

**The Watchdog Role of Journalism: A Study on the Perception
of Ethiopian Journalists**

Befrdu Woldeamanuel

**A Thesis Submitted to
School of Journalism and Communication**

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in Journalism and Communication**

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

June, 2012

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Befrdu Woldeamanuel, entitled:
The watchdog role of journalism: A study on the perception of Ethiopian journalists and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Journalism and Communication complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Examiner_____ Signature_____ Date_____

Examiner_____ Signature_____ Date_____

Advisor_____ Signature_____ Date_____

Chairman of Department or Program Coordinator

ABSTRACT

The Watchdog Role of Journalism: A Study on the perception of Ethiopian Journalists

Befrdu Woldeamanuel

Addis Ababa University, 2012

This study was an inquiry into the perception of Ethiopian journalists with regard to the watchdog role of journalism. In this regard, the researcher has employed Western model of journalism, Development model journalism and propaganda model as theoretical underpinnings to answer the designed research questions. To come up with a seeming finding, qualitative research methodology was employed with an individual in-depth interview and focus group discussion as instruments for data collection. Hence, using a purposive sampling, a total of six practicing journalists were interviewed in the in-depth interview category, of which two were editors-in-chief, the other two, deputy editors-in-chiefs, one assistant editor and finally a producer. In the focus group discussion domain, six journalists were interviewed from one media house. The participants for the individual in-depth interview were also drawn from both government and private media institutions.

In the findings, journalists from both individual and focus group fronts have the orientation toward watchdog journalism as the Western literature portrays it; ‘to be the public’s eye in monitoring and exposing power abuse and misuse, maladministration, and corruption, to serve as a check and balance on the government or a fourth estate to monitor the three branches of government.’ Except one who learned it at school, the rest were informed about it through reading and actual practice.

When it comes to our context, the government media has espoused development journalism, while the private media claimed to exercise watchdog journalism with all its challenges. At last, it was found out that since the practice of the Western model of journalism was not compatible to our situation, development journalism seems to be the available option that works in our condition. Moreover, it was also shown that watchdog journalism has a part to play in the realm of development journalism. Furthermore, it was suggested that the practice of watchdog journalism needs a redefinition in our context.

Acknowledgements

I am forever indebted to a number of people for their contribution in the completion of this project. My sincere thanks go to my advisor, Dr. Gebremedhin Simon, for his unrationed assistance and invaluable advice throughout the duration of this thesis writing.

I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to Dr. Abdissa Zerai and Dr. Negeri Lencho for lending me their expertise and invaluable resources that made a difference in the final output of this study.

My special thanks also go to my brothers and sisters; Isaias Woldeamanuel, Mesfin Woldeamanuel, Binyam Woldeamanuel, Wzro. Misrak Woldeamanuel and Wzro. Tigist Woldeamanuel, without whose support and encouragement my success would not have been a reality.

At last, all my friends and people around me during my study deserve to take their portion from the lavish cocktail of my gratitude.

God bless you all!

List of acronyms

BBC – British Broadcasting Corporation

EHRICO – The Ethiopian Human Rights Council

EPRDF – The Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary and Democratic Front

HQ – Head Quarter

ITV – Interactive TV

NWICO – New World Information Communication Order

NWIO – New World Information Order

PM – Propaganda Model

RTD – Right to Development

UNESCO – United Nations Educational Science and Cultural Organization

WWII – World War Second

Table of contents

	Pages
Acronyms_____	v
Chapter One: Introduction	
1.1 Background of the study _____	1
1.2 Statement of the problem _____	6
1.3 Objective of the study _____	10
1.4 Research questions _____	10
1.5 Scope of the study _____	10
1.6 Significance of the study _____	11
1.7 Organization of the study _____	11
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature	
2.1 Brief history of the press _____	12
2.2 Historic press freedoms _____	14
2.2.1 The right to print _____	15
2.2.2 The right to criticize _____	16
2.2.3 The right to report _____	17
2.3 Western model _____	20
2.3.1 Watchdog journalism: As a fourth estate and guardian of public interest _____	22
2.3.1.1 Sensationalized watchdogism_____	30

2.3.1.2 Lapdog Journalism	32
2.3.1.3 Adversarial watchdogism	33
2.4 A different approach challenging the normative liberal pluralist conception of journalism	34
2.4.1 Polarized pluralist model	35
2.4.2 Democratic corporatist model	37
2.4.3 Liberal model	39
2.5 Development Model of Journalism	44
2.6 Propaganda model	54
2.6.1 Worthy and unworthy victims	60

Chapter Three: Research Methodology

3.1 Data Sources	64
3.2 Sampling	65
3.3 Data collection	67
3.3.1 In-depth Interviews	68
3.3.2 Focus Group Discussion	69
3.4 Data analysis procedures	71

Chapter Four: Results and Analysis

4.1 Data presentation and analysis	76
4.2 Journalists' introduction to watchdog journalism	76
4.3 Journalists' view of Watchdog journalism	77
4.3.1 Watchdog journalism and development journalism	80
4.4 The journalists' interpretation of watchdog journalism	82
4.5 Prevalence of watchdog journalism practice in the media	87
4.6 Taking watchdog journalism as an option	91
4.7 Challenges faced in the practice of watchdog journalism	97

Chapter Five: Findings and Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion and Findings	106
5.2 Conclusion	106

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

According to Hatchen's (cited in Wall, 2000) suggestion, the two main influences on the African press were the settler tradition, which says the press ownership was either governmental or private but highly under government influence and the nationalist tradition, which was indigenous and political, opting for change. And both were aimed at the elites.

On the other hand, Karikari (2007) suggests the colonial state, the European settler colonists, the Christian missionary institutions, and the early African elite or the so-called intelligentsia to be sources of the origin of Newspapers in Africa.

Things as they stand, establishing the status of a pioneer newspaper in Ethiopian media looks contentious. As put by Shimelis (2000:7) the three papers that brought the disagreement are:

Father Bernard's weekly *Le Semaine d' Ethiopie*, which appeared in Harar in 1905 (Kaplan *et al.*, 1971 cited in Shimelis: 2000:7); *Blatta* Gebre Egziabher's handwritten sheets produced every week in the capital before 1900 (Pankhurst, 1962 cited in Shimelis: Ibid); and the state-owned አእምሮ (Intelligence), which made its first appearance contemporaneously with the above two papers (Pankhurst, 1962 cited in Shimelis: Ibid).

However, for lack of sufficiently conclusive evidence in their favor it would be difficult to endorse the first two. So, this very fact honors 'Aemero' to be the first universally

accepted Ethiopian journal. The first hand copied issue appeared in 1902 with 24 copies, with the advent of a copying machine the number of copies rose to 200. Subject to financial constraints, shortage of newsprint, and the Italian aggression, 'Aemero' passed through temporary suspension and revival (Deneke, 1991; Moges, 1963, and Pankhurst, 1962 cited in Shimelis, 2000).

All said, Birhanu (2009) accounts four stages in the history that characterized the development of Ethiopian press, when analyzed in terms of role and ownership style. Hence, the period from 1902 to 1935 marked the inception of newspapers in the country. It is only after the 1920s that the quantitative and qualitative improvement and modernization of newspapers was registered.

Due to the fact that newspapers were established and run by government then, they naturally served the status quo. This has also left the public with no other alternative source of information (Ibid).

The second phase (1936-1941) marked the days of the Italian occupation. During this time, the early fledgling Amharic newspapers were banned. Instead, the occupiers started publishing newspapers in Amharic. These newspapers were; የቄሳር መንግስት መጻሕፍት (Messenger of Cesar's government) and የሮማ ብርሀን (Light of Rome in English or Luce di Roma in Italian). The clear intent of these papers was to serve as a propaganda tool to discredit the then government and to challenge the moral of the patriots fighting the occupying force (Getachew, 2003). However, it should not be forgotten here that, there were also underground newspapers that served as a voice for the people in the fight against the colonial occupation (Birhanu, 2009). In this regard, Getachew (2003) says,

there were anti-occupation papers printed locally and abroad. From among them; የኢትዮጵያ ብርሃን ምስሶ (Ethiopia's Pillar of Light) a hand written paper, and ብንዳራችን (Our Flag) printed by patriots in exile in Sudan. Moreover, there were also pro-Ethiopia newspapers printed overseas. Among them were; 'Times and Ethiopian news' edited by Sylvia Pankhurst and published in London, 'Voice of Ethiopia' edited by Melaku Beyan and published in New York, and 'La voix de l'Ethiopie,' a newspaper that used to be published in Paris in 1935 but terminated a year later.

The post occupation period (1941-2002), has witnessed developments in Ethiopian press in the three successive governments. It was in the Imperial regime (1941-1974) that broadcast media was commenced. Admittedly, this period was remembered by its restrictive and strict control of the contents of the media via its censorship department. It even goes to the extent of specifying categorically, issues that the mass media shouldn't entertain (Getachew; Gebremedhin; and Negash cited in Birhanu, 2009). The period from 1974-1991 marked the military dictatorship in which the country was governed by the rule of arms. Here, the media and the flow of information was under the total control of the government (Tedbabe; and Wuletaw cited in Shimelis, 2000).

This period saw the launching of several newspapers under the ownership of the state with the aim of propagating socialist ideology and an extended participation in mass mobilization against its conceived adversaries. In that period, the media suffered strict censorship and continued to serve as government mouthpiece like its predecessor (Getachew, 2003).

However, being a new liner in the ranks of emerging democracies, Ethiopia has espoused freedom of the press to entertain plurality of ideas. As Shimelis (2000) puts, following the assumption of power by EPRDF, government conceded freedom of the press pursuant to the ratification of the 1948 declaration of human rights. According to Birhanu (2009), the period after the downfall of the 'Derg' regime is exceptionally noted for the proliferation of mass media in Ethiopia, following the provision of the press proclamation in 1992. This proliferation of private media outputs was a huge demonstration of a long-standing and deep dissatisfaction of the people with the government media and their thirst for an alternative source of information (EHRICO, cited in Shimelis, 2000).

On the other hand, polarization is a feature that came to the front following the proliferation of the private media in Ethiopia. In this regard, Shimelis (2002) says, Polarization is one of the distinctive features of the Ethiopian private press. And hence, the private press began life by breathing media jingoism.

Nevertheless, Shimelis (2002:201) puts, "the private press, as an integral part of civil society, can thus be an important force, a 'fourth estate,' empowering the poor, listening to the 'voices from below', fostering a responsive and accountable government and contributing to the vitality of democracy in Ethiopia." This as it may, Birhanu (2009) has found out a claim that mass media organizations are weak in professionally satisfying the public and discharging their watchdog role, when analyzing the institutional problems.

In addition, it is also true that the development of the private press is closely tied with the market. In this regard Webster (1995 cited in Williams, 2003) contends that it is through the market pressures of buying, selling and trading for the express purpose of profit

making that the development of new information and media technologies is decisively influenced.

Williams (Ibid) further states, maximizing profit margin from information and cultural products takes precedence over using them for public good. And access to these technologies is subject to the ability to pay.

However, Liberal-pluralists, as opposed to the Marxists, distinguish the media between private and publicly owned media. They point out that public organizations are not driven by the profit motive and the media regularly report minority interests critical of capitalism (Franklin, 1997 cited in Williams, 2003: 87). In addition, "both the BBC and ITV have regularly broadcast views critical of the major political parties and programmes, critical of political orthodoxies (Ibid)."

As Schudson (2003 cited in Carpentier 2006:54) states, media are governed according to three main models, named; market, trustee or advocacy. Furthermore, Schudson (Ibid) says;

The trustee model implies that media are looking after the interest of their audiences and the public in general and protected in some degree from market forces. In commercial systems of broadcasting, licenses may be issued by regulators to ensure this. In European public broadcasting, there are legal requirements to meet certain public interest goals.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Watchdog reporting embraces an array of journalistic genres. As a ritual, the watchdog press monitors the daily activities of the government, to help people appraise the efficiency of their government's performance (Coronel, 2010). Hence, journalists believe that they are endowed with a special responsibility of serving the public by watchdogging over the government, for the simple reason that government has an enormous power to affect the lives of people. And this governmental power could be pronounced by enacting and enforcing laws (Fedler, 1978).

Furthermore, investigative reporting is watchdog journalism whose aim is to check the abuses of those who enjoy wealth and power. It also exposes wrong doing so that it can be redressed, but not because journalists and their patrons would be lords of the exposure (Coronel, n.d). However, as much as there are corps of journalists for whom watchdogging is not universally seen as a role the media need to play (Coronel, 2008), journalists have shown consistent support to watchdog journalism (Harrison and Stein, cited in Schultz, 1998).

Elsewhere, in defining investigative journalism, Coronel (n.d) puts that all reporting is investigative. After all, journalists routinely dig for facts. They ask questions. They get information. They 'investigate'. Furthermore, Coronel (n.d) contends that, investigative reporting is watchdog journalism. It focuses on checking the abuses of the wealthy and the powerful. It exposes wrongdoing not because journalists and their patrons benefit from the exposure, but to see to it that wrong doing is corrected.

Thence, across counties and cultures, the watchdog role of the journalist has a spectrum of definitions. And this definition is not fixed; it picks its definition following the prevailing social, political, and economic conditions and a reflection as much of the historical moment as it is of pre-existing structures and media cultures. So, as much as they are inspired by the liberal democratic notion of the press as watchdog, journalists improvise their role definitions to the tunes of their audiences, news organizations and the time they live in (Coronel, 2008).

As David Protess and colleagues (cited in Waisbord, 2000) state, watchdogs do not bite their owners nor, it could be added, tear neighbors and people with whom they have friendly relationship with, to pieces. Therefore, it is only when there is a reasonable distance between the watchdogs and their targets of investigation that news organizations may be willing to pore over information and make political and economic powers in illegal activities be held, accountable.

To those outside the media industry, the watchdog role may look like an unleashed mastiff (a barking watchdog), but the watchdog role has become central to the contemporary understanding of the Fourth Estate by journalists and editors. Moreover, to the many media practitioners, the watchdog role is a badge of exemplary professional behaviour (Schultz, 1998).

On the other hand, Kasoma (2000:4) says, the watchdog role of the press in a liberal democracy is drawn from two basic tenets. Of these, the first one is, in a democracy, the press has a duty to promote transparency, accountability and good governance by revealing to the public things that the government is doing or not doing, and which

deserve public attention. The government in its part is indebted to explain its actions or the lack of them to its citizens through the media of public communication, in the most part. Second, in a democracy, it is the media's prerogative to play a watchdog role in alerting the public against misuse and abuse of power and bad governance. Hence, like a watchdog, the media is supposed to bark only if something has gone wrong or looks to be going wrong or there is a likelihood of going to be wrong for the public to ponder over.

Moreover, the press in a democracy is like a sentinel alarming the public when things seem to be not going right, especially within the executive branch of the government as being both the center of government policy and action. In reciprocity, the press is kept under scrutiny and checks by laws initiated by the executive, enacted by parliament and enforced by the judiciary (Ibid).

Press has a special enabling role in a democracy. It is a stake holder in the overall system of checks and balances that democracy bestows on it. Without the press, the body politic would be lent to a handicap and thereby leaves democracy to limp. Furthermore, the press is a critic to the state but not an enemy. Enemies are created when the two stand at loggerheads with conflicting interests. In a liberal democracy, the interests of the press and government are the same. Presumably, both dwell on the welfare of the citizenry. By watchdogging on government, the press is casting its watchdog role but not trying to inflict injury on government. Equally, the watchdog role of the press is not a free rein; it has duties and responsibilities to observe. (Kasoma, 2000)

Since the outputs and effects of media are the products of societies that shaped them (Karikari, 2007), we have witnessed two authoritarian regimes that know not freedom of

the press and the practice of watchdog journalism. However, after the downfall of the Derg regime in 1991 and the assumption of power by EPRDF, press freedom was liberalized and private newspapers mushroomed following the press proclamation of 1992.

This novel scenario has served as a new front to entertain diversity of opinions, as an alternative source of information and a watchdog that helps to put a check and balance on government, monitor misuse and abuse of power, guard the public interest and thereby contribute its share in nurturing the fledgling democracy. As much as the private media daringly and vigorously reported on issues of national concern that arrest readers' attention, it stood at loggerheads with the government; as Shimelis (2002:200) says, "the private media began life as a rebel."

In the development of events, the private and government press became polarized. The former started casting the role of an opposition though not monolithic, while the latter kept serving the status quo. Putting aside their watchdog role, they put themselves hell bent on blaming and naming one another. Today, with corruption, maladministration, misuse and abuse of power rampant, the media seem nowhere to be seen discharging their watchdog role.

