, Syria, Philippines, Somalia, Algeria, Pakistan, Russia, Colombia, India, and Brazil (CPJ, 2017).

Findings from a recently published scholarly work (Hughes & Marquez-Ramirez, 2017) on Mexican journalists suggest more than two-thirds (68 percent) of the surveyed journalists practiced self-censorship, almost two-thirds (64 percent) left field reporting, over 57 percent stick to their media organization's censorship policies, and half of the surveyed journalists reported hiding sensitive information from suspicious people or untrustworthy colleagues in their own newsrooms. The study was presented at the UNESCO Conference on Journalist Safety in May 2016 in Finland, on the occasion of the United Nations' World Press Freedom Day, and it has been recently published in a UNESCO book on journalist safety. Aslam (2011) suggests there are many projects around the world targeting different aspects of journalistic training in conflict zones, and some of those (such as projects taken up by the Network of Conflict Resolution in Canada, and others) focus on safety and survival techniques required for journalists working in conflict areas. This also indicates that the issue of journalists' safety has become a serious concern for many. Anthony Feinstein, who is a neuro-psychiatrist, a professor, and the author of books on journalists in war zones, suggests that the code of

conduct that once allowed journalists to do their job in conflict zones - without the kind of fear of being killed, tortured, or kidnapped for ransom that terrifies them in the present - is no longer practical (Feinstein, 2014). The increased personal threat has brought into focus the issue of journalists' safety, though there's a lack of training programs that could prepare journalists for the safety challenges in the evolving media environment (Feinstein, 2014).

Threat to Safety of Journalists in Pakistan

According to the CPJ data, Pakistan tops the list of those journalists who were killed on dangerous assignments since 1992 with a number of 23. According to a report published by Center for International Media Assistance (CIMA) in 2012, international media monitors have ranked Pakistan as the most dangerous place in the world for journalists (Ricchiardi, 2012). Freedom House rated Pakistan's media as not free in its 2012 Freedom of the Press report, with a score of 63. It ranked 144th out of 197 countries, down from 134th the previous year (Ricchiardi, 2012). Journalists in Pakistan are dealing with the dilemma of their right to safety clashing with the people's right to know (Rehmat, 2014). Local journalists are not only facing deaths on a regular basis but are also looked upon with mistrust by the government and the community (Aslam, 2011).

Conflict, violence and extremism have made journalism one of the most difficult professions to practice in Pakistan in recent years, as Pakistan had the highest fatality rate for journalists in the world from 2000 to 2014 (Rehmat, 2014). Jamil (2017) suggests that Pakistani journalists work in an unsafe institutional environment where different safety threats could affect their work and the overall quality of journalism in

the country. The study findings suggest that journalists face not only physical risks but also psychological, financial, emotional and digital risks while at work besides other threats. The study has particularly revealed social and emotional risks that the international organizations monitoring journalists' safety level in Pakistan often ignore.

A Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) report reveals that at least 60 journalists have been killed in Pakistan since 1992 for motives that have been officially confirmed. Motives behind the killings of additional 20 journalists during the same time period have not been known. Moreover, seven media workers have been killed since 2009, raising the number of killed journalists to 87 from 1992 to date. Others such as Rehmat (2014) suggest that more than 100 journalists and media workers have been killed and over 2,000 injured in the country from the beginning of 2000 to 2014. The CPJ (2017) data suggests that most of the killings of journalists occurred in the KP and FATA region (24), followed by Balochistan (15), Sindh (14), Punjab (6), and the federal capital Islamabad (1).

Pakistan media versus pressure groups. Pakistani journalists continue to be under severe threat not only from militants but also from political, religious, ethnic, and other pressure groups as well as law enforcement agencies, and the Pakistan Press Foundation (PPF, 2015) report on safety of media workers suggests and emphasizes that the culture of impunity has made the situation for journalists there more critical with frequent incidents of threats, physical attacks and killings. A number of journalists in the tribal areas are either forced to quit their profession or leave their hometowns (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017; IMS, 2009). A report of Freedom House (2016) also suggests that even though the rate of journalists' killings declined somewhat in the past few

years, the number and intensity of threats directed at journalists from a variety of state and non-state actors -- may it be the government, military, intelligence agencies or extremist groups -- remained high. Journalists in rural areas often face threats as they write about the poor conditions of farmers and against the misappropriation of funds and resources by politicians and other influential people (Bhattacharya, 2015).

Challenges of working in conflict regions – KP, FATA, and Balochistan.
Journalists countrywide in Pakistan face threats from state and non-state actors, including the intelligence establishment, civil and military state organs, militants, insurgents, gangsters, and traffickers, while many of them also experience physical surveillance, phone tapping, computer hacking, and threats to family and friends (Bhattacharya, 2015). However, some regions such as Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), FATA, and Balochistan are the most dangerous for journalists as violence has been on a rise in these regions for many years, making the job of media professionals more dangerous (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017; IMS, 2009). The works further suggest that many journalists in FATA discontinued reporting due to the increased vulnerability in that region, and for those who continued, reporting became too difficult for them because of frequent bombings. At least 38 journalists were killed in the northwestern region of the country, including 14 journalists who hailed from FATA (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017). The scholars suggest that more than a hundred journalists left FATA and moved to the adjacent city of Peshawar from where they continued reporting on FATA. Journalists in FATA face threats not only from the militants but also from the state. The violent situation in the region has made it nearly impossible for the journalists to do objective

11

reporting as most journalists prefer not to report anything that would infuriate any of the conflicting parties in the region.

An IMS (2009) report quotes Secretary General of Pakistan Federal Union of Journalists (PFUJ) Mazhar Abbas saying that journalists' families were coming under danger, they were harassed and they experienced physical violence so much that they were forced to leave their homes and move to other locations. Ashraf & Brooten (2017) further suggest impunity has given rise to risks that turn journalism into a highly difficult job in FATA, and the pervasiveness of different physical and psychological threats prevents journalists in FATA from making independent decisions without fearing for their own and their families' safety. The study further suggests that those in power cause great emotional strain for journalists through deaths of their colleagues and threats to their families, and that all these factors influence the decisions they make at work.

In January 2014, the banned militant outfit Tehreek-i- Taliban Pakistan (TTP) not only declared Pakistani media a party to the conflict, but also issued an order against the media and prepared a media hit list (Abdullah, 2014). FATA became the focus point after 9/11 while the tribal areas came under the control of Al Qaeda and the Pakistani Taliban and were used as a safe haven to launch attacks within and outside the country (IMS, 2009). Journalists in FATA claim that the militant control in the area affected the editorial policies of the media organizations, and that they limited the kinds of programs they used to run. They were compelled to avoid broadcasting reports on sectarian issues, investigative reporting, and in-depth stories about military operations (IMS, 2009). In the tribal areas especially, the three fighting parties – the Taliban, the security

forces and the locals – are reluctant to work with journalists (Aslam, 2011). According to Javid Siddiq, the resident editor of Nawa-e-Waqt, which is one of the three largest media groups in the country, the Taliban believed journalists work for the Pakistani army (IMS, 2009). The report argues that the situation has led to an increased information vacuum in FATA, as reporting from tribal areas has become very limited, and without any investigative journalism.

Similarly, many parts of the KP province have been the scene of a conflict between the army and militants, while the southern and western districts of the province have experienced a war-like environment for years (IMS, 2009). This has brought the dynamics of the conflict to new areas where local journalists who were not accustomed to war were forced to deal with the safety and security issues. Bhattacharya (2015) also suggests that terror activities leading to a conflict situation in Pakistan have made it threatening for journalists and media workers in the country's conflict zones while killing of journalists has become a common trend. Meanwhile, journalists in conflict regions learned to adapt to self-censorship in their reporting in order to not antagonize the conflicting parties, and therefore no in-depth or investigative reporting is done in the regions.

Previous scholarly works (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017; Jamil, 2017) have also highlighted harassment and other emotional and psychological threats among the different threats journalists in Pakistan face. Receiving the dead body of a journalist friend or colleague once in a while makes journalists in FATA realize how helpless they are in the pervasive violence against journalists (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017). Similarly, the scholars suggest that physical attacks or threats to family members have been a

13

constant mental stress for journalists in FATA. Jamil (2017) also suggests that frequent

killings and violence against journalists in Pakistan have consequently created a climate

of fear among the journalist community. A large majority of surveyed journalists cited

psychological and emotional threats among the most common threats to journalists in

Pakistan (Jamil, 2017).

In addition to KP and FATA, journalists in the Balochistan province do not face

a much different situation, though the conflict in Balochistan has a different

background. Balochistan has a history of independent movements and struggle against

what is seen as the federal government's suppression of the Baloch people and their

ownership of the province's resources. The Baloch local media face threats, assaults,

prospects of kidnappings and murder by extremists as well as by the military and radical

Baloch separatists that make it a great challenge for journalists in that region as well.

Many rural journalists in Pakistan work part-time for a local newspaper or they

freelance and provide local news for a larger urban or national media. However, they

lack backing for their safety concerns and support in legal matters and insurance.

Moreover, most of them have no journalism education or training at all since they come

from low-paid jobs as schoolteachers, and so on (IMS, 2009). In the backdrop of the

lack of media training and the vulnerable situation for journalists working in the conflict

regions of the country, the report suggests it becomes imperative that the journalists

working in those tribal areas and small regions learn techniques and ways to do

investigative journalism wisely, and work on their investigative stories while engaging

in a continuous risk-assessment process throughout their course of work.