Therefore, accommodating the facts presented by Shimelis (2000) that some reporters exhibit a deficit in the professional skill, ability or experience to ferret out facts and Birhanu's (2009) claim that the mass media are inefficient in professionally satisfying the public and discharging their watchdog role, this paper attempts to further study the perception of Ethiopian journalists with regard to the watchdog role of journalism.

1.3 Objectives of the study

General Objective

The main objective of the project was to study the perception of Ethiopian journalists with regard to their watchdog role and identify the challenges in pronouncing their journalistic roles.

Specific Objectives

The study has the following specific objectives:

- To examine if journalists have a clear orientation of their roles.
- To explore if the journalists' task is to purvey the daily news, only.
- To examine the current practices of journalists.

1.4 Research Questions

- How do Ethiopian journalists interpret watchdog journalism?
- To what extent do Ethiopian journalists practice watchdog journalism?
- What is the perception of Ethiopian journalists with regard to watchdog journalism? Do they recognize such a responsibility?

1.5 Scope/Setting of the study

This study Attempted to study the perception of Ethiopian journalists with regard to the watchdog role of journalism, only. Moreover, the study was conducted only in Addis

Ababa. This was so for two reasons. First, it was because most of the print and electronic media are found in Addis Ababa and second, it was because Addis Ababa has happened to be a haven for private newspapers.

1.6 Significance of the study

The findings of this study would serve as a stepping stone for further research ventures in the area. Moreover, the findings would lend other journalists examine and revisit their perception of watchdog journalism and thereby serves as an input to ponder on.

Moreover, since studies done in the area are very scanty, the researcher believes that this project would help to fill the gap and contributes its share in adding data for future studies at every level.

1.7 Organization of the Study

This thesis embraces five chapters. Chapter one presents a general background of the study. It deals with the problem statement, research questions, objectives of the study, scope of the study, and significance of the study. The second chapter presents brief theoretical underpinnings and frameworks, researches and views of different scholars which are in one way or the other pertinent to the study. Chapter three figures out the methods, procedures, and techniques employed in the study. This chapter justifies and explains the rationale for employing qualitative research design. It also explains why and how focus group discussion and individual in-depth interviews are employed in this study. It also briefly explains about the data management, analysis techniques and procedures employed in the study. The fourth chapter dwells on the presentation and discussion of the data, and analysis of the findings. At last, chapter five presents the conclusion of the study.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

According to Heath (cited in Wall, 2000:3), scholars have singled out three media models:

The government-owned development oriented model; the Western style, privately-owned model; and the traditional and nationalist populist model. These three traditions in various forms have appeared and reappeared throughout African journalism's history. The level of influence of each tradition depends upon which country is being discussed.

But in conducting my study, I have taken the propaganda model in place of the populist model, for it best fits or accommodates the areas I would like to entertain. However, when studying about journalism, it is quite vital to look at its history, the historic press freedoms, the two press theories and the social and political situations that accommodated them.

2.1 Brief History of the Press

With respect to the trend history exhibits, society tends to have as much information as it becomes more democratic. Hence, when societies started enjoying democracy, they seemingly tended to pre-journalism. According to the journalism educator John Hohenberg, the Greek, the uncontested earliest democracy, first practiced an oral journalism in the Athens market place where almost all important things about the public's business were in the open. Then appeared the *acta diurna*, in which the daily

activities and the political social life of the Roman senate was transcribed on papyrus and posted in public places. Following the transference of society into Authoritarianism and becoming violent in the Middle Ages, communication started dwindling and as the result of which news essentially disappeared (Kovach and Rosensteel, 2001).

Apart from the situation where news came in the form of song and story, and news ballads sung by wandering minstrels at the turn of the Middle Ages, modern journalism started to reveal itself in the early seventeenth century. Admittedly, it began to emerge out of conversations held in public places like 'coffee houses' in England, and pubs, or publick houses, in America. It is therefore in 1906 that the first newspapers surfaced, simply because printers began collecting and printing on paper the shipping news, the then gossips, and political arguments entertained in the coffee houses (Kovach and Rosensteel, 2001).

In line with the evolution of the first newspapers, a new phenomenon called public opinion became the talk of the politicians. Kovach and Rosensteel (2001:22) put this opinion as thus:

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, journalist/printers began to formulate a theory of free speech and free press. In 1720 two London newspapermen writing under the pen name "Cato" introduced the idea that truth should be a defense against libel. At the time, English common law had ruled the reverse: not only that any criticism of government was a crime, but that "the greater the truth the greater the libel," since truth did more harm.

With a parallel proportion, Cato's argument started exerting influence in the American colonies, as much as discontent against the English Crown was growing. Moreover, Cato's ideas served as a basis for the defense of Peter Zenger, a printer, who was put on

trial for writing a critic on the Royal Governor of New York in 1735. His lawyer argued saying, People had a right to enjoy in exposing and opposing arbitrary power by speaking and writing the truth. And hence the jury set Zenger free, to the greatest shock of the colonial legal community. This in a way lent the meaning of free press to start having a formal shape in America (Kovach and Rosensteel, 2001). With regard to the state of the press becoming a bulwark of liberty, Kovach and Rosensteel (2001:23) say:

Over the next two hundred years the notion of the press as the bulwark of liberty became embedded in American legal doctrine. "In the First Amendment," the Supreme Court ruled in upholding the New York Times' right to publish secret government documents called the Pentagon Papers in 1971, "the Founding Fathers gave the free press the protection it must have to fulfill its essential role in our democracy. The press was to serve the governed, not the governors."

Moreover, as Lee Bollinger, the First Amendment scholar and president of the University of Michigan has once said, "the idea that was affirmed over and over by the courts is a simple one; out of a diversity of voices the people are more likely to know the truth and thus be able to self-govern" (Ibid:23).

2.2 Historic Press Freedoms

The history of journalism and mass media is closely related with a long struggle to liberty. In this regard scholars (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985) contend that it is with the history of the long and arduous struggle people waged for the personal liberty and political freedom upon which the freedom to write and speak depends, that the history of journalism and of the development of the mass media begins. Less that freedom, all print and electronic gadgets are nothing to free minds.

In addition, freedom of expression was impeded under the heavy restrictions of the ruling class during the reign of the Roman Empire. As a result, the Caesars acted as gatekeepers

in the distribution of news to the people. They choked every single dissent to their government and chased their critics to graves. Hence, the struggle to write off censorship took more than five hundred years (Puno, 2008).

But, right from the moment Gutenberg introduced movable type in the West around 1440; different blocks and hurdles were put to obstruct the free flow of news and opinions. This is well illustrated in the works of Agee, Ault, and Emery (1985: 42) as thus:

In the English-speaking world printers and writers struggled until 1700 to win the mere right to print. They fought for another century to protect that liberty and to win a second basic right: the right to criticize. Addition of a third right, the right to report came equally slowly and with less success. Today's journalist knows that there remains a constant challenge to the freedoms to print, to criticize, and to report and that therefore the people's right to know is in constant danger. This is true in the Democratic Western world where freedom of the press is a recognized tenet, as well as in the larger portion of the world where it is denied.

2.2.1The right to print

The right to print without prior restraint was materialized two centuries later in 1694, following the setting up of the first printing press in England in 1476 by William Caxton (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985:45).Furthermore, in the years that stretched between 1534 to 1694, Henry VIII issued a proclamation in 1534 that dictates printers to have a royal permission before establishing their printing shops and this licensing measure that constitutes prior restraint reigned in England until 1694 (Ibid).

Here, power was bestowed on an organization of licensed publishers and dealers to regulate printing and hunt for illegal jobs that evaded registration. Eventually, harsh penalties were imposed on the unauthorized printing in 1566 and 1586. Especially in

1586, severe penalties were imposed by the authority of the infamous Court of the Star Chamber. But with all the harsh measures deployed on the printers, there remained some resistance (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985).

However, the coming to power of William and Mary preceding the 1688 revolution brought with it the restoration of freedom to printers. Apparently the parliament gave its blessing for the license to be waived in 1679. Admittedly, there appeared a short lived revival of the licensing act that died in 1694. Despite the fact that severe seditious libel laws remained intact, and taxes on print paper and advertizing were to be instituted beginning in 1712, the last nail on the coffin of the theory of prior restraint was hit hard. A number of newspapers appeared in London, from among them the daily Courant which appeared in 1702 was one (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985).

As Agee, Ault, and Emery (1985) put, the freedom to print became a principle that enjoyed acceptance in America. By the time the constitutional convention met in Philadelphia in 1787, nine colonies had already provided such constitutional protection. Moreover, when the bill of rights is incorporated in the constitution, freedom of the press was included in the First Amendment along with the basic liberties congress could not violate.

2.2.2. The Right to Criticize

The fact on the ground has shown that winning the right to print without prior restraint did not free the press from the draconian pressure of the government. In this regard the scholars (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985:49) put:

In eighteenth-century England, and in the American colonies, the law of seditious libel ran counter to the philosophical theory that

the press should act as “censor of the government.” To the authoritarian mind, the mere act of criticism of officials was in itself a crime, and “the greater the truth, the greater the libel” was an established tenet. This meant that publishing a story about a corrupt official was all the more seditious if the official indeed was corrupt.

Here, the enduring challenge for the journalist was to establish the principle of truth as a defense against sedition or criminal libel. The same scholars (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985) have opined that publishing alone would not be sufficient to constitute guilt, the printer or editor would be able to present the case before an open court. Governments then would be less likely to push sedition charges, if the principle of truth as a defense could be won. As a result, laws defining what constitutes sedition could be revised.

As things stand, the right to criticize needs a constant protection. This was shown in the attempt of a Louisiana political boss, Huey Long, advancing to punish his opponents through taxation. This boss and his political corps imposed a special tax on the advertising income of the big dailies of his state in which he faced a total opposition. Eventually, The Supreme Court held punitive tax unconstitutional in 1936. However, in early 1950s “courageous newspapers and magazines that spoke out against Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin and what became known as McCarthyism were harassed and denounced “(Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985:53). But, as much as they wished to have it, neither McCarthy nor his followers could bring about actual legislation restricting criticism (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985).

2.2.3 The Right to Report

Unlike its predecessors, the right to print and the right to criticize, the right to report doesn't nearly enjoy a safeguard by law and legal precedent. As the scholars (Ibid) put, it is based on a philosophical argument:

What would be gained through the right to print and criticize if no news were forthcoming? What good would a free press be for the reader if editors and reporters had no way to find out what government was doing? Denial of the right of access to news is a denial of the people's right to know, the journalist maintains.

Despite the fact that laws of seditious libel were the fashion of the day, the right to report wasn't granted recognition. Paradoxically, the downright reporting of government officials' activities or a parliamentary debate could be construed as seditious by someone in authority. To the extent, people in the person of William Bradford in Pennsylvania, James Franklin in Massachusetts and other colonial editors were pulled before the authorities for reporting a disputed action of government. Moreover, reporting of the proceedings of Parliament was banned in England until 1771, following "the satirical writings of Dr. Samuel Johnson and the open defiance of newspaper publisher John Wilkes crumpled to opposition" (Ibid).

Today the scenario has changed and there is a very slim likelihood for Washington correspondents to be denied access to the congressional press galleries. Here the exception is, denial of access may take place when the legislators hold an emergency executive session that happens in rare occasions. However, the admission of reporters to court sessions is only possible with the consent of the presiding judge and hence there is a likelihood of staying out of the court with other members of the public, if the court believes it is necessary (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985).

On the other hand, there has come an arrangement that can protect the media from the high hands of libel suits. Explaining this phenomenon, Agee, Ault, and Emery (1985) say that the important doctrine that came up is the doctrine of qualified privilege. It is only when its report is fair and accurate that this doctrine stands guard for a given news medium from the threat of libel suits, when reporting the actions of a legislative body or a court. This doctrine suggests, so that the public may know what congress and government are doing, the media have an obligation to report legislative and judicial sessions. Therefore, defamatory statements shattering the reputations of individuals that are made in sessions and courts would possibly be reported without fear of damage suits.

Talk about the legislative body, the right to report is suppressed at the lower level than the national level. However, the enactment of “open meetings” laws in quite a number of states in the 1950s, and the pressure of many news groups, lent to the amelioration of access to news at local level (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985:55).

As a matter of fact, it is in the national executive departments that the most publicized denial of access to news takes place. This growing tendency emanating from the necessity for secrecy in limited areas of the national defense establishment and atomic energy research has warned responsible journalists (Ibid). Eventually, societies of newspaper editors and professionals held well-organized campaigns for a free access to news that supplies facts for the people to make an informed decision (Ibid).

John Moss of California as its head, the sub-committee commissioned to study the information policies of government in 1995, brought some relief:

The Moss committee acted as the champion of the people's right to know and the reporter's right of access to news. By publicizing executive department refusals to make information available on public matters, the Moss committee forced some reforms, including passage of the Freedom of Information Act of 1966, giving the citizen legal recourse against arbitrary withholding of information by a federal agency. The Law was strengthened in 1974, but some presidents and government agencies still used every tactic to prevent disclosure on information they thought the public should not know. Even so, reporters determined to find out the facts can usually obtain them despite the opposition of such reluctant public officials (Ibid).

2.3 Western Model

The social and political milieus of the past 500 years have brought about two basic press theories. The older in their ranks is the authoritarian theory, which functions from top down. Here, few ruling class elites decide what the society should and should not know and believe. This authoritarian concept of relationship between citizens and the state could not allow to air dissent and reservations. Hence, publishing is licensed to those who support the status quo. And where there are controlled societies dominated by few ruling classes in some parts of the world, authoritarian press theory still exists. Moreover, a variant of this theory called the Soviet communist theory of the press emerged, with the twentieth-century dictatorship. Regardless of the state being fascist or communist, the press is dedicated to perpetuating the dictatorship and its social system (Agee, Ault, and Emery, 1985).

According to Agee, Ault, and Emery (Ibid), the second basic theory of the press developed following the advancement of the Western world through the Renaissance and Reformation into the democratic modern era. This is the libertarian press theory. Though its roots stretch back to the seventeenth century, it did not become dominant in the

English-speaking world until the nineteenth century. In libertarian theory the press is neither an instrument of government nor a mouth-piece for an elite ruling class. In this theory, human beings are taken to have the capacity to discern between truth and falsehood by themselves. And hence, if exposed to a press operating as a free market-place of ideas and information, they would be able to determine public policy. In a press of the libertarian theory, it is essential that all have a free access to information, regardless of their status.

When it comes to accommodating the libertarian press in a given society; Siebert, Peterson and Schramm (1984) say that in some countries it got blessed with a fertile soil and in many others it flourished soon, but died in a short time. In others it produced a different breed that showed little resemblance to the Anglo-American type.

On the other hand, transplanting this Western ideal of the free press wasn't an easy task for many developing nations. In this regard the scholars say:

Many of the underdeveloped areas of the world found it particularly difficult to transplant the Western ideals of a free press. In many instances the ideal was accepted with enthusiasm, but internal conditions apparently were not conducive to the full development of democratic principles. Nationalistic pressures, internal security were the principal factors which made it difficult to implement libertarian theories (Siebert, Peterson and Schramm, 1984:67-8).

Mohammed (1997 cited in Wall, 2000) argues, a 'Western style free press' probably will never take root in Africa, for it is based on the Western notions of individual rights and responsibilities. So, this very fact would make it culturally incompatible with the collective philosophies of Africans. However, (Siebert et al. cited in Fourie, 2004) say, the USA and British have lived with this type of press for two hundred years. The press

has been given all the encouragement to act as a Fourth Estate with the other three branches of government.

2.3.1 Watchdog journalism: As a fourth estate and guardian of public interest

It is now more than 200 years since the notion of the press as a watchdog surfaced. Classical liberal theorists of the late 17th century contended that publicity and openness provide the best protection from the excesses of power (Coronel, 2010:111).

On the other hand, the idea of the press as the Fourth Estate, as an institution that exists primarily as a check on those in public office, was grounded on the premise that powerful states had to be deterred from passing their bounds. The press, working independently of the government even as its freedoms were guaranteed by the state, was supposed to ensure this vocation (Ibid).

The 1980s and 1990s saw the revival of this centuries-old notion and its application especially on societies in transition, which were then emerging from the ruins of socialist and authoritarian regimes. It had a strong emotional appeal and resonance among citizens facing pervasive corruption, weak rule of law, and governments who failed to deliver basic services (Ibid).

Truly speaking, the watchdog role requires the news media to provide a check on powerful sectors of society with the inclusion of leaders within the private and public domains. Journalists are expected to discharge their responsibility of guarding and protecting the public interest from incompetence, corruption, and misinformation. The available empirical evidence suggests that as much as the free press does indeed promote

transparency in many countries, journalists often face serious constraints and obstacles in this regard, especially in autocracies (Odugbemi and Norris, 2010).