UNESCO, Freedom of Press, and Safety of Journalists

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) actively promotes the safety of journalists and media professionals, and believes that they have the right to work freely, without facing any threats of violence, and to ensure the right to freedom of opinion and expression for all (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). The organization believes that the killing of journalists and its impunity directly impacts the United Nations' human rights based efforts to promote peace, security, and sustainable development. Since most violence against journalists is not investigated and perpetrators are not punished, it encourages the cycle of violence and leads media to self-censorship, which hampers press freedom and deprives masses of information (UNESCO, C&I, 2016).

In 1993, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the date of May 3 as the World Press Freedom Day to celebrate the fundamental principles of press freedom, to evaluate press freedom around the world, to defend the media worldwide from attacks on their independence, and to pay tribute to journalists who have lost their lives because of their work, and their association with the profession of journalism (UNESCO, WPFD 2016). Since then, the day is dedicated to inform people worldwide of press freedom violations including the harassment, detention, and even killings of journalists in the line of duty. On the occasion of the World Press Freedom Day in May 2016, a UNESCO research conference on safety of journalists was held in Helsinki, Finland. UNESCO considers assuring the physical and mental well being of journalists to be one of the most pressing issues in recent times, and believes that it directly impacts on the freedom of information, the freedom of press, and sustainable

development. Therefore, one of the three different themes and perspectives to examine the world press freedom situation in 2016 was ensuring safety of journalists online and offline (UNESCO, 2016).

UN plan of action on the safety of journalists and UNESCO research agenda. The UN plan aims towards the creation of a free and safe environment for journalists and media workers in both conflict and non-conflict situations, with a view to strengthen peace, democracy, and development worldwide.

UNESCO has developed an academic research agenda on the topic of safety of journalists to strengthen cooperation with academia in regard to the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity. The organization aims to encourage academic research on this important issue, which has been rarely covered in scientific studies until lately (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). On the occasion of the World Press Freedom Day in 2016, UNESCO, in collaboration with others, organized the first academic full conference on the journalist safety topic in Finland. The conference brought together researchers who were either working on or were interested in the safety of journalists. Works presented in the conference have been recently published in a book (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). With a hope that its research agenda would inspire new research, UNESCO encourages communication researchers to conduct studies on topics listed in the agenda.

The UN research agenda discussed ten broad areas of possible research relating to the safety of journalists, including the physical and psychological aspects of the safety issue (Poyhtari & Berger, 2015). The agenda proposes ten broad areas for academic research on the safety of journalists -- one of them is "practitioner issues" that

is further divided into several research topics, such as journalists' perception and awareness on safety, their roles and professional skills in the coverage of safety issues, ethics of journalistic work and safety, freelancers and safety, and journalists' individual/professional roles and capacities and safety, and so on (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). Under each of these several research topics, the research agenda have listed a variety of possible research questions (discussed in the next section).

Research Questions

Trochim and Donnelly (2001) explain three basic types of questions that research projects can address – descriptive, relational, and causal, where a descriptive study primarily attempts to describe what is going on in a certain situation, or what exists, or to describe the proportion of people having different opinions on a certain issue. Since this study aims at learning the existing perceptions and opinions of journalists on the safety issue in relation to the risk assessment, the type of research questions posed in the study was descriptive.

As discussed in the above paragraphs, the research questions were derived from the UNESCO's academic research agenda. There are a number of research questions listed under the "practitioner issues," for instance, how journalists themselves perceive or view safety issues in their work, if journalists' professional behavior takes into account safety issues and minimizes possible risks, how journalistic practices could be improved to safeguard safety better, to what extent journalists organize collectively or show solidarity with others on safety issues and so on (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). This study attempted to answer three of those several research questions listed under the

17

"practitioner issues" in the agenda. The three questions were posed with the context of Pakistan:

RQ1: How do journalists in Pakistan regard/view safety issues in their profession?

RQ2: Does journalists' professional behavior take into account safety issues and minimize possible risks?

RQ3: How could journalistic practices be improved to safeguard safety better? The next chapter discusses the methodology for this study, including details on procedures followed for sampling, data collection, and data analysis.

Chapter 3: Methodology

As already discussed in the previous chapters, the study examined the perception and risk-related actions of working journalists in Pakistan in relation to the safety of journalists. The literature on the safety of journalists and on relevant journalism-research topics such as the future of journalistic work (Picard, 2015) depicts that researchers have used both quantitative and qualitative research methods in order to find out the perception of journalists. Hughes and Marquez-Ramirez (2017) surveyed about 380 Mexican journalists, inquiring about the strategies and tactics they use to avoid being killed due to their work, and minimize the risk to their safety that arises as a result of covering certain types of news stories. Another recently published study (Jamil, 2017) on the safety of journalists with the context of Pakistan adopted the quantitative method of survey in order to investigate the level of journalists' safety in Pakistan, and the threats that affect media institutions and journalists' routine work there. Researchers in another recently published study (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017) used in-depth qualitative interviews to investigate the challenges faced by local journalists of FATA in Pakistan. Picard (2015) examined the perception of journalists about the future of journalistic work using both quantitative and qualitative style of questioning. Another study, which was conducted by Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism (RISJ) with the help of the Society of Professional Journalists and examined the perception of journalists across the Western world about the future of journalistic work, adopted the survey method (Picard, 2015). The close-ended questions were measured on a five-point scale, but respondents were also asked to respond to questions in their own words -- for instance,

how they see the future of the journalism profession -- and the responses to open-ended questions were analyzed qualitatively.

This study adopted a quantitative survey method with a few open-ended questions. The quantitative data drew an overall picture of the situation whereas open-ended responses helped the researcher answer the research questions thoroughly.

Survey Instrument

Senam and Akpan (2014) suggest that in survey research, the issues that constitute a research problem could be attitude, opinion, behavior, practice, etc., that arouse the concern of a researcher, thereby driving him or her to carry out research. The survey technique is used in finding out facts when human beings are the source or custodians of the facts under investigation or when the phenomenon, opinion, behavior or trend that is under investigation is manifest and quantifiable (Wimmer & Dominick, 2006). Survey is the most applicable research method if a study seeks to find out people's opinion or perception (Senam & Akpan, 2014). Since the study aimed to examine the perception and opinion of journalists, survey was considered the most appropriate instrument for this study.

Wimmer and Dominick (2006) suggest one of the advantages of survey research is that it is not constrained to geographical boundaries, therefore it can be conducted virtually anywhere. This was another very important factor for why survey technique was chosen for this study as the data was collected outside the U.S. (i.e. in Pakistan).

The survey questionnaire was designed with mainly closed-ended questions and some open-ended questions to get the in-depth understanding of the responses. Senam and Akpan (2014) suggest researchers should ask mainly closed-ended questions and

should suggest as many options as possible for the respondents to select from. In the RISJ study, members of the SPJ were asked to complete a survey using the organizations' email newsletters and website announcements, while more journalists in North America and Europe were located via journalists' websites and their social media groups (Picard, 2015). The RISJ study also included both closed-ended and open-ended questions in the survey (Picard, 2015). Journalists were directed to a survey site where they were asked to respond to five questions about themselves and their work experience and then 20 questions about their perceptions of journalistic work, labor, and professional identity. The responses were measured on a five-point scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Respondents were also given the opportunity to express in their own words what they see is happening to the occupation (Picard, 2015).

The current study included 19 questions in the survey – a few divided into sub-questions. Participants were asked to choose from among the multiple choices given under the closed-ended questions, or rate a specific item on a scale of 4 or 5. They were asked to respond to open-ended questions in their own words.

Some of the key words and phrases in the survey were defined for respondents as follows: "injury" was defined as what happens accidentally, such as in protests, blasts, crossfires, and so on. "Physical assault" was defined as an attack that is intentional or targeted. The phrase "psychological threats" was defined as mental stress or trauma. The word "murder" was defined as an action that was intentional or targeted, whereas "killing" was defined as accidental, such as in protests, blasts, or crossfires. "Harassment" was defined as the pressure from government, army, extremists, or political/religious/other influential groups. "Prohibition of leaving the country" was

defined as a journalist's name on the exit control list. The word "violence" has been used in this paper in a broader sense that included all physical and psychological safety issues the surveyed journalists had personally gone through because of their profession.

Sampling

Sampling for this study was done with the help of the Centre for Excellence in Journalism (CEJ), which is an initiative for the professional development, training and networking of Pakistani journalists and media professionals. The CEJ offers media training for employed as well as independent journalists and media professionals in all parts of Pakistan. The organization is closely linked with Pakistan's news media industry and works under an advisory board comprising some of Pakistan's most prominent and experienced editors and media professionals (CEJ, 2016). The CEJ helped the researcher in creating a purposive sample. The organization shared contact details of journalists from its database. The journalists had attended workshops or training at the organization. Out of that list, journalists with special characteristics in relation to the safety issue were selected as the sample for this study -- journalists who have been directly or indirectly affected by safety threat or any kind of violence against journalists in the past, and those who could be potential targets of violence. A potential target, for example, could be a journalist who covers a sensitive news beat, or does investigative reporting, or is located in a conflict zone. Although those journalists might not have personally experienced any incidents of violence in the past, they could become a target in future because they possess one or more special characteristics as mentioned above.