A cardinal justification for press freedom is that free media will act as a watchdog over the government. In actual facts, one of the main justifications for freedom of the news media is that a lack of censorship will enable the news media to act as a watchdog over the government and thereby render the government more responsible and responsive (Kovach and Rosensteel, 2001, cited in Woodring, 2009).

Moreover, the news media exercise an indispensable investigative function on behalf of citizens as the “watchdogs” of government and no government will earn the trust of its citizenry without the assurance certified by a watchdog press. Apparently, every media organization doesn’t fulfill this role, and in every country there are media who are more “lapdogs” than watchdogs (Democracy and the Media: The Ineluctable Connection between Democracy and the Quality of Journalism, 2005).

The watchdog press is guardian of the public interest, warning citizens against those who are doing them harm. Besides, a fearless and effective watchdog is in its part critical in fledgling democracies, where institutions are weak and publicly attacked by political pressures. When legislatures, judiciaries and other oversight bodies are powerless against the mighty or are themselves corruptible, the media are often left as the only check against the abuse of power. This calls for them to play a heroic role in exposing the excesses of presidents, prime ministers, legislators and magistrates despite the risks (Coronel, 2009).

In many emerging democracies, an adversarial press is part of the political process and it is hard to imagine how governments would manage to function without it. However, despite constitutional guarantees and in many cases, and also wide public support, the media in fledgling democracies have been disabled by stringent laws, monopolistic ownership and sometimes, brute force (Coronel, 2009).

After all, in many developing countries investigative reporters take great risks and are poorly or modestly paid. Apart from physical attacks, investigative reporters have also been subjected to jail terms and harassment lawsuits as well as laws that restrict information access, all of which impede their ability to expose wrongdoing. The pathology is clear: even as democracy provides the optimum conditions for watchdog reporting, many democracies in the world are unable to provide adequate protections for journalists. And yet, neither murders nor lawsuits have succeeded in gagging the press (Coronel, 2008:5).

Moreover, as a seemingly supplementary statement to the theoretical treatises, we find the practice of watchdog journalism in some corners of the globe. To cite the few: the Argentine media has unearthed the actions of military juntas in the Falklands war, the Menem's administration wrong doings and scandals and the participation of government officials in drug-money laundering operations; between 70s and early 80s, Columbian media have exposed several cases of wrong doing that include illegal trade of wild animals, corruption in local government, corruption in the country's leading airline companies and many more (Waisbord, 2000).

The list also includes the exposure of scams and illegal money-making of the Thai Buddhist monks, false claims of business success by a former Croatian minister, and corruption in relation to the privatization of state companies, war crimes, organized crime, and social problems such as human trafficking. The list continues down the lines (Coronel, 2010).

As much as the issue of watchdog journalism is open to debates and contentions following the contemporary power structures and globalization, it is hard to put a consensus like definition that holds water across the board. However, Coronel (2008) says that with respect to institutional and economic changes as well as the expectations of their audiences, journalists are obliged to constantly redefine their roles. Normative role definitions are tuned in line with the reality at hand that journalists find themselves in. Moreover, the definition is not static, but picks its form based on the existing social, political, and economic conditions and the current historical moment. As much as journalists are inspired by liberal democratic notions of the press as watchdog, they draw from the well of their own culture and history. Hence, they tune their role definitions in line with the demands of their audiences, their news organizations, and the times they happened to live in.

Being a metaphor to symbolize a guard dog keeping an eye out for criminals, the term watchdog has come to refer to a group that scrutinizes illegal or unethical behavior (Olivier, 2004). Hence, putting aside the degree of the ethical standards of the journalist or the quality of reporting, watchdog journalism is exposure journalism. It is also the exposure of wrong doing in the public interest that differentiates the watchdogging enterprise from other genres of journalism (Coronel, 2010).

With regard to its role, the principal democratic role of the media is to act as a check on the state, according to the liberal theory of the press. Apparently, the media is expected to monitor the full range of state activity and expose official abuses of authority in all vigilance (Curran and Gurevitch, 2000). But, this principle is wrongly perceived as to

mean 'afflict the comfortable.' Equally, contemporary journalism has posed a threat on it by overuse and wrong watchdog practice that aimed at gratifying the desires of the audiences than serving the public (Kovach and Rosensteel, 2003). Moreover, the watchdog practice could be episodic or sustained. A one-go exposé that may not achieve its desired goal in the former case, and sustained where a community of journalists deploy its energies to expose wrong doing and malfeasance in a stream of reports ,in the latter (Coronel, 2010).

As much as the notion of the press as watchdog is more than 200 years old, the very thought of media vigilance in monitoring government and exposing its excesses is yet surfacing around the planet. However, the demise of authoritarian and socialist regimes, media deregulation at many corners of the world and globalization, have added momentum for a renewed interest and called for efforts by different groups to support the watchdog endeavour of the media (Coronel, 2008:2).

In addition, it is to rein back the powerful from passing their bounds that the idea of press as a fourth estate and as an institution with a task of checking those in public office was conceived. So, even though its freedoms were guaranteed by government, the press was supposed to work independently of government toward the set ideal (Ibid).

Thomas Carlyl, to whom the term Fourth Estate is credited, attributes the notion of the Fourth Estate to the eighteenth century statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke. Accordingly, Burke said: *there were Three Estates in Parliament; but, in the Reporters' Gallery yonder, there sat a Fourth Estate more important far than they all* (Wills, 2007:138).

This centuries old notion saw revival and enjoyed applicability on transition societies, those rescued from the rubbles of authoritative and socialist regimes, in the 80s and 90s. Nowadays, even in countries experiencing democracy anew and in countries like China, where democracy and free press are toddling, the notion of the press as a watchdog of power is grounded in the self-definition of journalists and in public expectations of the media (Coronel, 2008).

Moreover, mainstream liberal journalists consider themselves as an integral part of the Fourth Estate (Schultz, cited in, Louw, 2005:29), whose vocation is to act as “watchdogs” over the political power house. This positions journalists in the democratic political trajectory, as vigilant participants with a call, to make sure the legislative, executive, and judicial players do not abuse their power (Ibid).

However, the press did not partake in the government structure. So, this lent the press to be called the Fourth Estate of government. The job of this independent body was to monitor the other three branches of government, as an external check on behalf of the public. Hence, this is what is called the watchdog role of the media (Vivian, 2001).

As Schultz (1998) puts, the scenario that brought forth the idealized watchdog estate was a changing political environment which awakened suspicion and skepticism on citizens about the integrity and honour of those in power. As much as the news media mirror the political system they happened to be in, this public cynicism and disillusion has been reflected in a news media increasingly willing to undertake a critical and supervisory role. This role, filled with costs and benefits, in turn struck receptive ground among

journalists who became increasingly assertive and willing to demand the 'role of the watchman' during the 1980s.

Apparently, the fact of state controls being stumbling blocks to watchdog journalism is far from argument. By the same token, market pressures are also major hurdles to its continued survival. Moreover, critics contend that privately owned media, independent of the state but slave to the market, are nothing more than incidental and unreliable watchdogs (Coronel, 2008).

Furthermore, the relation between truth and journalism is not in full harmony at all times and places. As Waisbord (2000:203) puts, the relation between truth and journalism is not a perfect fit as journalists publicly claim it to be. What journalists write about issues is not the whole truth, there remain some truths uncovered. Self-censorship is the first filter that compromises the completeness of the journalists' report. Hence, the fight to get published arises and some journalists show the willingness to take up this fight, but sporadically. Moreover, the speculation that potential problems would occur in the news room, shatters the spirit of journalists from putting their investigative hands on specific stories. And, news organizations in their part put stories that enrage political and economic powers, at bay.

It is also true that the media are seldom immune from the pressures of either the government or the market. In many countries, they even suffer the pressures of both. Coupled with it, the structure and ownership of the media industry as well as professional practices, cultures, and norms also have a bearing on how well the press plays its watchdogging role. In addition, government-media relation and certain historical

moments seem to be more viable to watchdog reporting than others. With no reservation, the institutional arrangements of democracy provide the most hospitable environment for watchdog reporting (Coronel, 2008:4).

Moreover, the massive investigative energies exhibited in the last 20 years were largely in places where repressive regimes are toppled down. This was for the simple reason that citizens were hungry for information and their appetite for news and commentary was unleashed, following the loosening of restraints after years of propaganda and thought control (ibid). Hence, emboldened by their wild liberty, prestige and profits, the media in emerging democracies are now stepping their feet in areas that were once red-lined, exposing corruption at all levels of power (ibid).

According to Coronel (2010), watchdog journalism embraces a wide range of journalistic genres. Day in and day out, the watchdog press monitors the day-to-day workings of government, thereby helping citizens to appraise its performance. Reporting beyond the words of government officials or their spokespersons, to assess government's performance, is in a way a form of watchdogging.

Moreover, Watchdog journalism essentially deals with "moral disorder news" (Gans, quoted in Waisbord, 2000:198), that is, news about behavior that contradicts moral expectations. It attests to the role of the media as an agent for the communication of moral values, a channel through which citizens learn about moral problems and form ideas about acceptable and non acceptable behavior (Tester, quoted in Waisbord, 2000).

Furthermore, watchdog journalism has the capacity to open and to stimulate debates about wrongdoing but it can hardly appropriate the truth as its trophy. Its responsibility

needs to be to sustain the openness of public discourse by mobilizing information that can be a springboard for debates about wrongdoing in different social realms (Waisbord, 2000). At its best, watchdog reporting offers a tool, a window for raising the level of discourse, for engaging the public, and reconstructing a public sphere dwindled by the market and the restraints of the state. In addition, it keeps the cherished journalistic myths that put the press as the guardian of public interest (Coronel, 2008).

2.3.1.1 Sensationalized watchdogism: A good number of contemporary journalists working for media favouring spectacle and sensation still believe themselves to be adherents of the watchdog principle. Hence, this venture has produced a journalistic genre by a cross marriage of adversarial journalism with reports focusing on politics as competition and conflict, mixed with the titillation of personal indiscretions and evaluations of the ‘character’ of political players. Admittedly, the end result is a sensationalized watchdogism calling for entertainment seeking mass audiences. However, it would be quite proper to unpack the practices of political journalism. To do this, it takes scrutinizing the full range of relationships that can develop between journalists and politicians (Louw, 2005).

In this regard, we will have a quick look at the three most important typology of journalist-politician relationships forwarded by Sabato (quoted in Louw, 2005:62). They are:

- The first type of journalist–politician relationship is (pre-watchdog) *partisan journalism* wherein the media support a particular political party, or ideology. This form of media characterized the early liberal oligarchies of Britain and

America when middle-class/burgher journalists actively worked to challenge monarchies. Partisan journalists worked collaboratively geared towards attracting mass audiences, rather than an actual concern with politics-as policy. This type lends itself to politicians working with (or leaking stories to) journalists, in order to undermine their opponents (Ibid).

- The second type of the journalist–politician relationship is *Fourth Estate journalism* as envisaged by Delane. In this model, journalists are insiders within the liberal political process – a part of the policy-formulation process in so far as they service the policy-making elites with information, ‘intelligence’, opinion and a platform for debate. This journalistic genre eschews sensation and titillation, and can lead to conflict between journalists and politicians because Fourth Estate journalists will publish stories politicians would prefer were repressed. But this genre does not cultivate a necessarily adversarial position. Neither does it deliberately pursue politics-as-competition-and-conflict stories as a means to attract audiences. Within Anglo liberalism, it is a genre associated with ‘quality journalism’ aimed at elite audiences interested in policy issues (Louw, 2005:63)
- Third, there is *muckraking (or ‘yellow’) journalism* as developed in the USA by Joseph Pulitzer and Randolph Hearst towards the end of the nineteenth century. This journalistic genre, which is commercially driven, strives to build mass audiences through sensationalism. Spectacular, lurid or titillating stories about the rich and famous (including politicians) attract mass audiences, as do stories of conflict, sex and pain. Journalists justify such stories by deploying the Fourth Estate principle, which gives them the right to publish whatever they want. It is an

adversarialism driven not by political commitment or a concern with policy issues, but by a search for sensationalist and personally intrusive stories (Ibid).

On the other hand, if journalists become insiders within the liberal political system, their self-definition would necessarily shift as they distance themselves from partisanship. Therefore, journalists could adapt one of the three insider relationships to the liberal political system:

- The *journalist-as-loyal-opposition* or watchdog. This role can take two forms. Firstly, the provider of ‘intelligence’ (for policy makers). Secondly, the watchdog adversary;
- The *lapdog*, where journalists cooperate with politicians to make the political system work. It is easy for partisan journalists to slide into becoming lapdog journalists when (successful) revolutionary movements they support become governments;
- Seeking out those aspects of political behavior that provoke emotional responses (e.g. anger, shock or outrage) in audiences because these can be sensationalized and hyped up. This type of journalist–politics relationship is associated with *spectacle journalism*, geared towards attracting mass audiences, rather than an actual concern with politics-as-policy. This type lends itself to politicians working with (or leaking stories to) journalists, in order to undermine their opponents (Ibid).

2.3.1.2 Lapdog Journalism: Lapdog journalism is a genre where journalists avoid adversarialism and put aside the watchdog approach. Instead, they collaborate with

politicians. This collaboration is not necessarily motivated by political partisanship, but is more often driven by a belief that once society faces ‘challenges’ serious enough to make adversarial watchdog journalism unhelpful while trying to solve the problems. Sabato (cited in Louw, 2005:64) argues that lapdog journalism characterized the US media from the 1930s to mid-1960s. It began when the media opted to assist Roosevelt to implement his ‘New Deal’. The ‘New Deal’ involved the government adopting *Keynesian* policies and investing in huge public works programs to try and solve the Great Depression’s unemployment crisis. Possibly the most serious consequence of America’s lapdog period was Senator McCarthy’s 1950s’ political witch hunt of communists. McCarthy could not have flourished without media acquiescence. Because objective journalism advocated simply reporting the ‘facts’ – McCarthy’s hearings – McCarthyism was able to flourish without any critical scrutiny (Louw, 2005).

With regard to lapdog journalism, Norris and Odugbemi (2010:14) have the following to say;

Not all journalistic roles have equally positive consequences for the quality of democratic governance and human development. For example, journalists in some countries may well see their primary responsibilities as “lapdogs,” acting as loyal spokespersons for state authorities, rarely questioning official information, and providing extensive coverage of ruling elites, dignitaries, and leaders. In this regard, the news media may serve as an effective propaganda machine for autocracies, reinforcing the hegemonic control of the powerful, rather than providing a countervailing force and adversity of viewpoints.

2.3.1.3 Adversarial watchdogism: It is a Watchdog piece in which journalists must be deliberately adversarial towards politicians in order to function as effective watchdogs. Although related to the Fourth Estate approach, adversarial watchdog journalism has less of a policy focus than Delane’s model (where journalists are a part of the policy making process). It focuses more on political personalities, partly because personality and

character issues are easier to sell to mass audiences than policy issues. Such watchdogism can generate controversy and conflict without necessarily improving the quality of socio-political debate or policy making (Louw, 2005).

Sabato (quoted in Louw, 2005) contends that, American journalists abandoned lapdog journalism in favour of an adversarial watchdog approach as a result of the Ted Kennedy Chappaquiddick accident and Watergate. The former involved the attempt to cover up a car accident in 1969 in which a female passenger died after Senator Kennedy drove off a bridge at Chappaquiddick. Watergate involved the scandal of Nixon and his White House staffers being caught covering up their attempted 1972 burglary/espionage at the Democratic Party's Watergate HQ.

Here, it would be important to mention barking journalism as a variety in watchdog journalism, with a different tone. As Odugbemi and Norris (2010) articulate, 'attack-dog' journalism, packed with fierce and bitter assaults on political rivals, can bolster mistrust within divided communities.

2.4 A different approach challenging the normative liberal pluralist conception of journalism

The notion of watchdog journalism seems to be well accommodated in liberal democracy, where neutrality and professionalism reign thereof. But, on the other end of the continuum, there is a philosophical difference challenging the normative liberal pluralist conception of journalism.

In this respect, Hallin and Mancini (2004) have made a comparative analysis on three media systems that they clustered across Europe (less the East) and North Atlantic. The

three media systems they proposed are the Liberal Model, which prevails across Britain, Ireland, and North America; the Democratic Corporatist Model, which prevails across Northern continental Europe, and the Polarized Pluralist Model, which prevails in the Mediterranean countries of Southern Europe.

However, from the three systems mentioned, it is only polarized pluralism that is directly related to my study. But, the reason I included the rest two is to show what is out there in the scholarship other than the Four Theories of the Press, with regard to media systems.

All said, when we come to our topic , Hallin and Mancini (2004:21) have proposed four major dimensions with which to compare the media systems in Western Europe and North America. These variables are:

- (1) The development of media markets, with respect to particular emphasis on the strong or weak development of a mass circulation press;
- (2) Political parallelism; that is, the degree and nature of the links between the media and political parties or, more broadly, the extent to which the media system reflects the major political divisions in society;
- (3) The development of journalistic professionalism; and
- (4) The degree and nature of state intervention in the media system.

2.4.1 Polarized Pluralist Model

The first media system/model that these scholars analyzed was the polarized pluralist model. This system developed in a lieu where conservative opposition to liberalism was strong and the transition to liberalism long and conflictual. On the other hand, polarized pluralism tends to be associated by large with political parallelism. Here ideological

tendencies are well reflected in the newspapers, and traditions of advocacy and commentary-oriented journalism, often strong.

Furthermore, as much as a spectrum of competing world views are contending, the notion of politically neutral journalism is less plausible (Hallin and Mancini, 2004).

The scenario at the introduction of liberalism in the Mediterranean part Europe with the Napoleonic invasion, had peculiar features. Based on landed property and an absolutist state (though with weak prevalence in the countryside), the social and political structures were feudalistic and patrimonial. Cultural life was also dominated by the church. Moreover, the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie and the urban working and middle classes, which are supposed to form a political constituency for liberalism, were relatively weak (Hallin and Mancini, 2004).

As Hallin and Mancini (2004) argue, given the fact that these nations are ancient and with a past full of feuds, polarized pluralism may frustrate the passion of journalists for the “watch-dog” role, for reasons that they would probably happen to stir the political stability and the democratic legitimacy therein.

Hence, the long transition of South European nations to capitalism and bourgeois democracy (which is riddled with conflicts) has produced a media system closely hooked to the world of politics. Once democracy took hold, political parallelism of high magnitude prevailed for the media to lend hands to a wide range of political forces grappling for influence. The commercial press did not develop as that of the liberal or democratic corporatist systems and newspaper circulation remained relatively low with broadcasting being central. With regard to professionalism, it is less developed in the

polarized pluralist system than in the Liberal or Democratic Corporatist systems, for reasons that commitments to common professional norms and institutions are overridden by political loyalties.

Instrumentalization of the media by those who have a stake; the state, parties, and private owners with political tie is relatively common. Despite the fact that clientalism and political polarization undercut its effectiveness as a regulator (with the exception of France) the state has tended to play an interventionist role in a number of ways. Thus, the media of the Mediterranean countries depart in many ways from the dominant liberal norm of neutral professionalism and a “watchdog” media (Hallin and Mancini, 2004).

2.4.2 Democratic Corporatist Model

The second media model analyzed by the scholars was the Democratic Corporatist model. As Peter Katzenstein (cited in Hallin and Mancini, 2004) puts, the small countries of Northern and West-Central Europe adopted political models that accommodated compromise and power sharing among the major organized interests of society and an expansion of the welfare state, in the early twentieth century. On the other hand, Germany and Austria aligned themselves with the countries that espoused this model after WWII, by adopting much of the things therein.

According to Hallin and Mancini (2004:144), there are three co-existences that distinctly identify the Democratic Corporatist countries. The first among these co-existences is that a strongly developed mass-circulation press has co-existed with a high degree of political parallelism, a strong tendency for media to express partisan and other social divisions.

The second co-existence which is seemingly distinctive to the Democratic Corporatist countries is a high level of political parallelism in the media that has coexisted with a high level of journalistic professionalization. This includes, a sizeable degree of consensus on professional standards of conduct, a notion of commitment to a common public interest, and a meaningfully high level of autonomy from other social powers, showing again the weakening of the former characteristics in relation to the latter. Moreover, these co-existences exhibit that Democratic Corporatist countries share characteristics like; a relatively high degree of political parallelism, advocacy, and external pluralism in the press with Polarized Pluralist countries and a strong development of media markets and professionalism with the Liberal model (Hallin and Mancini, 2004).

The third “coexistence” that Hallin and Mancini (2004) put is, about the role of the state. The traditions of self-government go back, in certain forms, to early historical periods in the Democratic Corporatist countries and liberal institutions were consolidated early (except in Germany and Austria).Thence, this illuminates that there is a strong tradition of limits on state power, which is one among many manifestations for the early development of press freedom. Moreover, the twentieth century saw the development of strong welfare state policies and other forms of active state intervention in the Democratic Corporatist countries. These tendencies are therefore manifested in important forms of public sector involvement in the media sphere helping to distinguish Democratic Corporatist from those of Liberal countries.

According to Hallin and Mancini (2004), the development of strong mass-circulation commercial media and of media tied to political and civil groups; the coexistence of

political parallelism and journalistic professionalism; and the coexistence of liberal traditions of press freedom and a tradition of strong state intervention in the media, which are seen as a social institution and not as purely private enterprises, are all simultaneously packaged in these co-existences.

The scholars, Hallin and Mancini (2004) propound that, the experience of the Democratic Corporatist countries supplement the argument they made earlier regarding the notion that, political parallelism and journalistic professionalism should not be squeezed into a single conceptual dimension, but rather high levels of both can in fact coexist; or put otherwise ,apart from the Liberal Model of neutral professionalism, the experience of the Democratic Corporatist countries suggests that other forms of journalistic professionalism can exist.

2.4.3 Liberal Model

The last media system the scholars (Hallin and Mancini, 2004) analyzed was the Liberal model. In their analysis, they opined that no media analyst worth his name would argue that journalism at any corner of the world is neutral. Moreover, the use of the term 'neutral' to refer to the "Anglo-American" style of journalism is not meant to suggest that it is literally "value free" or without a point of view. On the contrary, it is long ago that scholarship in the Liberal countries refuted this notion. Cutting across the principal lines of separation amongst the established political forces in society, these media count themselves as 'catchall' media (Hallin and Mancini, 2004).

With regard to professionalism, the 'separation of church and state' that became a key metaphor of American journalistic professionalism, had a double meaning. It meant a

separation between the opinions of the newspaper, in an editorial page (they reveal the expressed views of the newspaper owners) and news page, which are the crafts of a professional journalist. It also wants to mean a clear divide between the business departments of the news organization and the newsroom. In spite of all, professionalism developed primarily in the context of market-based media and much of this context incorporated within it (Hallin and Mancini, 2004).

According to Hallin and Mancini (2004), the social role of the state in Liberal countries is relatively limited and the role of the market and private sector relatively large. In both Britain and America, market institutions and liberal ideology developed strongly in general and specifically in the media field, where they are manifested in the early development of commercial media industries and of the liberal theory of a free press rooted in civil society and the market. However, the role of the state cannot be ignored, even in the United States, which is taken to be the icon of Liberal democracy in its purest form. This role is apparently manifested through the building of the initial communication structure that made the development of the press possible and the equally important development of human infrastructure.

The other point the scholars (Hallin and Mancini, 2004) discussed was individualized pluralism. The established practice of Political representation in the Liberal systems tends to be seen more in terms of the accountability of government to individual citizens other than in terms of the involvement of organized social groups , parties and ‘peak associations,’ in the political process. Here, the United States is seen as the extreme case

of individualized pluralism, whereas Britain tilts a bit more toward continental European patterns and Canada and Ireland probably somewhere between those two.

When discussing the Liberal theory of media, Curran and Gurevitch (2000) said, the principal democratic role of the media as per the Liberal theory is to act as a check on the state. The media is also supposed to monitor the full range of state activity, and fearlessly expose abuses of official authority. It is also said that, apart from overriding the other functions of the media, this watchdog role dictates the form in which the media system should be organized. In this view, the media's complete independence from government could only be ensured by hooking the media to the free-market. Otherwise, if once the media becomes subject to public regulation, it would only become a Rottweiler to government interests by losing its watchdog bite.

The two American political scientists with a conservative orientation, Kelley and Donway (quoted in Curran and Gurevitch, 2000) argue that any form of media, however desirable, wouldn't be acceptable if it bargains the watchdog function. This simply means, a press that is licensed, franchised or regulated is subject to political pressures whenever it opts to deal with issues affecting the interests of those in power.

However, Curran and Gurevitch (2000) argue that as much as the watchdog role of the media is important, it would perhaps be quixotic to argue that it should be overriding. It is the situation of the eighteenth century where the 'principal' media were public affairs-oriented newspapers that brought forth this conventional view. Conversely, the media systems in the early twenty-first century are given over largely to entertainment. Even those media that claim to cater news, allocate only a small portion to public affairs and a

slim amount to official wrongdoing. In effect, the liberal orthodoxy defines the main democratic purpose and organizational principle of the media in terms of what is on the menu than on the table.

Moreover, the other time worn status of the watchdog argument is, the traditional liberal theory's conception that government is the sole object from which press vigilance surfaces. The reasons that led to this notion is a period in which government was by default taken to be the hub of power and main source of oppression. However, this classical view hasn't lent its attention to the economic authority exercised by shareholders. Hence, there needs to be a revised conception that demands the media to be conceived as a check on both public and private power (Curran and Gurevitch, 2000). Unlike the traditional conception that media are compromised by their links to big business, today, the media themselves have become big business (Curran and Gurevitch, 2000).

The experience of the last three decades that exhibited the conglomeration of news media, gave rise to an area of red lines where journalists are reluctant to cross for fear of stepping on the corporate toes of a parent or sister company (Hollingworth and Bagdikian as cited in Curran and Seaton and cited in Curran and Mancini,2000).There is also a seeming claim that media underplayed their vigilance in relation to corporate than public bureaucracy abuse, for a simple reason that they are part of the corporate business arena (McChesney, quoted in Curran and Gurevitch,2000).

Curran and Gurevitch (2000) also say, following the extended sphere of government, politicians and public officials are now routinely involved in decision-making that can

affect the profitability of private media enterprises. Likewise, media organizations have become more profit-oriented, have more extensive economic interests and have more to gain from business-friendly government. In reciprocation, governments also are now more in need of government-friendly media, for they need to solicit and retain mass electoral support.

So, whether leading media corporations became much bigger, more dominant and more profitable depended, in part, on political and bureaucratic consent. This would ultimately mean, the market can give rise not to independent watchdogs serving the public interest but to corporate mercenaries that tune their critical scrutiny to dance with their private purpose (Curran and Gurevitch, 2000).

In summary, Hallin and Mancini (2004) say, despite the fact that Liberal model has dominated media studies as being the principal traditional yardstick used to measure other media systems; it is the polarized pluralist media model that earned applicability on other systems as an empirical model of the media-political systems relation. Moreover, they suspect that scholars working on the wider expanse of the world; Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, Latin America, the Middle East and all of the Mediterranean region, Africa, and most of Asia will find much of their analysis on Southern Europe as having much relevance including the notions, such as; the role of clientalism, the strong role of the state, the role of media as an instrument of political struggle, the limited development of the mass circulation press, and the relative weakness of common professional norms.

These same scholars, Hallin and Mancini (2004) opine that, in all these cases, substantial modifications could be made on the models they proposed, for a possible application. In addition, the models would primarily be useful as an inspiration for a future creation of new models based on research into specific political and media systems. All said, the watchdog principle extends its monitoring on all powerful institutions in society, other than simply watching on governments in power. Pioneers of the trade have firmly established as a core principle, their responsibility to scrutinize the obscured corners of society coupled with the search for voices unminded and cheats undiscovered (Kovatch and Rosensteil, 2001).

As truth became the ultimate bail for the press in John Peter Zenger's trial, it was the watchdog role that made journalism "a bulwark of liberty," as James Madison puts it (Kovatch and Rosensteil, 2001:113). In the end, a watchdog self-definition helps to marshal journalistic energies to investigation in places where states and government create a breathing space for this kind of reporting (Coronel, 2008).

2.5 Development model Journalism

Today, development issue has joined the ranks of human rights issues debated on the international arena. As Marks (n.d:137) puts it:

The right to development (RTD) has been part of the international debate on human rights for over thirty years, but has not yet entered the practical realm of development planning and implementation. States tend to express rhetorical support for this right but neglect its basic precepts in development practice. Paradoxically, the United States opposes or is reluctant to recognize development as an international human right and yet the current administration has proposed to nearly double its development spending under a program that is strikingly similar to the international RTD model.

Furthermore, Marks (n.d:18) discusses the belongingness of the RTD to the third “generation” of human rights in the brief outline of the Right to Development. He says:

In the 1970s and 1980s the RTD was introduced as one of several rights belonging to a third “generation” of human rights. According to this view, the first generation consisted of civil and political rights conceived as freedom from state abuse. The second generation consisted of economic, social, and cultural rights, claims made against exploiters and oppressors. The third generation consisted of solidarity rights belonging to peoples and covering global concerns like development, environment, humanitarian assistance, peace, communication, and common heritage. The cataloguing of human rights into such neat generations is appealing in its simplicity. A general priority has been given to guaranteeing individual freedoms in eighteenth century revolutionary struggles of Europe and North America, to advancing social justice in nineteenth- and twentieth-century struggles against economic exploitation, and to assigning rights and obligations to the principal agents able to advance global public goods in the late twentieth century.

On the other hand, development Journalism is a more recent development theory, which would seemingly fall more toward the authoritarian side of the spectrum. This ideology propounds that government mobilizes the media to serve national goals in economic and social fronts. Here, information is considered to be a scarce natural resource that should be managed and employed by the government to achieve national goals. The goals the media are supposed to help achieve include political integration, literacy, economic self-sufficiency, and the eradication of diseases (Dominick, 1999). Moreover, Development media are mobilized by government to assist in promoting national development objectives (and usually the regime in power). In many parts of the world, development journalism is justified as a temporary expedient to help poor countries catch up to the West (Stevenson, 1994). According to Dominick (1999), the role of the media in development journalism would be to support national interests and social development

.The support to be made also includes objectives such as national unity, stability, and integrity.

Moreover, developmental media theory stands in advocacy that the media should support the efforts of the government in power so as to bring national economic development. Taken from the ranks of several South American countries, Brazil and Honduras, exemplify developmental media theory. The nexus established here is, 'by supporting government development efforts, media helps society at large.' This theory argues that media should put its critical stance on government in pending and remain supportive, until a nation is well established and its economic development well under way (Baran and Davis, 2010:126-7). However, American journalists have been critical of this view stating that it is an updated version of authoritarian theory. They also opine that the media should never compromise their power to criticize government policies, even if voicing those criticisms meant calling for their doom (Ibid).

Given the grave problems facing third world governments, NWICO theorists of the 60s and 70s argued that journalists should avoid 'negative' stories which might destabilize states, and instead actively collaborate with their governments by way of producing development journalism. Thence, development journalism deliberately focused on positive news, and stories that promoted modernist development (Louw, 2005).

The other interpretation of development journalism suggested by Norris (2010) puts emphasis on the journalists' role in building a nation by encouraging positive news stories with reference to community development initiatives that embrace attempts to bolster the economy, build stable societies, foster harmony within and between

communities, and strengthen consensus between diverse groups. Such journalism should also dwell on the reporting of crisis and problems so as to single out causes and come up with solutions, but not to put the public in fits of panic. Adherents of this approach are often influenced by modernization theories that portray journalists as important channels for putting across the insights of government and other elites to the masses in a manner that they could possibly comprehend, to help build a modern, rational, urbanized, entrepreneurial culture.

Nevertheless, development journalism is not only about portraying rosy pictures of the development endeavors, it should also show the other side of the story. In this respect, the Second Press Commission (1982 cited in Murthy, 2006) noted that development stories should cater successes and drawbacks. It should also work to ferret out the reasons behind for the failure and success of development programs that affect the lives of many.

Furthermore, one of the five interpretations of development journalism stated by Norris (2010: 356-7) posits news media as watchdogs and says, A fourth interpretation of development journalism puts media institutions as watchdogs. Hence, journalists must ferret out weaknesses in governance and hold governments responsible in straightening them out. Support for the watchdog approach surfaced after the Asian crisis of 1997, where financial journalism failed to cast a light on corruption and flawed economies of the badly affected nations. On the morrow, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and UN Development Programme promoted watchdog journalism as a guardian of transparency, defined as the timely release of reliable information about government activities.

Standing against the notion that freedoms and rights must sometimes be sacrificed for the sake of development and stability, supporters of the watchdog approach propound that restrictions on free speech, free press, and other civil liberties compromises good governance, that would in turn, disrupts development. This resulted in taking different assumptions among various development journalism models, with regard to the best way for governments and communities to foster development and the correct role for journalists in mediating the dynamics of governance and democratic life. The stance taken by Asian governments to support the journalism-as-government-partner notion has called for vehement censure from critics who claimed that the ethic has been recklessly bent by governments to serve as an apologia for dictatorial leadership and press censorship. The interpretation of development journalism as a government partner has never enjoyed acceptance in the liberal camp, which have been more influenced by Indian economist and philosopher Amartya Sen's often quoted claims that famine has never occurred in a democratic country with a relatively free press. Apparently, the partnership model lost support following the 1997 economic crisis, even among some of Asia's less liberal governments.