The purposive sample included journalists from all parts of Pakistan having one

or more special characteristics and considered more vulnerable and at risk during work. All journalists from regions of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), and Balochistan were included in the sample because of the severe security situation in those regions. The CPJ data and previous works on this topic (IMS, 2009) show that the above-mentioned regions have been the most vulnerable for journalists in Pakistan. Therefore, all journalists (in the CEJ list) from those regions were included in the sample.

From the rest of the regions, i.e. Punjab, Sindh, Azad and Jammu Kashmir (AJK), and the federal capital Islamabad, journalists who work on sensitive news beats (for instance, crime, militancy, political parties, government, military, judicial courts, civil unrest), and hence are considered to be more vulnerable and at risk during work were included in the study. Journalists from all media and types of work – print, online, and broadcast reporters, camerapersons, photographers, freelancers, editors – were included in the sample.

Data Collection and Analysis

For this study, the primary researcher initially sent the survey questionnaire to the 350 journalists via email, followed by three reminder emails with a gap of one week. A separate reminder email was sent out to more than a dozen participants who had initially committed to participate in the study and mentioned sending their responses in the next couple weeks but did not send the response later on.

The closed ended questions were analyzed through descriptive statistics. Although respondents identified themselves by region, no statistical tests to make comparisons by region were done because of the small number of respondents from

23

several regions. Open-ended questions were analyzed through qualitative coding

method. Answers for open-ended questions were read multiple times in order to find all

categories mentioned in the answers. In order to identify categories, the researcher

looked for common words and phrases for each open-ended question across the answers

of the respondents. The results are discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 4 - Results

The study examined three research questions. The first research question (RQ1) examined how journalists in Pakistan regard or view safety issues in their profession. The second question (RQ2) examined journalists' professional behavior as to whether or not they take into account safety issues, and minimize possible risks at work. The third research question (RQ3) explained ways in which journalistic practices could be improved to protect safety of journalists better.

The survey was sent out to a total of 350 journalists, out of which 73 journalists responded to the survey, for a response rate of 20.9%. Breakdown by regions indicates the highest response rate (44.3%) from KP and FATA followed by AJK (37.5%), Islamabad (21.9%), Balochistan (18.4%), Punjab (9.7%), and Sindh (8.8%).

Some respondents worked for more than one medium. Out of the total 73 respondents, 33 (45.2%) worked for print media, 43 (58.9%) worked for broadcast media, whereas only 11 (15.1%) worked for online media. Almost half (48%) of the total respondents were from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) and Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), 13.7% from Sindh, 12.3% from Islamabad, 9.6% from Balochistan, and 8.22% respondents were each from Punjab and Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK). (See Table 1.)

RQ1: How do Journalists in Pakistan Regard/View Safety Issues in Their Profession?

The results for this question show many of the journalists surveyed have experienced one or more incidents of threats or violence because of their work. Participants were asked to list the three most common threats for journalists in the

25

country and rank them in order. They were also asked to rank their region on a scale of 1 to 7 (1=the riskiest, 7=the least risky). Participants were also asked if they had ever been in a dangerous situation, and to describe how they handled the situation. The findings for this research question (RQ1) are discussed in detail in the following text.

Table 1. Breakdown of Respondents by Region

Province	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents	Results by region	
			Total number in sample	Response rate
KP & FATA	35	47.9%	79	44.3%
Sindh	10	13.7%	114	8.8%
Islamabad	9	12.3%	41	21.9%
Balochistan	7	9.6%	38	18.4%
Punjab	6	8.2%	62	9.7%
AJK	6	8.2%	16	37.5%
Total	73		350	20.9%

Most common threats to safety of journalists. Participants were asked to list the three most common safety threats for journalists in Pakistan out of the 11 options listed in the survey. A large majority, or 63 out of 73 respondents (86.3%), said "harassment" – defined in the survey as pressure from government, army, extremists, political/religious/other influential groups, etc. – is one of the three most common threats. Nearly three-fifths, or 43 respondents (58.9%), said "psychological threat" –

26

defined in the survey as stress, trauma, etc. - and the same percentage cited "injury" (described in the survey as accidental injury, such as in protests, blasts, crossfires, etc.) as one of the three most common threats. (See Table 2.)

Nearly one-third (32.9%) of respondents cited harassment as the most common threat, whereas one-fifth (20.5%) of respondents cited psychological threat or injury as the most common threat.

Table 2. Safety Threats to Journalists Cited as Most Common

Threat	Citing among 3 most common	Citing as most common
Harassment	63 (86.3%)	24 (32.9%)
Injury	43 (58.9%)	15 (20.5%)
Psychological Threat	43 (58.9%)	15 (20.5%)

Most common safety threats to journalists by region. Because of the small number of responses from many regions, it is difficult to analyze the breakdown by region. However, the most prominent findings are discussed here. Harassment was cited as the most common threat in all regions but Balochistan. (See Table 3.) Respondents in Balochistan cited killing (accidentally, such as in protests, blasts, crossfires, etc.) and injury as the most common threat to journalists. Psychological threat was cited as the second most common threat in all regions except Balochistan and AJK. Harassment was cited as the second most common threat in Balochistan, whereas both killing and injury were cited as the second most common threat in AJK. Injury was cited as the third most common threat in KP & FATA, Islamabad, and Punjab, whereas respondents in Sindh

cited physical assault (intentional/targeted attack) as the third most common threat to journalists.

Table 3. Most Common Safety Threats to Journalists by Region

Region	Most common	2nd most common	3rd most common
KP & FATA	Harassment	Psychological threat	Injury
	28 (80%)	25 (71.4%)	21 (60%)
Sindh	Harassment	Psychological threat	Physical assault
	10 (100%)	6 (60%)	5 (50%)
Islamabad	Harassment	Psychological threat	Injury
	9 (100%)	6 (66.6%)	5 (55.5%)
Balochistan	Injury & killing	Harassment	-
	5 (71.4%)	4 (57.1%)	
Punjab	Harassment	Psychological threat	Injury
	6 (100%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)
AJK	Harassment	Killing & injury	-
	6 (100%)	5 (83.3%)	

Journalists' perception of riskiness of their region. Participants were asked how safe or risky they thought their region (province) was for journalists in comparison to the rest of the country. A three-fifths majority or 43 respondents (60.5%), said their region seemed to be more dangerous and riskier than other regions. One-fourth or eighteen (25%) respondents said their region seemed to be less dangerous and riskier

than other regions. Ten (14.1%) respondents said their region had the same risk as other

regions. (See Table 4.)

Table 4. Journalists' Perception of Riskiness of Their Region

Province	More risky	Risky as other regions	Less risky
Balochistan	7 (100%)	-	-
KP	30 (91%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)
Sindh	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)
Punjab	1 (16.6%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50%)
Islamabad	1 (11.1%)	3 (33.3%)	5 (55.5%)
AJK	-	-	6 (100%)
Total	43 (60.5%)	10 (14.1%)	18 (25.3%)

All 7 respondents (100%) in Balochistan, and large majority (91%) of

respondents in KP and FATA said their region seemed to be more dangerous and riskier

than other regions. On the other hand, all 6 respondents (100%) in AJK, 3 respondents

(50%) in Punjab, and more than half (55.5%) respondents in Islamabad said their region

seemed to be safer and less risky than other regions.

Respondents from the province of Sindh seemed to be divided on the question as

4 respondents (40%) said their region seemed to be more dangerous and riskier than

other regions, 3 respondents (30%) said their region seemed to be safer and less risky

than other regions, and another 3 respondents (30%) said their region seemed to be have

the same risk as other regions.

One-third (33%) of respondents in each Punjab and Islamabad said their region

seemed to have the same risk as other regions, whereas only 6% of respondents in KP

and FATA said their region seemed to have the same risk as other regions.

Threats journalists said they had received/felt. Responding to another

question on different kinds of threats they have received or felt in their professional life,

journalists most often cited harassment (39 or 54.1% of respondents) and psychological

threat (32 respondents or 44.4%). (See Table 5.)

Table 5. Threats Journalists Said They Had Received/Felt

Threat	Number of respondents	Percentage
Harassment	39	54.1%
Psychological threat	32	44.4%
Injury	26	36.1%
Physical assault	26	36.1%
Killing	17	23.6%
Abduction	17	23.6%
Murder	14	19.4%
Arrest	13	18%

The next most common threats were all physical: injury (26 respondents or

36.1%), physical assault (26 respondents or 36.1%), killing (17 respondents or 23.6%),

abduction (17 respondents or 23.6%), murder (14 respondents or 19.4%), and arrest (13

respondents or 18.1%).

Violence journalists said they had experienced. It may be reminded here that

the word "violence" has been used in this paper in a broader sense that included all

physical and psychological safety issues the surveyed journalists had personally gone

through because of their profession. Responding to a question on different kinds of

violence they have experienced at work, 39 or more than half (53.4%) of respondents

said they were harassed (pressured), and 32 respondents (43.8%) said they went through

psychological threat (mental stress or trauma). (See Table 6.)