As Campbell (2004) puts, one's interpretation of the concept of development journalism relates a lot to how one perceives the role of state influence on journalism. Here, the central criticism lies in the fact that such kind of journalism, would inevitably involve inappropriate state influence in trying to insure the press are supportive and report positively on state development program.

Still more, as framed at UNESCO forum since the 60s, the constructive community-oriented role has tacitly called for the principles of development journalism. However, development journalism soon earned a bad name after incessant criticism of the practice by journalists molded by liberal or western media system. Hence, development journalism was put to be similar to a kind of journalism that was easily manipulated, and thus subjected to government control (Loo, 2009).

Unlike a newspaper, whose content is influenced by the variety of information and entertainment needs of the readership, development journalism oriented newspaper treats popular culture and entertainment news as peripheral. At its center is then news and information that serve as a catalyst for a social change. Adherence to ethical standards of journalism being intact, the yard stick for the evaluation of development journalism is community growth and human development rather than circulation figures, ratings and advertizing revenue (Loo, 2009).

Strictly speaking, development journalism methods should not be taken as a substitute to conventional market-oriented journalistic practice, but quite arguably as a genre that highlights what conventional reporting overlooked. And gives equitable access and participation in the media, to a wider audience it possibly can, across diverse communities (Loo, 2009).

Furthermore, practicing development journalism is not the prerogative of the commercial media as stated by Fox (1988 cited in Reeves, 1993:95) Stillmore, practicing development journalism is not the prerogative of the commercial media. As stated by Fox (Ibid),

commercial mass media are exonerated from responsibility for the meeting of public service obligations, and therefore development communication is not in any way their lot.

On the other hand, development journalism shatters the assumption of detached observation inherent in conventional journalism and works on the principles of journalistic engagement with the audience, to kindle a dialogue. The mode of communication employed by development communication is bottom-up. Such a communication mode allows the grass roots to have their concerns recognized by policy makers, channeled through the media. Hence, Gatlung and Vincent (cited in Loo, 2009:4) propose that development journalism requires a re-orientation of conventional journalistic principles such as;

- “Whenever there is a reference to development, try to make it concrete in terms of human experience.” Journalists should write about people as subjects, actors and agents rather than as objects or victims with “needs deficits”.
- A development-oriented journalist would never forget the dimension of democracy. “The task of the media is to report what the system is doing. Democracy can only function when there is a free flow of information between people, the system and the media. Using the media to make people visible, both as objects and as subjects, becomes one task. Using it to expose the system through investigative reporting is the second. Using the media to expose media that fail to do their job is the third.”
- Consider the possibility of reporting about development, not critically in terms of problems, but constructively in terms of positive programmes. Success stories may contribute to a general sense of optimism that can generate more momentum

for democracy and development. People in similar situations elsewhere can benefit from such success stories if the report is adequately concrete.

- Allow the “people” to talk. This means giving them a voice. A useful approach is for journalists to sit down with a range of people to discuss the meaning of development to generate “an enormous range of visions” as well as “how-to” insights.

In summary, the conception of development journalism by a group of independent Asian journalists goes back to the 1960s. These journalists believed that since national development depends very heavily upon economics, journalists should be better trained and educated to cover and report fully, impartially and simply, the many problems of a developing nation. However, providing an all-inclusive definition of development journalism is not an easy venture. But Narinder Aggrawala (cited in Mwaffisi, 1991:87) has this to say:

In its treatment, development news is not different from regular news or investigative reporting. It can deal with development issues at macro and micro levels and can take different forms at national and international levels. In covering the development news-beat, a journalist should critically examine, evaluate and report the relevance of a development project to national and local needs, the difference between a planned scheme and its actual implementation. Development journalism is the use of all journalistic skills to report development processes in an interesting fashion. It may require high skills and hard work but the reward of this kind of journalism can be tremendous.

This definition holds that development journalism puts heavy responsibility on African journalists, in the real sense of the term. What makes their responsibility heavier is the fact that they are writing for and about nations or societies nearly embarking or embarking on development undertakings or as sovereign states. Other than being saleable

like any other commodity, their news must be 'responsible news.' Their news must serve as a high bolt charger of national pride and unity, simply because, for the young nations, such pride and unity are very important to bring about development. In this regard, Hilary Ngweni (Ibid) contends that in counties riddled with disunity and tribalism, the prime duty of the press is to encourage greater national unity. With a deficit of minimum amount of national unity, all other human values in society would be too far to be reached.

No matter that there are a train of definitions with regard to development journalism; its outright aim is to accelerate the process of development to bring about a noticeable change in the quality of life of the great masses. Despite this enduring fact, Western scholars mistook the concept of development journalism to be mere advocacy, commitment, and a genre of propaganda journalism (Murthy, 2006).

Going back to history, we can see that development journalism did not come out of the blues. Instead, its root is grounded in the American journalism. In this regard Stevenson (1994:232) says that development communication and development journalism were terms closely linked with the New World Information Order (NWIO), which was at the center of debate in UNESCO in the 1970s and early 1980s, though the argument on whether the mass media could be mobilized to guide social change dates back before the inception of UNESCO. It is taken from the experience of the United States and a few other Western countries early in the twentieth century, who created a variety of government programs to promote development in rural areas. To carry out this program, a large bureaucracy named Agricultural Extension Service was established in the United

States. The “country *ag agent*” and “home agent” are still functional in rural courthouses to ameliorate agricultural production and rural life in general.

Programs prepared by the ‘ag’ extension office on local radios and newspaper columns are part of life in many rural areas of the United States. In the 1950s and 1960s, it was thought that these programs could be adapted to do away with the problems facing the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa. This consideration was the premise for a small field of communication research activity that became known as communication development, development-support communication, development information, and, finally, development journalism. All the terms which are often used interchangeably but imprecisely, refer to the simple idea that progress or development can be made possible by the help of change agents and the work of these change agents can be multiplied and duplicated by mass media (Ibid).

The other point that deserves public scrutiny when discussing about development journalism is the incorporation of “protocol news” to this genre of journalism. The scholar (Stevenson, 1994) also says that the coinage of the term *development news* or *development journalism* dates back to the Philippines in the 1960s. The term then meant technical information in the extension agent tradition that helped enhance economic productivity and thereby change lives. Following the change in the development goal from economic and political change to identification of the regime in power with the nation, development news also changed accordingly. Identifying itself with power there be, it totally axed criticism and negative information. It paid much attention to the positive aspects of social change, the slow climb toward modernity that the Western media, with their focus on disruption and disaster, ignored. Hence, development news

was drowned in the sea of singing the symbolic actions of leaders. Coverage of protocol news (ceremonial news) came to be thought as an appendage of development news.

At last, it is worth mentioning the conceptual problems of development. Despite a pile of academic literature, development journalism suffers the lack of a unified set of theoretical principles. Hence, it has blended a variety of ideological and political traditions. In the journey that intended to outline a press model for developing countries that diverged from the canon of Anglo-American liberalism, development journalism has served as a unifying idea for various political and intellectual positions at play. Development journalism has remained conceptually ambiguous, for it has served as a stage on which various expectations were casted on (Waisbord, 2010).

2.6 Propaganda model

A propaganda model, as a general theory of the free press, is portrayed by Mullen and Klaehn (2010:217-8) as thus:

The PM represents a ‘general theory of the Free Press’, and it offers an institutional critique of mass media behaviour (see Klaehn 2002, 2003a, b, 2005, 2008). Like other approaches within the critical-Marxist tradition, it is concerned with exploring the relationships between ideology, communicative power and social class interests. More specifically, attending to the interlocks that exist between the media, dominant social institutions, powerful elites and the market, the PM explores the interplay between economic power and communicative power. The fundamental argument put forward in the PM is that structural, political-economic elements influence overall patterns of media performance. However, theirs is not a conspiracy theory of media behaviour; rather, at the outset of *Manufacturing Consent*, Herman and Chomsky (1988: xii) emphasize that the PM presents a ‘free market analysis’ of mainstream media, ‘with the results largely the outcome of the working of market forces.’ Importantly, the PM challenges commonly held notions that media are liberal and dedicated to the public interest. Instead, it suggests that the structural contexts in which news discourses are produced are such that media themselves are predisposed to serve propaganda functions within capitalist, liberal-democratic societies.

Moreover, Herman and Chomsky (1988: ix) say, “the democratic postulate is that the media are independent and committed to discovering and reporting the truth, and that they do not merely reflect the world as powerful groups wish it to be perceived.” These scholars have also noted that the mass media deliver service to the general public in communicating symbols and messages. Apart from amusing, entertaining, and informing the public, inculcating individuals with the values, beliefs, and codes of behavior that will integrate them into the larger society is the function of the media. Hence; it needs a systematic propaganda to fulfill this role in a world where there is concentration of wealth and conflict of class interests.

With regard to the ability of the powerful to fix media messages and manage public opinion, Herman and Chomsky (1988: xi) opine that:

If ... the powerful are able to fix the premises of discourse, to decide what the general populace is allowed to see, hear and think about and to ‘manage’ public opinion by regular propaganda campaigns, the standard [liberal-pluralist] view of how the media system works is at serious odds with reality.

Moreover, it is hard to see a propaganda model at work where private ownership of the media reigns and prior restraint is at bay. In this regard Herman and Chomsky (1988) contend that it is a bit more difficult to see a propaganda system at play in a private media scenario, where censorship is nonexistent. This holds water in a situation where the media compete actively, ferret out and expose corporate and government malfeasance, and boldly present themselves as advocates of free speech and the interest the general community. Here, what is clear but overlooked by the media is the limited nature of such

critiques, as well as the huge inequality in command of resources, and the effect it has on access to a private media system and on its behavior and performance.

Furthermore, news production processes are tuned by multiple factors that impact upon what becomes news. The scholars (Herman and Chomsky, 1988:2) say the following with regard to these factors;

A propaganda model focuses on this inequality of wealth and power and its multilevel effects on mass-media interests and choices. It traces the routes by which money and power are able to filter out the news fit to print, marginalize dissent, and allow the government and dominant private interests to get their messages across to the public. The essential ingredients of our propaganda model, or set of news "filters," fall under the following headings:

- (1) The size, concentrated ownership, owner wealth, and profit orientation of the dominant mass-media firms;
- (2) Advertising as the primary income source of the mass media;
- (3) The reliance of the media on information provided by government, business, and "experts" funded and approved by these primary sources and agents of power
- (4) "Flak" as a means of disciplining the media; and
- (5) "Anticommunism" as a national religion and control mechanism.

These elements interact with and reinforce one another. The raw material of news must pass through successive filters, leaving only the cleansed residue fit to print. They fix the premises of discourse and interpretation, and the definition of what is newsworthy in the first place, and they explain the basis and operations of what amount to propaganda campaigns.

In actual facts it needs to see how these filters function and put their impact on the workings of the mass media a bit further. Hence, the first filter constraint gives prominence to the interlocking and sharing of interest between the media and other dominant institutional sectors; corporations, the state, banks (Herman and Chomsky, 1988 cited in McQuail, Golding and Bens, 2005:145). Moreover, Herman and Chomsky point out that the dominant media firms are quite large businesses controlled by the

wealthy or managers who are at the mercy of the owners and other forces with a market-profit orientation (Ibid).

The second filter emphasizes on the influence advertizing values play on news production process. Most of the media must sell readers to advertisers to maintain their financial standing. So, the media performance could directly be influenced by such dependency (Ibid). Furthermore, Chomsky (1989 cited in Mc Quail, Golding and bens, 2005) opine that media content takes its color, from the perspectives and interests of the sellers, the buyers, and the product.

As Chomsky (cited in McQuail, Golding and Bens, 2005:146) Puts, the relevance of the first and second filters have gained prominence, since *manufacturing consent* was first published. And he also adds that the sweeping changes in all fronts of the economy, communications industries, and politics in the past few years have made their share in the applicability of the propaganda model. Ownership and advertizing, the first two filters, have become even more prominent.

The third filter is all about the dominant elites routinely facilitating the news gathering process. The activities contained herein are: providing press releases, advance copies of speeches, periodicals, photo opportunities and ready-for-news analysis (Ibid). Hence, for the simple reason that information supplied by corporate and government sources is taken for granted that it doesn't require a check for facts, a costly background research, and assumed to be accurate and credible, government and corporate sources are attractive to the media (Ibid).

Here, the scholars are not only showing the symbiosis of relationship established between the journalist and their sources, but the mutual interest involved in the relationship. They also said, “the third filter constraint stresses that the opinions and analyses that are expounded by corporate and state sources are adapted to dominant class interests and market forces “(Ibid). Moreover, for the reason that they are cited by the corporate media as experts and/or ‘authorized Knowers’ their opinions are taken as they are and dissenting opinions are put at bay (Ibid).

Moreover, the authors contend that preferred semantics are channeled to the news discourse as a result of the dominance of official sources that are identified as ‘experts’. In this manner, news discourse would be twisted and positioned toward the direction desired by government and the ‘market’ (Ibid: 146). Obviously, the preferred semantics channeled to news discourse are those functional for the elites (Ibid).

Flak, the fourth filter, refers to dominant social institutions, understandably the state, as having the power and the necessary organizational resources to twist the wrists of the media to entertain a propagandist role to the society. As explained by Herman and Chomsky (Ibid), what is meant by Flak is a negative response to a media statement or program and it may be organized centrally or locally or may dwell on the entirely independent actions of individuals. In sum, there appear to be powerful interests that push a right-wing bias in the media, as the authors maintain (Ibid).

The fifth filter that lost prominence following the collapse of the Soviet Union and global socialism is the anticommunist ideology, which is easily made less noticeable by the greater ideological force of the belief in the 'miracle of the market.' Now, there is a

religion like faith in the market, at least among the elite, that posits markets as benevolent and nonmarket mechanisms as suspect, regardless of evidence. Moreover, the stagnation of the soviet economy in the 1980s was attributed to absence of market and on the other hand, the allegation of the disintegration of the capitalist Russia in the 1990s was put on the failure of politicians and workers to make the market magic work. So, "adding it to the fifth filter in a world where the global power of market institutions makes nonmarket options seem utopian gives us an ideological package of immense strength" (Herman, 2003:11).

As PM has it, the stated filter constraints are the most dominant elements in the process of news production, and they continuously interact and operate on an individual and institutional level (Herman and Chomsky, 1988: Rai, 1995 cited in McQuail, Golding and Bens, 2005:147). According to Herman and Chomsky, the filter constraints chop off the news that does not serve the purposes of the powerful.

According to Herman and Chomsky (Ibid), the stated five filter constraints embrace the essential ingredients of the PM. Moreover, "the authors argue that there is 'a systematic and highly political dichotomization in news coverage based on serviceability to important domestic power interests' "(Ibid). Herman and Chomsky claim that this dichotomy is routinely reflected in choices of the story, extent and quality of coverage (Ibid). These scholars also maintain that choices for publicity and suppression are at the mercy of the five constraints discussed so far. Furthermore, the authors argue that media shape public opinion by controlling the presentation of ideas and putting a limit on the range of credible options (Ibid).

In the final analysis, the media industry, whose foremost task is to filter falsehood and verify truth, is subjected to manipulation. And it is now immersed in the production of falsehood, distortion and propaganda (Davies, 2008b cited in Muller and Klaen, 2010). However, Herman and Chomsky argue that the architecture of mass media behavior is built with the interlocks in ownership, common institutional imperatives and shared goals, market forces and internalized assumptions, as inputs (Mullen and Klaen, 2010). Moreover Herman and Chomsky 1988: x) say;

The mass media are not a solid monolith on all issues. Where the powerful are in disagreement there will be a certain diversity of tactical judgments on how to attain generally shared aims, reflected in media debate. But views that challenge fundamental premises or suggest that the observed modes of exercise of state power are based on systemic factors will be excluded from the mass media even when elite controversy over tactics rages fiercely.

2.6.1 Worthy and unworthy victims

The other dichotomy exhibited in the propaganda model is the worthy and the unworthy victims. As put by Herman and Chomsky (1988: 37):

A propaganda system will consistently portray people abused in enemy states as *worthy* victims, whereas those treated with equal or greater severity by its own government or clients will be *unworthy*. The evidence of worth may be read from the extent and character of attention and indignation. We will show in this chapter that the U.S. mass media's practical definitions of worth are political in the extreme and fit well the expectations of a propaganda model. While this differential treatment occurs on a large scale, the media, intellectuals, and public are able to remain unconscious of the fact and maintain a high moral and self-righteous tone. This is evidence of an extremely effective propaganda system.

Here, a telling comparison could be made between the media's treatment of a Polish priest, Jerzy Popieluszko, murdered by the Polish police in 1984 and the media's treatment of other priests killed in the client states of the U.S. In the PM model, it is

Popieluszko who would a worthy victim, because he is killed in an enemy state and has the power to elicit a propaganda outburst in the media. As to the latter, for reasons that he is killed in a client state and cannot generate sustained coverage in the media, he would fall in the unworthy victim domain (Herman and Chomsky, 1988).