Table 6. Violence Journalists Say They Have Experienced

Kind of Violence	No. of respondents	Percentage
Harassment	39	53.4%
Psychological threat	32	43.8%
Injury	17	23.3%
Physical assault	16	21.9%
No violence	13	17.8%
Almost killed	12	16.4%
Arrest	8	11%
Abduction	5	6.8%

Percentages for physical violence were lower but still substantial: Seventeen

respondents (23.3%) said they were injured, and 16 respondents (21.9%) said they were

physically assaulted. Only 13 respondents (17.8%) said they have not experienced any

violence. Several other kinds of violence were also reported: Twelve respondents (16.4%) said they were almost killed (accidental), 8 respondents (11%) said they were arrested, five respondents (6.85%) said they were abducted, one respondent (1.37%) said someone attempted to murder him, and one respondent (1.37%) said he was prohibited from leaving the country.

Dangerous situation at work. Participants were asked if they have ever been in a dangerous situation because of their work. Forty-three respondents or nearly a three-fifths majority (59%) said they have been in a dangerous situation either very often or sometimes. Specifically, 19 respondents (26%) said they have been in a dangerous situation very often, and 24 respondents (33%) said they have been in a dangerous situation sometimes. About one-third or 23 respondents (31.5%) said they have rarely been in a dangerous situation, whereas only 7 respondents (9.6%) said they have never been in a dangerous situation at all. (See Table 7.) In every region except AJK, at least one respondent reported having been in a dangerous situation very often, including 12 (34.3%) in the large number of responses from KP. In every province except Sindh, at least one respondent reported having been in a dangerous situation sometimes, including 14 (40%) from KP.

In the second part of the same question, participants were asked to briefly explain how they handled the dangerous situation, if they found themselves in one. Sixty-six of the 73 respondents said they found themselves in harm's way (very often, sometimes, or rarely). But 49 respondents did not share if they took any action or how they handled the situation. One even said that he had no choice but to rely on God. On

32

the other hand, 17 respondents who found themselves in danger during work mentioned taking some kind of initiative to get out of the dangerous situation.

Table 7. Journalists Have Been in Dangerous Situation

Province	Yes, very often	Yes, sometimes	Rarely	Never
KP	12 (34.3%)	14 (40%)	7 (20%)	2 (5.7%)
Punjab	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)
AJK	0	4 (66.7%)	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)
Islamabad	2 (22.2%)	3 (33.3%)	4 (44.4%)	0
Sindh	2 (20%)	0	6 (60%)	2 (20%)
Balochistan	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)
Total	19 (26%)	24 (32.9%)	23 (31.5%)	7 (9.6%)

The following categories emerged from the open-ended answers given by respondents.

Dealt with the situation by themselves– 8 respondents. Respondents said they either moved away from a violent scene by themselves, waited for authorities concerned to clear the site and then moved to a safer place, chose to take safety measures in later

work, or became very careful in the usage of words during live coverage of sensitive news.

Moved away from crossfire. One respondent said that when he was covering an attack on the Army Public School, he got himself into a very critical situation.

"The gunshots and blasts were atrocious. I reached the gate of the school. I could see the terrorist from the gates. Suddenly security forces came up behind me and started shooting at each other. Despite the fact I had no bulletproof jacket nor a helmet to save myself, I wore my press card, lied on the ground and crawled to the nearest canal and reached a safer place where other journalists had gathered."

Waited for authority to clear the blast area and then do the coverage. A respondent said that once he reached the site of a suicide attack even before the rescue work had to begin, and there were chances of a second blast at the site.

"So we decided to take a step back, and let the security force reach on the spot so they can cordon off the area, and then we do our reporting and coverage of the blast."

Chose to take safety measures in later work. A respondent said that he once did a story about miscreants' activities in an area.

"The news was published and the other day I was called by unknown person who threatened me that I will be killed soon. That stress was enough for me to be careful in future."

Became very careful in the usage of words during coverage of sensitive news. One respondent said that when he and other journalists were doing stories on militant activities, they often received threats not to cover the stories.

"But we handled the situations with extreme care. We were very thorough about our stories and we had to be extremely careful about how we chose our words."

Help from law enforcement authorities– 6 respondents. Respondents said they were either warned by law enforcement authorities or rescued from violent situations by police/military force.

Rescued by police/military force. A respondent said that he was once covering an army operation against terrorists, and just when they were about to leave the area, terrorists attacked them. The army came to their rescue.

Warned by police to stay away from danger. A respondent said that he was sitting in his office when his boss came and told him to go downstairs and check a car that had caught fire. He went down and started checking the car. "Suddenly a police man came and asked me to go away from the car as there was an IED (bomb) planted in the car. I ran away from the car as bomb disposal unit officials arrived and defused the bomb. I think it was a narrow escape."

Help from employer organization– 2 respondents. Respondents said they followed the instructions from their employer organization to not visit any violent areas alone, and informed them about the threats.

Followed instructions from employer organization to not visit violent areas alone. One of the respondents said that he had closely witnessed several violent situations that occurred in his city.

"I was informed not to visit disturbed areas alone and do not try to put myself in any risky position."

Reported to their office after receiving threats. Another respondent said that he received many threatening calls from militant groups. He responded to the situation by informing the head office of his organization.

Took to social media– 1 respondent. A respondent said that during a political gathering, he reported the incident of a girl who was harassed by political workers. Since it was a government event, the government tried to arrest him after the story was broadcast. However, the respondent made a quick decision and tweeted about the situation. Once the threat became public through social media, the arrest was called off.

Quit job after being harassed– 1 respondent. A respondent said that he was interviewing vendors about their problems due to militancy in an area that is considered the main shopping area in that region. Meanwhile, a local influential group forcefully took him to their area and inquired about his work and background. The entire episode made him so mentally stressed that he decided to quit his job.

Summary of results for RQ1. Results of RQ1 showed the three most common threats the surveyed journalists in Pakistan face are harassment, psychological threats, and injury. Respondents from most of the regions listed similar common threats except for a few differences reflected in Balochistan, Sindh, and AJK. Most respondents have been in a dangerous situation. Some shared their experience and said they handled that situation in a variety of ways.

RQ2: Does Journalists' Professional Behavior Take into Account Safety Issues and Minimize Possible Risks?

The second research question (RQ2) examined journalists' opinion and actions with regard to risk-taking at work. One set of questions under RQ2 examined the

journalists' views on risk-taking behavior. Another set asked directly about journalists' actions related to risk.

Opinions on journalist risk-taking. In the first set of questions, participants were asked about their opinion on risk-taking and on sharing the responsibility for their own safety. (See Table 8.)

Table 8. Journalists' Opinion on Risk-Taking and Sharing Responsibility for Their Safety

---

Is it reasonable for a journalist to put their life at risk to get a breaking or exclusive story?

Disagree	Don't Know	Agree
42	2	27
(59%)	(3%)	(38%)

Would you run an exclusive but sensitive story if it could put your life at risk?

Yes	Not Sure	No
39	15	18
(54%)	(21%)	(25%)

Journalists must take some responsibility for their own safety

Yes	No
52	21
(71%)	(29%)

Putting life at risk to get a breaking/exclusive story. Participants were asked if, in their opinion, it is reasonable for a journalist to put their life at risk to get a breaking or exclusive story. Almost a three-fifth majority or 59% of respondents said they

disagree with the idea of putting their life at risk. Almost two-fifths or 38% of respondents said they agree with the idea. Only about 3% said they don't know whether it is reasonable or not to put their life at risk to get a breaking or exclusive story.

Choosing between taking risk at life and holding back a scoop. Participants were asked what would they do if they got hold of an exclusive but sensitive story, and running that story could put their life at risk. More than half or 54% of respondents said they would take that risk of running the story. One-fourth or 25% said they would not take the risk. About one-fifth or 21% were not sure what they would do.

Journalists must take some responsibility? Participants were asked if they believe journalists must take some responsibility for their own safety. Nearly a three-fourths majority (71.23%) said "Yes," journalists must take some responsibility for their safety, whereas less than one-third or 29% said "No," it is the responsibility of media houses, the state, government, etc. to ensure the safety of journalists.

Journalists' actions related to risk. In the second set of questions, participants were asked about their actions in relation to risk-taking. They were asked if they had ever refused a dangerous assignment, if they assessed potential risks involved in their work, and take precautionary measures. (See Table 9.)

Refusing a dangerous assignment. Participants were asked if they have ever refused a dangerous assignment. A three-fifth majority or 59% respondents said they never refused an assignment. Only one-eighth or about 13% respondents said they had refused an assignment, whereas more than one-fourth or 28% respondents said they never came across any dangerous assignment.

Participants were also asked to briefly explain the dangerous assignment, if there were any consequences of refusing the assignment in case they said "Yes," and why did not they refuse the assignment if they said "No."

Six respondents mentioned they had refused dangerous assignments for various reasons. All of them said there were no consequences of refusing the assignment.

Table 9. Journalists' Actions Related to Risk

Refuse dangerous assignment	Yes 9 (13%)		No 42 (59%)		Never had to 20 (28%)
Assess risk before going to assignment	Yes 39 (54%)		Sometimes 22 (31%)		No 11 (15%)
Take precautionary measure before going to assignment	Yes 32 (44%)		Sometimes 26 (36%)		No 15 (21%)
Inform someone before going to assignment	Boss 48 (67%)	Colleague 33 (46%)	Family member 23 (32%)	Friend 17 (24%)	None 2 (3%)
Take important things (first aid box, etc.) before going to a dangerous assignment	Yes 6 (8%)		Sometimes 7 (10%)		No 60 (82%)

Reasons for refusing a dangerous assignment. The reasons for refusing dangerous assignments that emerged from the open-ended answers are as follows:

Receiving open threats - 3 respondents. One of the respondents said that he had refused doing a story on land grabbers/real-estate mafia. The target person of that story

39

was a tycoon, and was tipped off about the possible story. The respondent said that the tycoon approached the respondent through a third party who threatened the respondent:

"If you publish the story that will be your last day."

Another respondent who reported on the ideological conflict between two religion-based political parties found himself in troubled waters after publishing the story.

"They were all set to declare me a blasphemer."

The respondent said that as soon as he realized the danger of the situation, he wrote an article that somewhat defused the heat. Later on, his editor asked him to do a follow-up story on the conflict but he said:

"I refused to do so as I knew what happens to the person who is accused of blasphemy."

Violent nature of assignment location – 2 respondents. One respondent said that he had refused covering bomb blasts and crossfires between different tribes. Another respondent said that he refused to cover the incident of "Lal Masjid" (Red Mosque) that had once turned into a war zone.

Post-traumatic phase – 1 respondent. One respondent said that he had refused going to the rallies of a particular political party after having been threatened and physically assaulted by a mob at one of its rallies.

Reasons for not refusing a dangerous assignment. The categories that appeared from the narrations of respondents who said they have never refused an assignment are as follows:

Job insecurity. Twenty-five respondents said they couldn't put their job at risk.

40

One of the respondents who had made documentary on North Waziristan and Taliban said he had no choice but to do the assignment because it was assigned to him. Another respondent said that he had to cover dangerous assignments "Because I could not afford to lose my job." Others said:

"If we miss such dangerous assignments, we receive notice from the organization. Deliberately saying no to a dangerous assignment will surely cost us being fired from job."

"I was often pressurized by the office for dangerous assignments. In a critical situation, we are often told to reach the dangerous spot and cover the event without any safety protection."

"I think job security is always a threat. If I have been given an assignment I have to cover it."

Nature of job. Fourteen respondents said it's their job's nature or usual part of their profession so they cannot avoid it. A respondent said that a journalist should be ready to face any dangerous situations at work, and that it's important for a reporter to cover every kind of news and assignment. Another respondent said a journalist needs to put himself at risk while working on an exclusive story. Others said:

"I will never refuse any assignment just because of not taking risk."

"Because being journalist, it's my duty to put my fear aside and show the reality to world."

"As a journalist, I am bound to perform my professional duty."

Accepting challenges. Nine respondents said they like to accept challenges in life, so they accept the dangerous assignments.

"I never refused any such assignment because I love to accept challenges and cover assignments having maximum risk. Here in Pakistan, a single click can make reporter a big journalist," one respondent said.

Another respondent said that he has always taken up dangerous assignments because he liked challenges.

"It's the challenge that makes our job interesting."

Competition/peer pressure. Five respondents said they thought they must do certain stories to stay in the media race. A respondent said he never refused any assignment because he would have been in trouble if someone else covered the same story.

Lack of awareness. Only one respondent said he was not aware of the danger he put himself into.

"I was inexperienced at that time, therefore, I was not aware of the risk."

Assessing potential risks at work. Responding to a question on whether they assess (or evaluate) potential risks involved in work before going to an assignment, more than half or 54% of respondents said they assessed the possible risk at work before going to an assignment. Nearly one-third or 31% respondents said they assessed the risk only sometimes, whereas nearly one-sixth or 15% respondents said they never assessed the risk before going to an assignment.

Taking precautionary measures before going to assignment. Participants were asked if they take precautionary measures before going to an assignment. Nearly half of them or 44% respondents said they do take preventive measures at all times or very often. One-third or 35% of respondents said they take precautionary measures only

sometimes before going to an assignment. About 21% respondents said they don't take precautionary measures before going to an assignment.

Informing someone before going to assignment. Participants were asked if they inform someone before going to an assignment. A two-thirds majority or 67% of respondents said they inform their boss, nearly half of the respondents or 46% said they inform their colleague, one-third or 32% said they inform a family member, and one-fourth or 24% respondents said they inform their friend. Only about 3% said they do not inform anyone before going to an assignment.

Taking along a bag (with important things) before going to assignment. Participants were asked if they take a bag with important things (such as first aid box, etc.) before going to a dangerous assignment. More than a four-fifths majority or 82% of respondents said they never or rarely take a bag with them, 9.6% said they only sometimes take a bag with them, whereas only 8% said they usually or always take a bag with them when they go to a dangerous assignment.

Summary of results for RQ2. The overall results for RQ2 show a conflicting pattern in some of the reported opinions and actions of respondents. The results show that even though a majority (59%) of respondents disagreed with the idea of a journalist putting his or her life at risk to get a breaking story, more than a half (54%) respondents said they would take the risk of running a sensitive story, even if that puts their life at risk. A big majority (59%) of respondents said they never refused an assignment. Some of them gave reasons for not refusing an assignment; job insecurity and the risky nature of the journalism profession were cited as the most common reasons.

These results depict a conflict in respondents' view on risk-taking by journalists in general and their choice when it comes to taking risk in their own life. A large majority said that journalists must take some responsibility for their safety, and more than half said they assessed possible risks, took precautionary measures and informed someone before going to an assignment. However, a large majority of respondents also said they do not take a bag of important things (such as first aid box, etc.) with them before going to a dangerous assignment.

Hence the results for RQ2 depict that even though respondents said they should and they do take necessary measures in relation to the risk-taking at work, some of their reported actions (such as not taking an emergency bag to assignment, not refusing a dangerous assignment, etc.) did not reflect their opinion about risk-taking.

RQ3: How Could Journalistic Practices be Improved to Safeguard Safety Better?

The third and last research question (RQ3) in this study aimed at examining journalists' opinion as to how journalistic practices could be improved to safeguard their safety better. First, they were asked to talk about any actions or decisions they regretted in relation to any dangerous situation at work or a risky assignment. More important, they were asked to reveal how they think they should have acted differently in the situation (in case they had any regrets at all). Second, they were directly asked to make recommendations to improve the safety of journalists in Pakistan.

Regretting actions or decisions leading to dangerous situations. Responding to a question if they ever regretted any action or decision (during work) that might have put them in a dangerous situation, a large majority or 78.2% respondents said "No," they did not regret any such action or decision. Only one-fifth or 21.7% said they did

regret one or more actions or decisions they had made in relation to a risky assignment or a dangerous situation at work. In the second part of the above question, participants were also asked how they should have responded differently to the situations they had mentioned. The following categories came up from the responses:

Putting team members in danger - 4 respondents. A respondent said that he had taken risks and experienced dangerous situations several times. Often, he was not alone as his team members accompanied him at assignments. Therefore, he had ultimately decided that he would not put his colleagues' lives in danger.

Stupidity/unawareness (going into the battlefield, asking wrong questions, etc.) - 2 respondents. A respondent said that he used to cover routine news such as bomb blasts, kidnappings and government operations against militants. His experiences made him regret how he had underestimated the situations he had come across putting himself in grave danger. Another respondent said that once he was asked to cover an assignment about the demolition of an illegal settlement on the outskirts of the city.

"I pitched a wrong question in front of the affected and charged mob. The question was not wrong but it was placed in the wrong situation. I regret it even today."

Taking risk of life for international organizations not worthwhile - 1 respondent. This respondent said:

"I still believe that going to Pak-Afghan border was not a good decision…. working as a fixer for international editors doubles the risk because the international media and editors after occurring any incident don't even bother to own you."

Not informing anyone about work plan - 2 respondents. One respondent said that he regretted his habit of not sharing with anyone about what story he's working on, because sometimes that habit puts him in great trouble.

Taking byline/credit line on sensitive story - 2 respondents. A respondent said that he once wrote a story against some miscreants. Right after the news was published, he was called by an unknown person who threatened him, and said that he would soon be killed.

"I think in such news, reporters should hide their identity."

He said that if he had not taken a credit line for that story, the miscreants would not have known about the author.

"Credit lines must be skipped in risky news," he recommended.

Not using safety equipment - 1 respondent. A respondent regretted not wearing safety equipment while covering a dangerous assignment. He was covering an army operation against militants, but he did not wear his protection jacket and helmet that his organization had given to him. He said he regretted behaving carelessly towards his safety.

"I think all the journalists should give priority to their safety."

Driving into a blast site before clearance from authority - 1 respondent.

"I surely think that the way we follow instructions from bosses and organization to cover dangerous assignments, it causes us trouble and risk our life often. While covering a regular event, we got news of a blast, and as I received call from the boss, we drove for the spot without evaluating situation,"

one respondent said, regretting the way he along his colleagues covered the assignment.

Violating international border law - 1 respondent. One respondent said that he regretted several of his decisions at work but the one he highly regretted is that once he entered Afghanistan via Torkham crossing point, and started taking photos and interviewed children who were involved in child labor and were being sexually harassed by locals. He narrated:

"I should not have visited Afghanistan without valid visa and then should have not taken photos in alien country as it was against the international law along with journalism code of ethics. However, fortunately during my field work, I did everything very peacefully and did not face any untoward incident till returning from there and entering into Pakistani soil. I really regretted my decision... But those days were my initial in field of journalism and I took risk deliberately."