As mentioned by Mullen and Klaen (2010:216), the liberal-pluralist view with regard to the performance of the media in such societies is based on the notion that the media establish a 'fourth estate.' Put simply, there is a wide claim that the media would serve as guardians of the public interest and as 'watchdogs' on the exercise of power. Hence, the media would thereby contribute significantly to a system of checks and balances that comprise the modern democratic system (Ibid).

However, the critical-Marxist account of media systems posits that:

... the media are ... part of an ideological arena in which various class views are fought out, although within the context of the dominance of certain classes; ultimate control is increasingly concentrated in monopoly capital; media professionals, while enjoying the illusion of autonomy, are socialized into and internalize the norms of the dominant culture; the media, taken as a whole, relate interpretive frameworks consonant with the interests of the dominant classes, and media audiences, while sometimes negotiating and contesting these frameworks, lack ready access to alternative meaning systems that would enable them to reject the definitions offered by the media in favour of consistently oppositional definitions (Ibid).

With all the theoretical arsenals mentioned so far in its favour, this model is not immune from criticism. As Corner (cited in Robertson, n.d) suggests, Herman and Chomsky's writing is tuned with US-centric tendency. Herman and Chomsky's primary focuses are successive US administrations and their foreign policies. Hence, much of their treatises and activisms are reactive response to these actions.

Moreover, Golding and Murdoch (cited in Williams, 2003) criticize propaganda model for mobilizing great emphasis on strategic intervention of advertisers and owners in discriminating political messages and opinions in the media, while overlooking the contradictions within the system. Furthermore, both advertisers and owners work within structures that hold back and facilitate, that set limits and offer opportunities.

According to Mcquail, Golding and Bens (2005:142), the model presumes that news is framed to reproduce privileged interpretations of the news that are ideologically serviceable to corporate and state interests, while it does not theorize media effects. In addition, instead of studying media effects directly, the model focuses entirely on media content.

If one has an introduction to Chomsky's polemical writings on US foreign policy, one would agree that he dwells on circumstantial and other evidences that does constitute a 'proof' of hegemony and complicity. In the same vein, the PM is engaged in inferring self-interested or ideological motives (complicity and repressive tolerance) from structural patterns in news coverage. Likewise, the PM is also seen laboring to explain by appealing to psychological processes in individuals (Ibid).

With regard to the PM's argument that the elites have all the power to control news in their favor, critics say:

If scholars take too a rigid a view of how powerful elites control news, then much of the media's output, not to mention much of recent world history, cannot be understood. Is it wise to accept the flat-footed functionalism of Edward S.Herman's and Noam Chomsky's Manufacturing consent (1988), that the media 'serve to mobilize support for the special interests that dominate the state and private activity' (1988: xi) and that the propagandist role of the American press is not in any essential way different from the role *Pravda* played in the Soviet Union?

This would make many of the most dramatic moments in US media history in the past half-century inexplicable from the role of the press in publicizing the civil rights movement to its coverage of opposition to the Vietnam War. A view that sees large corporations and the media working hand in glove to stifle dissent or promote a lethargic public acceptance of the existing distribution of power cannot explain why corporations in the early 1970s should have been so incensed at how the US media covered politics, the environment and business (Dreier 1982 cited in Curran and Gurevitch, 2000: 180)

As Curran and Gurevitch (2000: 180-1) put, the ability of the capitalist class to manipulate and create a closed system of discourse has its own limits. And in the contemporary capitalism, ideology is a contested front. Though it is more explicitly advanced and have faced fewer legal and political hurdles, the ability of a socialist bureaucracy to create a closed system has limits too, despite the fact that its efforts to have one are stronger. The logical question to be asked here is what role the media play in the course of or in relationship to a social change.

The stance of the American press in questioning the Vietnam War might have occurred for the reason that the political elite is deeply divided. Even at this critical moment the press were engaged in their normal business citing official leaders, though they at odds with one another (Ibid). Here, the media did not did not reinforce the existing power, but rather toned up elite disagreements in unsettling and unpredictable ways (Ibid).

Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1 Data Sources

Having put the theoretical frameworks instrumental for the stated problem this study is trying to undertake, it is appropriate to move on to the explanation of the research methods and techniques to be employed and how the work would be carried out. Moreover, the process of data analysis to be conducted is also accommodated in this chapter.

Of the three approaches to research (quantitative, qualitative, and mixed), this study dwells on the qualitative research approach. With regard to qualitative methods, Kruger (cited in Daniel, 2008, thesis project), notes that such methods create openness and allow subjects to discuss pertinent issues, clarifying ambiguity or confusion.

Moreover, qualitative approach is a knowledge claim that the researcher makes, based primarily on constructivist perspectives or advocacy/participatory perspectives or both. And the primary objective of developing themes from the data is made possible through the collection of open-ended and emerging data (Creswell, 2002).

In addition, unlike the quantitative approach, qualitative method accommodates flexibility (Silverman,2005;Priest,2010,cited in Nwanko,2011,thesis project:21).The data the research brings forth is also in the form of words than in numbers (Ibid).Furthermore, identifying the relevant themes contained in the data should be the main purpose, when making use of a qualitative data (Ibid).Hence, the main objective of this study being the

perception of Ethiopian journalists with regard to the watchdog role of journalism, the qualitative method is seen suitable because the data collected entails it.

3.2 Sampling

As articulated by Ulin, Robinson, and Tolley (2005), selecting a sample for a qualitative inquiry is not a desultory enterprise, nor is it bound by dogmatic-like rules of reproducibility. It needs to be systematic but flexible, subject to the research questions. For the reason that the purpose of a qualitative approach is to explore in depth, the investigator carefully selected subjects that can best serve the objective of the study. Hence, to identify and get the right people who can supply vital information to the researcher, the sampling method is generally based on purpose rather than on statistical probability of selection.

Moreover, when developing a purposive sample, researchers consult their special knowledge or expertise about some group to select subjects that represent this population. In addition, purposive samples are selected after field investigations on some groups in some instances, owing to the assurance that certain types of individuals or persons displaying certain attributes are captured in the study (Berg, 2001).

With respect to the notion that the qualitative researcher labours to collect information representative of a spectrum of experiences, perspectives, and behaviors pertinent to the research questions, small purposive samples are ideally suited to qualitative inquiry. This suggests that as much as a large random sample could not serve the objectives of an in-depth study, likewise, a small random sample could not accurately represent a large population (Ulin, Robinson, and Tolley, 2005).

Based on the theoretical assumptions discussed so far, the researcher has employed a purposive sampling to select his subjects for a one-on-one in-depth interview. In this respect, two practicing journalists working at the level of an editor-in-chief and a deputy editor-in-chief were selected from the Ethiopian Press Agency; one producer from Ethiopian Radio and Television Agency; and one deputy editor-in-chief from Ethiopian News Agency. Though their modus operandi was different from the government media two journalists from the private media were selected: one editor-in-chief from 'Sheger FM Radio,' and one assistant editor from the 'The Reporter' (The Amharic bi-weekly). Moreover, only Ethiopian News Agency was taken for a focus group discussion, considering the huge deployment of time and cost the venture demands.

With regard to individual interview participants' age distribution, sex distribution, educational background, areas of study, the title they held during the interview, media denomination and time spent on discussion: Six media professionals were interviewed individually for periods ranging from 13 minutes-25 minutes. The participants are editor-in-chiefs, deputy editor-in-chiefs, an assistant editor, and a producer. Of these there is only one female participant. Age wise, they are between 32 and 47 years. From among the participants, two of them are from the private media organizations and the rest were from government media organization. With regard to their years of experience in the trade of journalism, it ranges between 5 to 25 years. When it comes to their level of education and field of study, all are Bachelors degree holders except one participant with a Masters degree and the other a PhD candidate. As to their areas of study; two of them have studied journalism, the other two have studied Amharic literature, the other BA

holder has studied philosophy and the participant with an MA degree has studied public policy. Lastly, the PhD candidate is currently studying Amharic folklore.

The participants were selected from juniors in the trade up to those with quite an experience, so as to inform the study from a variety of perspectives. In conducting the interview, all but one participant requested anonymity. To make the information comprehensive, and triangulate the information, a focus group discussion was also conducted with five journalists as members. The participants of the focus groups discussion are selected from one media house, Ethiopian News Agency, for convenience sake. The discussion has taken one hour and five minutes. All the participants are BA holders with different fields of study. Three of them have studied English language and literature; one has studied political science and international relations, while the other studied the field of education. In their occupation, four of them were reporters and the other, a deputy editor-in-chief with years of service ranging between 6-10 years. Of the five participants, only one is female. Regarding their age, they range between 30 and 37 years. All the interviews were conducted in their respective places, except two, conducted out of their place of work, from March-April 2012.

3.3 Data Collection

As the literature has it, there are three primary methods from the foundation of qualitative data collection: observation, in-depth interview, and group discussion (Ulin, Robinson, and Tolley, 2005). From these ranks, this study employed the last two.

3.3.1 In-depth Interviews

As put by Rubin and Rubin (cited in Ulin, Robinson and Tolley, 2005), in-depth interviews are an interaction between one interviewer and one respondent. Different scholars have called this kind of intensive, one-on-one interviewing a “conversational partnership”(Rubin and Rubin 1995,cited in Ulin, Robinson and Tolley, 2005:82),”conversation with a purpose”(Ibid),and a “social encounter”(Ibid).

Moreover, of the three types and styles of interviews; fully structured interview, semi-structured interview, and unstructured interview (Robson, 2002) this study took semi-structured interview guides to collect data for the consumption of its undertaking. Furthermore, semi-structured and unstructured interviews are widely used in flexible, qualitative designs where respondents are given a free reign to say whatever they like on the wide topic of the interview with a fairly minimal prompting from the interviewer (Robson, 2002).

As much as King (cited in Robson, 2002:271), calls such types of interviews as qualitative research interviews, he also suggests guidelines for situations in which they might lend service:

- Where a study focuses on the meaning of particular phenomena to the participants.
- Where individual perceptions of processes within a social unit- such as a work-group, department or whole organization-are to be studied prospectively, using a series of interviews.

- Where individual historical accounts are required of how a particular phenomena developed-for instance, a new shift system.

As commonly practiced, interviews are conducted one-on-one and face-to-face. Equally, they can also take place in group settings (Robson, 2002). So, it is with endorsing these ideas that the researcher took in-depth individual interview or qualitative research interview as a method for collecting data.

3.3.2 Focus Group Discussion

As much as focus group could be defined as a kind of interview designed for a small group (Berg,2001), “a focus group is the use of group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found in a group” (Morgan 1988, cited in Ulin, Robinson and Tolley, 2005:89).

Moreover, focus group is not a simple group interview where many people are interviewed at a time for convenience sake. It rather depends on the exchange of ideas among participants, while answering to specific questions forwarded by the interviewer/moderator. In addition, there appear to be similarities between moderating a focus group and an in-depth interview.

In both cases; introducing main questions, forwarding follow-up questions to draw more pertinent details of information and probing for the meaning of responses are equally important (Ulin, Robinson and Tolley, 2005).

With regard to the size, Kruger (cited in Berg, 2001) suggests the number not to be more than seven participants for complex problems. He also added that “the moderator’s” job, like the standard interviewer's, is to draw out information from the participants regarding

topics of importance to a given research investigation. The rationale behind the informal group discussion atmosphere of focus group interview structure is to encourage participants to discuss freely and completely about behaviors, attitudes, and opinions they possess. Hence, focus groups are formidable means of collection information across all ages.

The size of focus group interviewees varies. Some scholars even suggest the number of group participants to be between 8-10 to represent a larger population or group, of relevance to the problem to be treated in the study (Michael, Lorna, Dephels, Colette and Howell, n.d). However, “some authors suggest that if the number of participants in a study is small, it is possible to increase the number of groups by reducing the size of the groups. Guidance on group size is common and seldom goes beyond a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 12 participants per group (Carlsen, Benedicte and Glenton, Claire, 2011). In this study, the number of participants is five.

Furthermore, focus groups are strongly dynamic, when conducted properly. They also stimulate and strike a vibrant discussion among group members, when one group member reacts on comments forwarded by the other. This group dynamism is described as “synergetic effect” (Stewart and Shamdasani, 1990; Sussman et al, 1991, cited in Berg, 2001). In as much as group members brainstorm collectively, a myriad of ideas, issues, topics, and even problem solutions could be generated via group interviews ,than through individual conversations. In actual facts, it is this group vigor that distinguishes focus group interviews from one-on-one, face-to-face interviews (Berg, 2001).

Being a new breed in the social sciences, the focus group interview is an innovative and evolving strategy for gathering information that might be difficult to obtain otherwise. It can operate as a lone means or as supplementary. However, the limitations of focus group interviews must be seen in all consideration to the advantages they offer in a given research scenario. Considering the synergistic effect of focus group interview and the synergy that allows multiple ideas, issues, and opinions to surface, this study employed a qualitative focus group interview to examine the perception of Ethiopian journalists with regard to watchdog journalism, in addition to the conventional style of one-on-one interview.

3.4 Data analysis procedures

The emphasis of qualitative analysis falls on how to fit the rubrics of data, bringing together context and meaning (Ulin, Robinson and Tolley, and 2005). Creswell (2002) also says, making sense out of text and image data are the things carried out in the process of data analysis. The process also involves preparing the data for analysis, going pretty deeper into understanding the data, representing the data, and making an interpretation of the larger meaning of the data.

Regarding data preparation, both individual and focus group discussions were tape recorded and notes were taken to strengthen the recorded data. All the audio data were transcribed and the important ones were translated into English, since the original data were collected in Amharic.

In qualitative data analysis, there is a sequence of interrelated steps to be considered; reading, coding, displaying, reducing, and interpreting (Ulin, Robinson and Tolley,

2005). As Creswell (2002:191) puts, an ideal situation in qualitative data analysis is to blend the generic steps with the specific research design steps. Hence, he forwards these steps:

Step 1. Organize and prepare the data for analysis. This involves transcribing interviews, optically scanning material, typing up field notes, or sorting and arranging the data into different types depending on the sources of information (Ibid).

Step 2. Read through all the media. A first general step is to obtain a general sense of the information and to reflect on its overall meaning. What general ideas are participants saying? What is the tone of the ideas? What is the general impression of the overall depth, credibility, and use of the information? Sometimes qualitative researchers write notes margins or start recording general thoughts about the data at this stage (Ibid). As opined by Ulin, Robinson and Tolley (2005:145), qualitative analysis begins with data immersion, which means the researcher reads and rereads the organized notes and transcripts until he/she is well familiarized with the contents.

Step 3. Begin detailed analysis with a coding process. Coding is the process of organizing the material into “chunks” before bringing meaning to those “chunks” (Rossman and Rallis, 1998 cited in Creswell 2002:192).It involves taking text data or pictures, segmenting sentences (or paragraphs) or images into categories, and labeling those categories with a term, often a term based in the actual language of the participants called, an *in vivo* term (Ibid).

Moreover, Ulin, Robinson and Tolley (2005:147) contend that, there are two common pitfalls with regard to coding. One is, coding too finely (too many distinctions) that

results in missing concepts and the other is, forcing new findings into existing codes instead of adding codes that could extend analysis in new directions.

Step 4. Use the coding process to generate a description of the setting or people as well as categories or themes for analysis. Description involves a detailed rendering of information about people, places, or events in a setting. Researchers can generate codes for this description. This analysis is useful in designing detailed descriptions for case studies, ethnographies, and narrative research projects. Then use the coding to generate a small number of themes or categories, perhaps five to seven categories for a research study. These themes are the ones that appear as major findings in qualitative studies and are stated under separate headings in the findings section of studies. They should display multiple perspectives from individuals and be supported by diverse quotations and specific evidence.

Beyond identifying the themes during the coding process, qualitative researchers can do much with them to build additional layers of complex analysis. For example, researchers interconnect themes into a storyline (as in narratives) or develop them into a theoretical model (as in grounded theory). Themes are analyzed for each individual case and across different cases (as in case studies), or shaped into a general description (as in phenomenology). Sophisticated qualitative studies go beyond description and theme identification and into complex theme connections (Creswell, 2002:193-4). Hence, this researcher has coded the participants and attached the table in annex four.

Step 5. Advance how the description and themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative. The most popular approach is to use a narrative passage to convey the findings

of the analysis. This might be a discussion that mentions a chronology of events, the detailed discussion of several themes (complete with sub-themes, specific illustrations, multiple perspectives from individuals, and quotations), or a discussion with interconnecting themes.

Many qualitative researchers also use visuals, figures, or tables as adjuncts to the discussions. They present a process model (as in grounded theory), they advance a drawing of the specific research site (as in ethnography), or they convey descriptive information about each participant in a table (as in case studies and ethnographies). (Creswell, 2002:194)

Step 6. A final step in data analysis involves making an interpretation or meaning of the data. "What were the lessons learned" captures the essence of this idea (Ibid). These lessons could be the researcher's personal interpretation, couched in the individual understanding that the inquirer brings to the study from her or his own culture, history, or experiences. It could also be a meaning derived from a comparison of the findings with information gleaned from the literature or extant theories. In this way, authors suggest that the findings confirm past information or diverge from it. It can also suggest new questions that need to be asked-questions raised by the data and analysis that the inquirer had not foreseen earlier in the study. One way ethnographers can end a study, says Wolcott, 1994 (Ibid), is to ask further questions. The questioning approach is also used in advocacy and participatory approaches to qualitative research. Moreover, when qualitative researchers use a theoretical lens, they can form interpretations that call for action agendas for reform and change. Thus, interpretation in qualitative research can

take many forms, be adapted for different types of designs, and be flexible to convey personal, research-based, and action meanings (Creswell, 2002:194-5).

Having gone through the suggested interrelated steps, the information was then written in a narrative form. Moreover, pertinent quotations from the group discussion and individual in-depth interview which refer to the theoretical assumption were selected to illustrate the major findings of the study. Thence, these quotations were presented in verbatim.

Chapter Four

Results and Analysis

4.1 Data presentation and analysis

This chapter presents the data and its analysis in view of the literature discussed in chapter two of this study. The data obtained both from the in-depth interviews and focus group discussions are corroborated together for the purpose of triangulation. It also discusses findings of the analysis and the interpretation of the researcher.

Moreover, in places where translations are made on the verbatim quotes of the participants' interviews, the researcher has tried hard to find an equivalent 'Amharic' word for watchdog journalism, but could not come up with one. So, he is compelled to use 'የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት' throughout the translation pieces.

4.2 Journalists' introduction to watchdog journalism

All individual interview participants and focus group discussion participants are informed about the watchdog role of journalism. As to the context in which they picked the information; one participant (P2) from the individual interview domain said he learned it from journalism school and those who came from language schools said they have taken some courses that introduced them to watchdog journalism. The rest learned about watchdog journalism through readings, trainings, workshops and actual experiences. In the course of the interview, I had come to observe that journalists with years of experience were better versed with the subject than the juniors.

4.3 Journalists' view of Watchdog journalism

Most of the individual interview participants, including focus group discussion participants seem to perceive watchdog journalism as the literatures on the subject articulate it.

In truth, the watchdog role expects the media to put a check not only on the powerful sectors of the society, but on heads of private and public domains as well. Likewise, journalists are expected to perform their responsibility of guarding and protecting the public interest from incompetence, corruption, and misinformation (Odugbemi and Norris, 2010). Furthermore, the notion for taking the press as a Fourth Estate, as an entity that exists primarily as a check on those in public office, was based on the premise that the play ground of powerful states has to be limit (Coronel, 2012)

So, all with no exception, said that watchdog journalism serves as the public's eye in monitoring and exposing power abuse and misuse, maladministration, and corruption. Some participants (P1, P4, P5, and P6 and FGD) also said it serves as a check and balance on government and help accountability to reign.

“The press did not partake in the government structure. So, this lent the press to be called the Fourth Estate of government. The job of this independent body was to monitor the other three branches of government, as an external check on behalf of the public (Vivian, 2001:407).” In this regard, one senior journalist and editor in chief (P5) stated;

የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥልጣን አላላቸውም ስለሆነ በሀገር ላይ የሚፈጸም ወንጀልን እና ሙሉን በማጋለጥ ህዝቡ የራሱን አቋም እንዲወስድ ያግዛል ከዚህም ሌላ ከሶስቱ የመንግሥት አካላት ከህግ አውጪው ከህግ አስፈጻሚውና ከህግ ተርጓሚው በተቃራኒ በመቆም እነዚህ አካላት በተሰጣቸው ሥልጣን እና ውክልና መሠረት መሥራት አለመሥራታቸውን ይቆጣጠራል።

Watchdog journalism exposes power abuse, state treason, and corruption to help the public take its position.”Moreover, by standing against the three governmental bodies; the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary, it monitors whether or not they have fared as per the power bestowed on them and the mandate they are given.

He further elaborated that;

የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት አራተኛ የመንግሥት አካል ከሚባለው ጋር የሚያያዝ ነው። በምዕራቡ ዓለም የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን ህግ አውጪ ህግ አስፈጻሚና ህግ ተርጓሚ አካላት ሥራቸውንና ኃላፊነታቸውን ባግባቡ መወጣታቸውን የሚቁጣጠር አራተኛ የመንግሥት አካል አድርገው ይወስዱታል።

“Watchdog journalism is associated with the fourth estate. In the Western world they take watch dog journalism as a fourth branch of government that monitors the fair play of the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary.”

Moreover, most focus group discussion participants said they recognize the responsibility of watchdog journalism and emphasized; beyond serving as a conduit of information, they even said; “የጋዜጠኝነት ተልዕኮ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥራ ነው።”

“The mission of journalism is watchdogging” (FGD1and p1). Equally, they have also articulated that; “የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥራ የሌለበት ጋዜጠኝነት ሥጋ የሌለው ጋዜጠኝነት ነው።” “Journalism is fleshless if it lacks a watchdog practice. “

One participant, a senior journalist and an editor-in-chief at that (P6), sees watchdog journalism from the journalistic morale point of view and puts it as thus:

ከመጽሐፍ አንጻር የሚደረገውን እይታ ትቼ እኔ ጋዜጠኝነትን የሚመለከት ከሞራል እይታ አንጻር ከጋዜጠኝነት የሞራል እይታ አንጻር ነው ጋዜጠኞች ሁሉ ከሚጠየቁላቸውና ከሚታዩላቸው የሞራል መርሆዎች አንዱ ፍትህ ነው። ፍትህ በምንልበት ጊዜ ጋዜጠኞች የመንግሥትና የግል ተቋማት ፍትህን ማረጋገጫ አለማረጋገጥባቸውን መጠበቅ አለመጠበቅባቸውንና መከላከል አለመከላከላቸውን የመመርመርና ለህብረተሰቡ የማስወጅ የሞራል ግዴታ አለባቸው። በተመሳሳይ መንገድ እነዚህ አካላት ፍትህን በአግባቡ መጠቀም አለመጠቀማቸውን የሚተሸና ለህብረተሰቡ የማስወጅ የሞራል ግዴታ አለባቸው። በተጨማሪ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ከሞራል እይታ የመነሻ ነው ይሁንና

በጋዜጠኝነት ድርሳናት ወስጥ ስማቸው የሚሳ በኢትዮጵያና በሌሎች ሃገሮች ያሉ ሰዎች የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን ወደ ማርሜሪ ሃምሳ አለቃ ሥራነት ዝቅ ያደረጉታል አግባብ ያልሆኑ ሥራዎች ሲሰሩ የሚከናወን ተራ የምርመራ ሥራ አድርገው ይወስዱታል። የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ግን በሁሉም የጋዜጠኝነት ዘወግ ወስጥ ይገኛል። የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት አለምን ታሪክን ፖለቲካንና የሰውን አስተሳሰብ ማርምሮ በሚታይ በሚሰማ በሚሰብ መንገድ ማቅረብ ነው። ጥሩ ጋዜጠኝነት ሁለቱንም አዋዶ ይይዛል።

Leaving aside the professional point of view, I see journalism from the morale point of view, from the journalistic morale point of view. From the moral principles that all journalists strive to uphold and remain true to, justice is one. When we say justice, journalists have a moral obligation to monitor, investigate and report to the public, whether or not the private and public institutions promote, protect, and defend justice. Likewise, they also have a moral obligation to check and report to the public the abuse and misuse of justice by these same institutions.

Moreover, Watchdog journalism is derived from the morale point of view. However, in Ethiopia and in some other countries, people who have a name in the literature of journalism want to reduce it to the level of the work of a master sergeant. They take it as a simple investigative work, when abuses and misuses are committed. But investigative journalism is at the heart of every journalism. It is investigating the world, history, politics, and human thought and presents them in a way that could be seen, heard, and read. A good journalism combines both.

Some seem to believe that nothing good comes out of the private media, save fault finding. One participant (p1) in this respect says; “የግል ሚዲያውን ብትወስድ ስህተት አነፍናፊ ነው ይህ ግን የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥራ አይደለም።” “If you take the private media, it is a fault finder. But this is not the prerogative of watchdog journalism.” As against the preceding statement, another participant (P2) put; “የግል ሚዲያውን ሥራ ስህተት አነፍናፊ አድርጎ የመመልከት አዝማሚያ አለ።” “There is a tendency to label the works of the private media as fault finding.” All the same a participant (FGD1) in the focus group discussion articulated that የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ግን ስህተት ፈላጊ ሳይሆን እውነትን ፈላጊ ነው። “Watchdog journalism is not fault finding, but is rather fact finding.”

4.3.1 Watchdog journalism and development journalism

Some participants, especially those who are from the government media are orientated toward development journalism and try to explain watchdog journalism could be accommodated in development journalism. Of the five development interpretations discussed on one literature, the fourth interpretation has it; “A fourth interpretation of development journalism positions the news media as a watchdog. In this perspective, journalists must highlight problems and weaknesses in governance and ensure that governments are responsive to public concerns and opinions” (Norris, 2010:356-7).

Hence, at the backdrop of this interpretation, one participant (P3) said; እኔ የምሠራበት ሚዲያ የሚከተለው የልማት ጋዜጠኝነትን መንገድ ሲሆን የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት አንዱ መነሻ ነው እሱንም እንተገብረዋለን። “The media I work for dwells on the development journalism approach and watchdog journalism is one of its elements. And that we exercise.”

Asked how they came to exercise watchdog journalism, given the behavior of development Journalism to be supporting the prevailing government, he responded; “የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት መልካም ገፅታን መግለፅ አይደለም። መልካም ገፅታዎችን የሚዘግቡትን ያህል አሉታዊ ገፅታዎችንም ገንቢ በሆነ መንገድ መዘገብ ይኖርበታል ሁለቱንም ጎን ለጎን የማስኬድ ነገር ነው።” “Development journalism is not all about portraying positive images. As much as it reports the sunny sides, it has to report the negative side in a constructive way. It is running both side by side.”

The other participant (P4) also opined that; የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትና የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት ተመሳሳይነት አላቸው. “Watchdog journalism and development journalism are of the same breed.” Asked how they could be similar given the fact that they are from two different schools of thought, she said;

የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት ሙስናን በመዋጋት፣ የተደበቁ ሃቆችን ፈልፍሎ በማውጣት እና መልካም አስተዳደር እንዲያብብ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሚናውን መጫወት ይኖርበታል። ቅድም እንዳልኩት ስህተትን በማጋለጥ ይገናኛሉ። የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት ይህ ድልድይ ተገነባ ወዘተ እያሉ ስኬትን ብቻ መዘገብ አይደለም። ሙስናን የማጋለጥ

ሥራዎችንም ይሠራል የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትም እነዚህን የማጋለጥ ሥራዎችንም ስለሚሰራ እዚህ ቦታ ላይ ይገናኛሉ።

Development journalism should play its role as a watchdog by fighting corruption, unearthing hidden facts and helping good governance blossom and contend. As I said, they meet in the exercise of exposing wrongs. Development journalism is not only about reporting achievements like the construction of bridges and the likes. It also works on exposing things like corruption. Since watchdog journalism also works on such things, they meet at this juncture.

Stevenson (1994:239) in this regard puts, “development news centered more and more on the symbolic actions of the leader. Coverage and ceremonial events were called protocol news, which can be thought of as an extension of development news.”

This participant (P4) was also asked if it could be said development journalism works on monitoring, checking and making government accountable for the ills it committed, as watchdog journalism does? Her response was;

የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ማጋለጥ ላይ ሲያተኩር የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት ልማት ላይ ያተኩራል። ይህ ማለት ግን የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት በምንም ዓይነት የማጋለጥ ጋዜጠኝነትን አይተገብርም ማለት አይደለም። እኛ ያላደረግነው ነገር የድርጅቶችን የሥራ ጥላን ማየት ነው የምንዘግበው እነሱ የነገሩንን ስኬት ነው የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት የአንድን ድርጅት የሰራ ክንውን ከጥላኑ አንፃር አስተያይቶ ጥያቄ ማቅረብን ይፈቅዳል።

Development journalism focuses on development, while watchdog journalism focuses on exposing. But that doesn't mean development journalism would not in any way exercise exposure journalism. But the things we haven't implemented is seeing the plans of organizations, we just report what they told us to have achieved. Development journalism permits questioning the performance of an organization as against its plans.

The literature in this regard also says; “in covering the development news-beat, a journalist should critically examine, evaluate and report the relevance of a development project to national and local needs, the difference between a planned scheme and its actual implementation”(Mwaffisi, 1991:87).

Another question was also put to this participant which says; watchdog journalism is a fourth estate that looks at the ills of government and development journalism in its part dwells on monitoring the performance of organizations as per their plans. So, where do they meet? The response was, “በአንድ ድርጅት ውስጥ ጥፋቶች ሲፈፀሙ ጉዳዩ የአንድ ሰው ብቻ አይደለም ሁሉንም የመንግሥት ተቋማት ይመለከታል በዚያው ልክ ጋዜጠኛው ሁሉንም ተቋማት ይቆጣጠራል ይመለከታል።” “If there are wrongs in one organization it is not the affair of a single individual. It includes all government institutions and the journalist by extension monitors and looks after all institutions.” However, this argument looks to raise watchdog journalism to the level of performance evaluation of an organization.

4.4 The journalists’ interpretation of watchdog journalism

Although a blitz of watchdog practice is seen on the horizon of the private of media, both the private and government media seem to be polarized to the extreme ends of the Ethiopian media landscape. Concerning polarization Shimelis (2002:200) says, “Another important distinctive feature of the private press in Ethiopia is polarization. The private press in Ethiopia has begun life not as an instrument of government but as a rebel.” In this respect one participant (P1), a senior journalist and deputy-editor-in-chief noted that;

በግል ሚዲያው ወደአንድ ጥግ የተገፋ ትንሽ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥራ ነበር። የመንግሥትን ህጎች መርምረው ያጋልጣሉ ግን ያን ያህል ጠንካሮች አይደሉም። ሥራው የተበጠጠና በቋሚነት የሚሠራ አይደለም። ስለዚህ የግል ሚዲያው ጠንካራ ነው የሚል ቅኝት የለኝም። በተጨማሪም የመንግሥት ሚዲያውም ወደአንድ ጥግ ተገፍቷል። በመሆኑም የመንግሥትና የግል ሚዲያዎች ሁለት ፅንፍ ይዘዋል።

A miniscule practice of watchdog journalism was there in the private media, which is pushed to the extreme end. They investigate and expose government faults, but they are not that strong. The practice is fragmented and not consistent. So, I don’t have the illusion that the private media is strong. Moreover, the government media is also pushed to the other extreme end. So, the private and government media are polarized on both extreme ends.

It seems that it is unlikely for a government media to practice watchdog journalism, and hence they are seen catering development journalism. Moreover, following their

polarization, the media seem to serve different political interests. Again, the same participant explains this trajectory as follows:

በሌላ በኩል በመንግሥት ሚዲያ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥራ የለም። የስኬት ታሪኮች በብዛት ይዘገባሉ በሥልጣን ላይ ያለው መንግሥትም ብፁዕ ተደርጎ ይሳላል። በተጨማሪም አንድ ፅንፍ ስትይዝ ከጋዜጠኝነት መሠረታዊያን ጋር አብረህ መጓዝ አትችልም። ሚዲያ ተቃዋሚ ፖርቲ ወይም የመንግሥት ልሳን አይደለም። አንድ ሰው መንግሥትን ሊጠላ ይችላል ነገር ግን በተጨማሪ ስላለው አዎንታዊ ነገር ማውራት ነውር የለውም። በተጨማሪም የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት መገኘት ያለበት በሥልጣን አለአግባብ መጠቀም አለመጠቀምን በማጋለጡ በኩል ነው። በሌላ በኩል የመንግሥት ሚዲያ ምሥጋና ማቀንቀን የለበትም። የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ፍሬ ነገሩ ይህ አይደለም። ለዚህ ነው ሚዲያው ጠንካራ አይደለም የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሚናውንም እየተወጣ አይደለም የምለው።

On the other hand, there is no watchdog practice in the government media, success stories are reported in big doses and the government in power is portrayed as holy. Furthermore, when you become polarized, you do not go along with the basics of journalism. Media is not an opposition party nor is it a government mouth-piece. One may detest the government, but talking about positive things on the ground is not bad at all.