Recommendations to improve journalistic practices to ensure better safety of journalists. Participants were finally asked to make recommendations (training programs, organization policies, guidelines, insurance, safety equipment, counseling, etc.) with regard to improving journalistic practices to ensure better safety of journalists in Pakistan. The several categories that emerged from their responses are:

Need for training - 62 respondents. A large majority of respondents recommended proper training for journalists. A respondent said that his employer organization once arranged a training session, but that was only about how to face the camera. He said that media employers are not interested in saving their journalists, and what they are only interested in is their vehicles, cameras, etc. Another respondent said

that there's need for training programs for journalists where they would be trained on precautionary measures, and also on how they should get out of a trouble if the situation at work goes out of control.

Need safety equipment – 29 respondents. The second most common recommendation was to ensure usage of safety equipment. One respondent said that the equipment should be provided by the organization as it should be accountable for the life of the person who is working for it. Another respondent said that media organizations should be accountable to provide the life saving equipment in all the vehicles carrying their teams for coverage.

Mandatory insurance – 28 respondents. Many respondents said that life insurance for journalists is greatly significant but unfortunately most media houses insure only their equipment, not their employees.

One said insurance should be a requirement for every media worker all across Pakistan to compensate any loss.

Implementation of media safety policies/guidelines – 27 respondents. One respondent said:

> "I think the media houses should take every measure to ensure the safety of the person working for them. They should arrange programs, workshops where they tell their journalists to follow safety guidelines, and ensure them that they, and not the news, are the priority."

Another respondent said that journalists should not be compelled to do something that seems to be a threat for their safety. Another respondent said that media

organizations should make policies for the safety of journalists, because journalists give breaking news risking their life for the organization.

Law/government policy amendment– 21 respondents. One respondent suggested that the government, press clubs and press unions ensure the safety of journalists through proper legislation.

Counseling – 15 respondents. One respondent said:

"I would definitely recommend counseling because our work comes with a lot of stress and trauma in some cases, which is quite difficult to cope with."

"Trauma centers need to be established for journalists," another wrote.

Training of editors, media managers/owners – 11 respondents. Several respondents recommended training for editors and media owners.

"I think top officials of all media organizations should be invited at one training where they should also be briefed about safety of journalists and they should be told to insure their workers so that in case of any mishap the family of the victim can be benefited," one said.

"Training should be conducted but not with the journalists but with assignment editors who are setting in newsrooms and assigning different stories and also with the owners who wish to cover everything but don't even take a pain to think about employees' risk," another said.

Risk assessment by journalists – 10 respondents. Some of them said journalists should be more careful in their judgment over a dangerous situation.

"The journalist himself should take all precautionary measures before putting his life in a risky situation, or instead analyze the risk he could face while going to an assignment," one respondent said.

Ensure job security/improved wages – 7 respondents. Some respondents recommended job security and improved wages for journalists. One respondent emphasized increasing salaries of journalists because he said the salaries are very low whereas the workload is too high.

"No" for training – 3 respondents. A very few respondents were of the exceptional view that training would not change much or there's no need for training. One respondent said that nothing can save a journalist while he or she is reporting on sensitive issues, because the kinds of threats have changed in the country. He said that now in Pakistan, a journalist is threatened by not only by extremists and the government, but also by several other state and non-state actors.

"I think if journalists only follow the guidelines there will be no need of training," another respondent said.

Penalty for violators of media safety guidelines – 2 respondents. One respondent said that the government should ensure implementation of media safety policies. He emphasized that the government must bind media houses to design and implement organizational policies for the safety of journalists, and also take steps for the counseling of journalists. Another respondent said that journalists who do not follow safety guidelines should be penalized in order to make them realize the importance of media safety.

Summary of results for RQ3. Results for the third and last research question (RQ3) in this study reveal several recommendations, made by journalists, to improve journalistic practices in Pakistan. A minority of respondents said they regret one or more actions or decisions made during work, and some reflected on these regrets. The major recommendations for change included training of journalists as well as media employers, policymaking and guidelines for media safety and their implementation across all media houses, provision and usage of safety equipment, risk assessment by journalists on their own, treatment of psychological problems that occur because of work, securing jobs, improved wages, and mandatory insurance for journalists. The implications of these results on the media industry and academia are explained in the next chapter in detail. The chapter discusses the significance of this study beside the previous works on the topic. It also underlines the limitations of this study and lists suggestions for future research on the topic.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The findings from this study highlight three aspects in connection to the safety of journalists in Pakistan: first, understanding and experiences of journalists about the safety threats in their respective regions; second, practical safety measures they take to address the safety issue (risk assessment and management); and third, recommendations on how the safety issue could be addressed through better journalistic practices in the future.

The study posed three research questions. The first research question (RQ1) examined how journalists in Pakistan regard or view safety issues in their profession. The second question (RQ2) examined journalists' professional behavior as to whether or not they take into account safety issues and minimize possible risks at work. The third research question (RQ3) explained ways in which journalistic practices could be improved to safeguard safety of journalists better.

Nearly half of the respondents were from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) or Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), areas of high terrorism and violence. The others were spread among the remaining five regions. The findings from RQ1 show most of the surveyed journalists have experienced harassment and many have experienced other kinds of threats to their safety and physical violence because of their profession.

"Harassment" appeared as the most prominent threat among all kinds of threats experienced by the surveyed journalists. As discussed in the previous chapters as well, journalists in Pakistan experience pressure from different pressure groups, may it be government, army, intelligence agencies, militants, religious/political or other groups.

One of the major findings of this study is that harassment is a big issue when it comes to the safety of journalists in Pakistan, as more than half (53.4%) of the surveyed journalists said they were harassed (pressured) because of their profession. The second most common threat cited by the surveyed journalists was the psychological threat as many (43.8%) said they went through psychological threat (defined as mental stress or trauma in this paper) because of their profession.

More than 90 percent of the surveyed journalists had been in a dangerous situation at work at least once. Some of them shared a variety of ways that they handled the situation, such as taking measures on their own, seeking help from their employer organization or from law enforcement authorities, or taking to social media. The study underlines harassment, psychological threats, and injury as the three most common threats that the surveyed journalists face.

Journalists from most regions of Pakistan listed similar common threats except for a few differences reflected in Balochistan, Sindh, and Azad and Jammu Kashmir (AJK). A majority deemed their region more dangerous and riskier than other regions.

The results from RQ2 show a conflicting pattern in some of the reported opinions and actions of respondents. Even though a majority of respondents disagreed with the idea of a journalist putting his or her life at risk to get a breaking story, more than half of respondents said they would take the risk of running a sensitive story, even if that put their life at risk. A majority of respondents also said they never refused an assignment. Some of them cited job insecurity or the nature of the journalism profession (accepting journalism as a risky profession or citing their professional responsibility) as the most common reasons for not refusing an assignment.

A large majority said that journalists must take some responsibility for their safety, and large majorities also said they assessed possible risks, took precautionary measures and informed someone before going to an assignment. However, nearly two-thirds of respondents also said they never took a bag of important things (such as first aid box, etc.) with them before going to a dangerous assignment. Hence the results for RQ2 depict that even though respondents said they should and they do take necessary measures in relation to the risk-taking at work, some of their reported actions (such as not taking an emergency bag to assignment, not refusing a dangerous assignment) did not reflect their reported opinion about risk-taking.

Results for the third and last research question (RQ3) in this study reveal several recommendations, made by journalists, to improve journalistic practices in Pakistan. Only a minority of respondents said they regret one or more professional decisions that might have put them in danger, and some reflected on these regrets. However, almost all respondents shared recommendations for better journalistic practice in order to ensure the safety of journalists. The major recommendations for change included training of journalists as well as media employers, policymaking and guidelines for media safety and their implementation across all media houses, provision and usage of safety equipment, risk assessment by journalists on their own, treatment of psychological problems that occur because of work, securing jobs, improved wages, and mandatory insurance for journalists.

Significance of the Study

The safety of journalists is a burning issue these days around the globe, but Pakistan is one of those countries that have been affected by this issue the most

(Rehmat, 2014; IFJ 2016). Although safety of journalists is considered to be an important requirement for unhindered practice of journalism and for the freedom of expression, journalists' safety has not been frequently discussed in academic research (UNESCO, C&I, 2016). Therefore, such a study, which could highlight media safety concerns and journalistic practices, was more needed than ever before. As noted in the literature review, the UNESCO research agenda listed several research questions that need to be addressed with the context of the safety of journalists. This study addresses some of the issues on which UNESCO called for academic research in conjunction with a 2016 conference on the safety of journalists (Poythari & Berger, 2015; UNESCO, C&I, 2016). It specifically attempted to answer three of the several research questions listed under the practitioner issues categorized in the research agenda: how journalists perceive safety issues in their work, whether their behavior takes into account safety issues and minimizes possible risks, and how journalistic practices be improved to safeguard their safety better.

The findings from this study added to previous work on journalists' safety by showing that even though the surveyed journalists realize the gravity of their job and show concern over various kinds of threats to their safety, many do not adopt strategies (taking a bag with important things before going to a dangerous assignment) in which they could minimize work-related risks or believe they do not dare saying "no" to their boss, if assigned to cover a dangerous assignment, because of job insecurity.

The study also reveals significant patterns of threats and violence against journalists in Pakistan and the usual practices in relation to risk-taking by media professionals in different parts of the country. Rehmat (2014) suggests journalists in

Pakistan have to make a lot of compromises and put their lives at risk to continue reporting. Findings from the current study add to Rehmat's work, and show why journalists put their lives at risk (job insecurity, nature of the job/ professional responsibility cited as most common reasons for risk taking). It also underlines the fact that journalists lack awareness and need training on how to handle risky situations at work (since a large majority of respondents recommended training for journalists).

This study also supports the work of Bhattacharya (2015) that suggested journalists countrywide in Pakistan face threats from state and non-state actors, including intelligence establishment, civil and military state organs, militants, insurgents, gangsters, traffickers, and so on, while many of them also experience physical surveillance, phone tapping, computer hacking, and threats to family and friends. Findings from this study show "harassment" (defined as pressure by government, army, extremists, political/religious/other influential groups) as the most common threat to journalists in Pakistan. Similarly, the current study supports another previous work that suggests local journalists are not only facing deaths on a regular basis but are also looked upon with mistrust by the government and the community (Aslam, 2011). This study shows "psychological threat" (defined as mental stress and trauma) as one of the three most common threats to journalists in Pakistan, and mistrust by government and other parties could be seen as a cause of mental stress to journalists.

Moreover, this study adds value to the previous work (Jamil, 2017) that indicates that journalists in Pakistan work in an unsafe institutional environment. Jamil's study suggested that social and emotional risks were often ignored by international organizations monitoring journalists' safety level in Pakistan, and

recommended more detailed research. This study highlights harassment and psychological threats as the most common threats experienced by the surveyed journalists. The former study (Jamil, 2017) was confined only to Karachi, the most populous city of Pakistan. However, this study covered the entire country. Ashraf & Brooten (2017) investigated challenges faced by journalists who hailed from FATA but had to leave their homes because of the severe conflict situation in the region. Although the current study was not confined to the vulnerable regions of the country, almost half of responses came from western bordering regions, including FATA. This study adds value to the previous study (Ashraf & Brooten, 2017) as it underscores opinions of journalists who still continue to work under the risk despite of constant threats in that region as well as other parts of the country.

These findings not only hold significance for media professionals and media academics as they underline the opinion of journalists from a country that has been considered one of the most dangerous countries for journalists, but they also elevate the existing research work by various non-government organizations (NGOs) such as the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ), Reporters Without Borders, and the International News Safety Institute dedicated to press freedom and media safety. This study confirms the higher danger level for journalists in KP and FATA as the CPJ data suggested (CPJ, 2017). It also supports the idea of journalists' training proposed and insisted upon by all these NGOs.

In the backdrop of the UNESCO's statement that the journalist safety issue is complex and academic research can significantly increase the understanding of the issue, and can consequently help in creating safer working conditions for journalists and

media professionals worldwide, this study is a potentially valuable addition to the existing research on the topic.

This study hopes to make field journalists understand that journalism itself is not a suicide mission. No scoop or story can be more important than the life of a journalist. In a society such as Pakistan, where there is almost no implementation of media safety rules and regulations in the media industry, a safe haven would need to be built from within. The more journalists would understand about their productive role, rights, and duties performed only with calculated risks, the safer the profession would become. This study also aimed to broaden the understanding of this aspect, i.e. how journalists could possibly take control of their safety by themselves (by assessing and minimizing risk beforehand).

As for media owners or top-level management, recommendations from journalists in this study might act as a bridge between the media owners and field professionals. Journalists in the field would be encouraged to use the safety equipment and follow the safety guidelines if their organization provides them. Similarly, an editor or assignment editor should be able to warn reporters or make them alert about possible threats or risks while giving them dangerous assignments. This study also supports Feinstein's (2014) idea of a lack of training programs that could prepare journalists for the safety challenges in the evolving media environment, as almost all respondents mentioned training as the most important need for journalists to ensure their safety.

This paper recommends that special training and other initiatives be taken to meet the distinctive needs of Pakistani journalists at high risk. For example, journalists should be given the complete first-aid training. They should also be trained on how to

build a support group in order to resist any threats that impede their work and put them at risk. The fact that most journalists in rural areas such as FATA do not have educational background in journalism. Therefore, it is also recommended that special courses be designed to educate them on the journalists' safety issue, so that they get aware on their rights and duties. They should be trained on how to assess and minimize risks at work, how to avoid or refuse highly dangerous assignments without putting their job at risk. The journalists' associations in conflict regions should also take necessary initiatives to ensure the journalists are well educated or well trained on the safety issue.

Limitations

Even though findings from this study add value to the existing research on the safety of journalists as it draws a picture of the safety situation in different regions of Pakistan, and highlights opinions and actions of journalists at high risk in relation to risk-taking at work, the findings could not be generalized to the entire journalist community in Pakistan because of the small number of responses from most provinces except Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) and because of the purposive, non-random nature of the sample. The frequency and intensity of threat for these journalists may be greater than for journalists in Pakistan as a whole. This study did not compensate participants for their time. Inclusion of compensation could have possibly resulted in a higher response rate.

Besides, it was observed that some respondents could not entirely or conveniently convey their responses to the open-ended questions because of a lack of English writing skills. Therefore, future surveys could also be designed in Urdu (the

native language) or kept bilingual so that participants could choose to respond in their preferred language - English or Urdu.

Suggestions for Future Research

A number of opportunities exist for future research on the topic of safety of journalists in relation to Pakistan and elsewhere. Future research in Pakistan could include surveys and interviews in Urdu (the native language of Pakistan), or bilingual surveys (English and Urdu) to specially encourage journalists in rural areas participate more in the research.

Future research could also include in-depth interviews of journalists considered at high risk and of editors and media managers in different regions of the country. Future research could include region-based studies (focusing one or two provinces at a time). Moreover, comparative studies with in-depth interviews could reveal the difference of opinion and of risk-taking practices among journalists in different regions of the country.

This study has looked into the concept of the journalist safety in a country where media equipment is insured whereas journalists are not. This study suggests how little journalists themselves may be aware of work-related risk assessment, let alone ways to minimize those risks. There is further opportunity for future research on the concept of risk assessment and risk management among journalists in Pakistan and in other countries where journalists are at high risk.

Responsibilities of risk assessment and management in journalism rest on both managers and field professionals. Many respondents in this study pointed at the importance of training editors and media managers so that they understand the risk they

put their employees (reporters, camera operators, photographers, technicians, etc.) in as they assign them sensitive and risky assignments in a routine. Therefore, future research involving media managers, owners, and editors could be helpful in highlighting their perspective on the safety of journalists.

Since the absence of life insurance for media professionals and the media safety equipment is one of those aspects that the surveyed journalists have highlighted in this study, a comparative study could also explain if there is any significant relationship between journalist's life insurance and his or her perception about risk-taking. Thus a comparative study could look into risk perception, safe conduct, and journalistic practices of two different groups of journalists-- with and without life insurance coverage.

With all the recommendations mentioned above, this study raises hope for continued research on this topic to strengthen safety of journalists.

References

Abdullah, H. (2014, January 23). Media now in TTP crosshairs. Retrieved from
    http://www.dawn.com/news/1082132

APP. (2011, July 15). Journalists demand more protection of government, media
    organizations. Retrieved from http://www.dawn.com/news/644235

Ashraf, S. I., & Brooten, L. (2017). Tribal journalists under fire. Threats, impunity and
    decision making in reporting on conflict in Pakistan. In Carlsson, U., &
    Poyhtari, R. (Eds.), The Assault on Journalism. Building Knowledge to Protect
    Freedom of Expression (pp. 147-158). Sweden: Nordicom, University of
    Gothenburg.

Aslam, R. (2011). Peace journalism: A paradigm shift in traditional media approach.
    Pacific Journalism Review, *17*(1), 119.

Bhattacharya, S. (2015). Violence: A bane for Pakistani media. Journal of the
    International Relations and Affairs Group, Volume V, Issue II, (2), 228.

CEJ. (2016). Retrieved from https://cej.iba.edu.pk/AboutUs.php

CPJ. (2017). 60 journalists killed in Pakistan since 1992/motive confirmed. Committee
    to Protect Journalists. Retrieved from https://cpj.org/killed/asia/pakistan/

CPJ. (2017). Journalists missing. Retrieved from
    https://www.cpj.org/reports/2008/02/journalists-missing.php

CPJ. (2012). Journalist security guide. Covering the news in a dangerous and changing
    world. Retrieved from https://cpj.org/security/guide.pdf

CPJ. (2012). Assessing and responding to risk. Journalist Security Guide. Covering the
    news in a dangerous and changing world. Retrieved from
    https://cpj.org/reports/2012/04/assessing-and-responding-to-risk.php

Daly, E. (2016, November 2). Journalists at risk. Annual day promotes accountability

for attacks on the media. Retrieved from
https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/11/02/journalists-risk

EEA. (2016). Introduction to risk assessment concepts. Environmental risk assessment, approaches, experiences, and information sources. Retrieved from http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/GH-07-97-595-EN-C2/chapter1h.html

Feinstein, A. (2014). In harm's way: Why war correspondents take risks and how they cope. Retrieved from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/in-harms-way-why-war-correspondents-take-the-risk/article20278510/

Freedom House (2016). Pakistan. Retrieved from https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2016/pakistan

Hicks, T. (2013, November 6). Nieman reports: Why journalists take the risk to report from dangerous places. Retrieved from http://niemanreports.org/articles/why-journalists-take-the-risk-to-report-from-dangerous-places/

Hughes, S., & Marquez-Ramirez, M. (2017). How unsafe contexts and overlapping risks influence journalism practice. Evidence from a survey of Mexican journalists. In Carlsson, U., & Poyhtari, R. (Eds.), The Assault on Journalism. Building Knowledge to Protect Freedom of Expression (pp. 303-316). Sweden: Nordicom, University of Gothenburg.

IFJ. (2016, December 30). 93 media professionals killed in 2016. Retrieved from http://ifj-safety.org/en/contents/93-media-professionals-killed-in-2016

International Media Support (2009). Between radicalization and democratization in an unfolding conflict: Media in Pakistan.

INSI. (2017). 115 journalists killed in 2016 – year begins and ends with mass casualties. Retrieved from http://newssafety.org/news/insi-news/insi-news/detail/115-journalists-killed-in-2016-year-begins-and-ends-with-mass-casualties-1827/

Jamil, S. (2017). Freedom under pressure. Threats to journalists' safety in Pakistan. In

Carlsson, U., & Poyhtari, R. (Eds.), The Assault on Journalism. Building Knowledge to Protect Freedom of Expression (pp. 323-328). Sweden: Nordicom, University of Gothenburg.

Maurice, P., Lavoie, M., Laflamme, L., Svanström, L., Romer, C., & Anderson, R. (2001). Safety and safety promotion: Definitions for operational developments. Injury Control and Safety Promotion, 8(4), 237-240.

Pakistan Press Foundation (PPF). (2015). Report on safety of media workers. Retrieved from http://www.pakistanpressfoundation.org/2015/10/pakistan-press-foundation-ppf-report-on-safety-of-media-workers/

Picard, R.G. (2015). Journalists' perceptions of the future of journalistic work. Reuters Institute for The Study of Journalism. University of Oxford.

Poyhtari, R. & Berger, G. (2015, June 1). Towards a research agenda on the safety of journalists. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/images/Themes/Freedom_of_expression/safety_of_journalists/Draft_Research_Agenda_Safety_of_Journalists_06_2015.pdf

Rehmat, A., (2014). Reporting under threat. Testimonies of courage in the face of impunity from Pakistani journalists.

Ricchiardi S., (2012). Challenges for independent news media in Pakistan. A report to the center for international media assistance.

Senam, N., & Akpan, U. (2014). The survey communication research. International Journal of Education and Research. Vol. 2.

Trochim, W. M., & Donnelly, J. P. (2001). Research methods knowledge base.

UNESCO, JSI. (2016). Communication and information. Journalists' safety indicators. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/freedom-of-expression/safety-of-journalists/journalists-safety-indicators/

UNESCO, C&I. (2016). Communication and Information. Safety of journalists and impunity. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/freedom-of-expression/safety-of-journalists/

UNESCO, C&I. (2016, June 24). Communication and Information. UNESCO publishes report on safety of journalists in Kenya, based on the UNESCO journalists safety indicators. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/resources/news-and-in-focus-articles/all-news/news/unesco_publishes_report_on_safety_of_journalists_in_kenya_b/

UNESCO (2016). News organizations standing up for the safety of media professionals. What media can do to strengthen the safety of journalists. Retrieved from http://en.unesco.org/safety-media-professionals

UNESCO. (2016). Themes for 2016. Access to information and fundamental freedoms: This is your right! Retrieved from http://en.unesco.org/world-press-freedom-day-2016/themes-2016

UNESCO, WPFD. (2016). World press freedom day 2016. Access to information and fundamental freedoms: This is your right! Retrieved from http://en.unesco.org/world-press-freedom-day-2016

UNESCO (2015). Concept note. Access to information and fundamental freedoms. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/WPFD/WPFD2016_Concept-Note.pdf

UNESCO, C&I. (2016). Communication and information. UNESCO's research agenda on the safety of journalists. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/freedom-of-expression/safety-of-journalists/unescos-research-agenda-on-safety-of-journalists/

Wimmer, R., & Dominick, J. (2011). Mass media research: An introduction. (9th Ed.) Boston: Wadsworth.

World Health Organization. (1998). Safety and safety promotion: conceptual and

operational aspects. Québec: WHO, 1-20.

Appendix: Survey

1.   Please check (X) the type(s) of media you work for:

   - Print (newspapers, magazines)
   - Broadcast (TV, radio)
   - Online

2.   Please mention the name of the province where you work.

3.   What is your job title or designation?

4.   What is your area(s) of work/news beats?

RQ1: How Do Journalists in Pakistan Regard/View Safety Issues in Their

Profession?

5.   (a) Please check (X) the three most common safety threats journalists in
      Pakistan face because of their profession:

   - Police arrest
   - Injury (accidentally, such as in protests, blasts, crossfires, etc.)
   - Physical assault (intentional/targeted attack)
   - Psychological threats (stress, trauma, etc.)
   - Murder (intentional/targeted)
   - Killing (accidentally, such as in protests, blasts, crossfires, etc.)
   - Harassment (pressured by government, army, extremists,
     political/religious/other influential groups, etc.)
   - Prohibition of leaving the country (your name on the exit control list)
   - Abduction
   - Other *(Please specify if you think there's any other common threat that is
     not listed above)*.

   (b) Now, please rank the three threats (that you have selected from the section
   above) from most common (No. 1) to least common (No. 3)

   1.
   2.
   3.

6. How safe or risky your region (province) is for journalists? Choose the answer best suitable to you.

- My region seems to be the safest and the least risky of *all the regions* of the country.
- My region seems to be safer and less risky than *most other regions* of the country.
- My region seems to be safer and less risky than *some other regions* of the country.
- My region has the same risk as other regions.
- My region seems to be more dangerous and riskier than *some other regions* of the country.
- My region seems to be more dangerous and riskier than *most other regions* of the country.
- My region seems to be the most dangerous and riskiest of *all the regions* of the country.
- I am not sure/I don't know.

7. What kinds of threats have you received or felt in your professional life? Choose all that apply.

- I could be murdered (intentional/targeted)
- I might be killed (accidentally, such as in protests, blasts, crossfires, etc.)
- I might get injured
- I might be abducted (kidnapped)
- I might be physically assaulted
- I might be harassed (pressured)
- I might be arrested
- I might be prohibited from leaving the country
- I might experience mental stress or trauma
- Others (please specify)
- I have not received or felt any threat in my entire professional life

8. What kinds of violence have you experienced at work? Choose all that apply.

- Someone attempted to murder me (intentional/targeted)
- I was almost killed (accidental)
- I was injured

68

- I was abducted (kidnapped)
- I was physically assaulted
- I was harassed (pressured)
- I was arrested
- I was prohibited from leaving the country
- I went through mental stress or trauma
- Others (please specify)
- I have not experienced any violence in my entire professional life

9.　　(a) Have you ever been in a dangerous situation because of your work?

- Yes, very often
- Yes, sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

(b) If your answer is 'Yes,' briefly explain in your words what was the situation, and how you handled it.

RQ2: Does Journalists' Professional Behavior Take into Account Safety Issues and Minimize Possible Risks?

10.　　It is reasonable for a journalist to put their life at risk to get a breaking or exclusive story. Please circle () your answer.

Strongly disagree　　Disagree　　I don't know　Agree　Strongly agree

11.　　Have you ever refused a dangerous assignment(s)?

- YES -- Briefly explain what the assignment(s) was, and if there were any consequences of refusing the assignment(s).

- NO -- Briefly explain why you did not refuse the assignment (job security, you like to accept challenges at work, etc).

- I have never come across a dangerous assignment.

12.　　Do you believe that journalists must take some responsibility for their safety? Briefly explain your answer.

- Yes

- No *(It's the responsibility of media houses, the state, government, etc. to ensure the safety of journalists.)*

13. I assess (or evaluate) potential risks involved in work before going to an assignment.

    - At all times
    - Very often
    - Sometimes
    - Rarely
    - Never

14. I take precautionary/preventive measures before going to an assignment.

    - At all times
    - Very often
    - Sometimes
    - Rarely
    - Never

15. What would you do if you get hold of an exclusive but sensitive story, and running that story can put your life at risk?

    - I will definitely take the risk
    - I might take the risk
    - I am not sure what I would do
    - I probably would not take the risk
    - I will never take that risk

16. Do you inform someone before going to an assignment? Check (X) all that apply.

    - I inform my boss
    - I inform my colleague
    - I inform my family member
    - I inform my friend
    - I don't inform anyone (Why? Briefly explain your answer.)

17.   Do you take a bag with important things (such as first aid box, etc.) before going to a dangerous assignment?

- At all times
- Most of the times
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

RQ3: How Could Journalistic Practices be Improved to Safeguard Safety Better?

18.   (a) Did you ever regret an act/decision (during work) that might have put you in a dangerous situation?

- Yes
- No

(b) If your answer is 'Yes,' how do you now think you should have responded differently to the situation(s)? Please explain in your own words.

19.   What would you recommend (training programs, organization policies, guidelines, insurance, safety equipment, counseling, etc.) with regard to improving journalistic practices to ensure better safety of journalists in Pakistan? Explain in your own words.