Moreover, watchdog journalism should position itself in checking whether there is abuse and misuse of power. The government media on the other side should not be hell bent on singing praises. This is not the essence of watchdog journalism and that is why I say the media is not powerful and doesn't exert its watchdog role.

Furthermore, an editor-in-chief (P5), and a participant in this study seem to argue that watchdog journalism is not a *carte blanche* that works across the globe. He said;

የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ለሁሉም የሚሰራ አይመስለኝም በአፍሪካና በእስያ የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት የሚባል የጋዜጠኝነት ዘውግ አለ የያንዳንዳቸው ሁኔታ ግምት ውስጥ ገብቶ ሲታይ ከምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት የበለጠ ይቀርባቸዋል የሰለጠኑት አለማት ስለተጠቀሙበት ብቻ በኛ ሁኔታ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት መጠቀም የምንችል አይመስለኝም።

I don't think watchdog journalism works for all. In Africa and Asia, there is a different genre of journalism called development journalism. Given their respective contexts, it is nearer to them than watchdog journalism. I don't think we can translate watchdog in our context, simply because the developed world have employed it.

This editor-in-chief (P5) also argued that watchdog journalism is a manipulation, when discussing the public service elements inherent in watchdog journalism. He noted that, “to some extent we can see watchdog journalism delivering a public service. But since it is a thing done deliberately and in all obscurity, it could not be possible to put our trust on it.”

This statement falls on the enunciations of Davies (2008b cited in Muller and Klaen, 2010:225) that say; “in the final analysis, the media industry, whose foremost task is to filter falsehood and verify truth, is subjected to manipulation. And it is now immersed in the production of falsehood, distortion and propaganda.”

Asked if we could say watchdog journalism is a piece of manipulation, this participant forwarded some explanations by raising some instances in this regard. He said;

በሚገባ! የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ጥምዘዛ ነው ምክንያቱም ጉዳዮችን በሚይዘውበት መንገድ በግልፅ ይታያልና። የሊቢያን ጦርነት ብንወስድ አሜሪካ፣ብራታኒያና ፈረንሳይ ናቸው ጦርነቱን የመሩት እነሱ በሚቁጣጠሩት ሚዲያ በተለይም በአሜሪካ ሚዲያዎች ለዚህ ጦርነት የተሰጠው ሽፋን የሚገርም ነው። የጦርነቱን ሌላ ገፅታ የሚያሳይ ሥርጭትን በመዝጋት በሚገባ በተደራጀ ዝምዘዛ አለምን ሁሉ በነርሱ ዙሪያ ማሳለፍ ችለዋል። በመከታተል በመመርመርና የጋዳፊ ወታደሮች ፈፀሟቸው የሚላቸውን እውነተኛና የፈጠራ ጭፍጨፋዎችን አጋነው በማቅረብ በኢራቅ ላይ የተካሄደውንም ጦርነት መውሰድ እንችላለን። የጦርነቱ ሰብብ የኢራቅ የጅምላ ጨራሽ መሣሪያዎች ባለቤት መሆን ነው። በኢራቅ ላይ ለታወጀው ጦርነት እውነኛው ምክንያት ግን ኢራቅ የነዳጅ ዘይቷን በዶላር ላለመለወጥ መወሰኗ ነው። ምፀቱ ግን አለም ሁሉ ኢራቅ የጅምላ ጨራሽ መሣሪያ ባለቤት መሆኗን ማመኑ ነው። ለጥምዘዛቸው ከነዚህ ሁኔታዎች በላይ ማስረጃ ይኖራል ብዩ አላስብም።

Of course watchdog journalism is manipulation, because it can evidently be shown in their orchestration of issues. If we take the Libyan war, it was the United States, Britain, and France that actually led the war. The coverage given to this war by these countries through the media they control, especially through the American media was very astounding. By closing the release of the other faces of information by other media, they have happened to align the whole world behind them in this war by an organized manipulation. Simply by following, investigating and delivering

amplified reports of some real and some cooked up atrocities and crimes that are perpetrated by the Ghadafi soldiers. We can also take the war waged on Iraq. The pretext for the war was Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction. But the real cause of the war declared on Iraq was her decision not to sell their oil in exchange for US dollars.

The paradox was the whole world had believed Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction. I do not think there would be any strong evidence for their manipulation than these instances.

In defining watchdog journalism, one participant (P6) forwarded the following as givens;

“የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት በሚደፍረው ተጠቃሚው የባህል ደረጃ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነቱ በሚከላከልበት ሃገር ህጎችና ፍቃዱን በሚከተለው ሃገር ባለው መንግሥት ችሎ የሚለጩ አዝማሚያ የሚወስን ነው።”

“Watchdog journalism depends on the laws of the country that the journalism is practiced, on the media consumers' level of culture, and on the tolerant attitude of the government of the country that issue media licenses.” He has also defined watchdog journalism by putting its types;

ገንቢ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት አለ ለምሳሌ የተወሰኑ የህዝብ ስብስቦች ከተገለሉና ህጉ የፈቀደላቸውን መብት ከተነፈጉ ወደብጥብጥ ማምራታቸው የማይቀር ነው እናም የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ወንጀሉን ወደመመርመር ያመራል። ‘ባርኪንግዶ’ የሚሉት ጋዜጠኝነትም አለ ይህ ጋዜጠኝነት አንዳች ወንጀል ሲያገኝ ይጮሃል ይደንገል ከበሮ ይደልቃል ይህ አይነቱ ጋዜጠኝነት ኢትዮጵያ ቢሰራም እንኳን ውጤታማ የሚሆን አይመስለኝም ሶስተኛው ‘ላፕ ዶግ’ የሚሉት የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ነው ይህ አይነቱ ጋዜጠኝነት በመንግሥት በስፖንሰርሮችና ገንዘብ ክብርና ዝና ባላቸው ትላልቅ ሰዎች እጅ ውስጥ ያለ ጅራፍ ነው። ይህ ድርጅት ይህን ሠርቷል ሂድና መርምረህ አጣራና አሳጣልኝ ልሳቅበት ላዋርደው የሚል አይነት አስተሳሰብ ነው እናም መጥፎ የጋዜጠኝነት ዓይነት ነው።

There is the constructive watchdog. For instance, if a certain group of people are marginalized, if they are denied the rights the law allowed them to enjoy, then it is likely that they would resort to violence. Hence, the constructive watchdog tends toward investigating the crime. There is also journalism that they call the barking dog journalism. When the journalism comes across a certain crime; it shouts, dances, and beats drums. If by chance it works in Ethiopia, I don't think it would be productive. The third

is a form of investigative journalism termed as lapdog journalism. This is a whip in the hands of the government, sponsors, and big personalities with money, prestige and fame. ‘This organization has done this; go, investigate, verify and ridicule him. Let me laugh at him and humiliate him,’ they say. Such is the attitude and it is the worst form of journalism.

Some writers argue that it is hard to exercise watchdog journalism in a collective society like ours. They also argue that watchdog journalism is a western breed, so it doesn't work in our context. Mohamed for one, (1997 cited in Wall, 2000:6) argues against the Western style free press from a different perspective; ”a ‘Western style free press’ probably will never take root in Africa because it is based on the Western notions of individual rights and responsibilities which he says are culturally incompatible with the collective philosophies of Africans.” The above participant (P6) puts his argument in line with the stated argument saying;

እኛ የምንኖርበት ዓለም ራሷን ያልቻለች በመሆኗ ህ/ሰቡ ጋሪዮሻዊ ነው። እራሳችንን ብንችል ህ/ሰቡ ከጋርዮሻዊ ወደ ግለሰባዊነት ይሸጋገራል። አሁን ካፒታሊዝም እያደገ ነው ሰዎችም ራሳቸውን እንደግለሰብ መግለፅ ጀምረዋል። ህ/ሰብ ጋሪዮሻዊ ነው የሚለው ሙግት እየከሰመ ነው። ሁለተኛ ምንም እንኳን በሚደያ ባይስተናገድም ምርመራ የኑፊኦችን አንዱ አካል ነው ብዬ እሚገታለሁ። ለምሳሌ በህ/ሰባችን ውስጥ የሚተገበረውን ባህላዊ እርቅ እንውሰድ በህ/ሰቡ የተደነገጉ ደንቦችን ተላልፎ የሚፈፀም ወንጀል ሲኖር በወጉ ምርመራ ተደርጎ አጥፊው ይቀጣል።

The society we're now living in is a collective society, because our world (the third world) is not self sufficient. If we happen to be self sufficient, the society will be transformed from collective to individualistic. Now capitalism is growing and people have started defining themselves as an individual. So, the very center of the argument that society is collective is withering away. Secondly, though it is not streamed to the media, I argue that investigation is part of our life. Take for instance the traditional arbitration exercised in our society. When there is an abuse and crime committed by breaking the norms established by the society, it would thoroughly be investigated and the outlaw would be punished.

On the other side, some participants (P2andP6) also say that watchdog journalism is not always adversarial, it also advises the government. “የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት መንግሥት ከህ/ሰቡ ጥቅም በተፃራሪ ሲሄድ ህ/ሰቡ እንዲህ ዓይነት ነገር አይፈልግም ብሎ መንግሥትን ይመክራል። “Watchdog journalism advises the government when it goes against the public interest by saying ‘the public doesn’t want such a thing.’”

Moreover, as one participant (P6) said watchdog journalism supports the government. “መንግሥት ፀረ ሙስና ፖሊሲ ሊቀርቅ ይችላል። መቅረፁ አንድ ነገር ሆኖ ይህንን ፖሊሲ ለህ/ሰቡ የሚያሳውቅለት ተቋም ይፈልጋል እንዲህ አየህ ነው የሚልለት ያ ተቋም ደግሞ ሚዲያው ነው።” “Government may establish a policy like anti-corruption. It is one thing to establish but it needs an institution that can show to the public, ‘this is happening.’ And this institution is the media.”

4.5 Prevalence of watchdog journalism practice in the media

As one participant (P2) from the private media articulates, the principle of his media endorses the coaching of journalists who came from other fields of study to work as a watchdog. He boldly declared that they are serving the public as a watchdog and said;

ስለምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ትግበራችን ደረጃ ብጠየቅ አጥጋቢ አይደለም ነው የምለው የምንፈልገውን ያህል እየተገበርነው አይደለም። ለዚህ ምክንያቱ ደግሞ በሙያው የሰለጠኑ ጋዜጠኞች እጥረት ነው ካለ በኋላ እሱ በሚሠራበት ሚዲያ ከነዚያ ሁሉ ጋዜጠኞች በሙያው የሰለጠኑ ከሱጋ ሁለት ብቻ እንደሆኑ አጋልጧል።

“If I am asked about the level of our watchdog practice, I would say it is not satisfactory. We are not practicing it up to our hearts’ feel.” The reason for this he said is shortage of journalists trained in the craft and confessed that they are only two trained journalists in the media he works for, from the total troop of journalists.

In the course of the interview with one participant (P3) from the government media, a question was raised if watchdog journalism is practiced in government media. In his response, he boldly said there is nothing that prohibits watchdog journalism from being

practiced in government media. The only thing is, it all depends on the objectives of the media's establishment. Otherwise it works in all media, including the government media.

Asked to explain what this objective means, he said, “መገደው የተቋቋመበት አላማና የሚረምደው አጀንዳ ነው።” “It is the reason for the media's establishment and the agenda it promotes.”

In the discourse of one of the participants (P4), it seems that watchdog journalism is put as a next hierarchy one reaches after having gone through the practice of development journalism. In elaborating her idea she noted;

የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን እየተገበርን ነው ብዬ አላምንም አሁን ገና የልማት ጋዜጠኝነትን አየተገበርን ነው። ምናልባት የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ከአንድ አገር አጣቃላይ አድገት ጋር የሚያያዝ ይሆናል። ስለሆነም የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት በማደግ ላይ ላሉ ሃገሮች የሚስማማ ነው ስለዚህ የልማት ጋዜጠኝነትን ከተገበርን በኋላ ወደምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት እንሸጋገራለን በተጨማሪም እኛ ገና አሁን በቅርቡ ነው መታችንን እንኳን መጠቀም የጀመርነው እናም በዚህ አጭር ጊዜ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን መተግበር ትንሽ ይከብዳል።

I do not believe we are practicing watchdog journalism. Currently, we are yet exercising development journalism. May be the practice of watchdog journalism is related with the overall development of a given country. Hence, development journalism is a theory that best suits the developing countries. So, after practicing development journalism, we can embark on watchdog journalism. Moreover, it is only very recently that we started exercising our rights and so it would be a bit difficult to practice watchdog journalism in such a short span of time.

Furthermore, asked what the difficulties are in exercising watchdog journalism, this same participant commented that our society is very tight in availing information and it is therefore difficult to monitor and investigate the abuse and misuse of power in such a scenario.

Likewise, a senior journalist and an editor-in-chief in a government media (P5) out rightly said, they do not practice watchdog journalism and their editorial policy is guided by development journalism. He also noted that the activities of his media institution are explicitly tuned with none other than development journalism. Moreover, their plans, editorial policies, and agenda are mainstreamed with the tempo of development journalism. Furthermore, in response to the question posed to him whether watchdog journalism is practiced in our country, he stated that;

የተወሰኑ መከራዎች አሉ። ከዚህ ውጭ ግን የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት ነው በሶስተኛው ዓለም ውስጥ ያለው በተደራጀ መልክ ባይሆንም የልማት ጋዜጠኝነትን በተመለከተ ህዝቡ፣ መንግሥት ከፍተኛ የመንግሥት ባለሥልጣናትና ፈፃሚዎች ቁልጭ ያለ ግንዛቤ ያላቸው አይመስለኝም ልማት ሲባል ስለልማት ብቻ መዝገብ እንደሆነ ያስባሉ የሱን ሙግት በመደገፍ ሌላዋ ተሳታፊ የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት እየተተገበረ ነው የሚል እምነት እንደሌላት ገልጻለች ገና አሁን ነው በሥልጠና በጋዜጠኞች ዘንድ ስለልማት ጋዜጠኝነት ግንዛቤ የተፈጠረው።

There are some limited trials. Otherwise it is development journalism that prevails in the third world, though not in an organized manner. With regard to development journalism enterprise, I don't even think the public, the government, high government officials and the executives have a clear understanding and perception on it. When it is said development, they only think that it is all about reporting development. Supporting his argument another participant (P4) also noted, she doesn't have the belief that development journalism is exercised. Extending her opinion, she said; "it is only now that awareness on development journalism is being created among journalists through trainings."

In what seems a supplementary statement, journalists who participated in the focus group discussion have also said, they are currently espoused to development journalism, but do not think they are faring well even in this front. Most of them said, they are reporting positive news and success stories which are incomplete at that. Moreover, they believe that development journalism should not only talk about success stories, they should also

treat negative stories. Otherwise, their venture will only be parrot journalism, which their media house is exercising.

As one participant of the focus group discussion (FGD 2) articulated; “አሁን የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን እየተገበርን ነው ነገር ግን በትክክል ስየተገበርነው ነው ለማለት አልደፍርም። ከልማት ዘገባ ይልቅ የፕሮቶኮል ዜና ነው።” “We are now practicing development journalism, but I dare not say that we are doing it properly. It is more of protocol news than a development reporting” (FGD1, 2and P1).Likewise, the literature in this regard states that;

Development reporting should tell the story of what is going on well as well as what is going wrong. It should investigate the reasons for success as well as for failure, at different places under different conditions, of various development programs affecting the lives of common people (Second Press Commission 1982 cited in Murthy, 2006:53).

Moreover, Stevenson’s (1994:239) words also seem to go along with the statement of the above participant with regard to development news; “development news centered more and more on the symbolic actions of the leader. Coverage and ceremonial events was called protocol news, which can be thought of as an extension of development news.”

While the media law encourages reporting about wrongs and negative stories, journalists seem to be hell bent on portraying success stories. One participant (P1) forwarded enduring facts and reasons for this handicap:

የሚዲያ ህጉ ስህተቶችን ሪፖርት ማድረግን ያበረታታል ነገር ግን ሂሳብ ታሪኮችን ስትፅፍ ሪፖርትህ ‘በጌት ኪፐርስ’ እጅ ይወድቃል በተጨማሪም የመንግሥት ሚዲያ ውስጥ የሚሰሩ ጋዜጠኛ ችግር ሊገጥመኝ ይችላል ብሎ ስለሚሰጋ ራሱን ‘ሰልፍ ሴንሰር’ ያደርጋል። ስራየን አጣለሁ ብሎ ስለሚያስብ አሉታዊ ታሪክ አይፅፍም። ጋዜጠኞች ሥራ ያጡባቸው አንዳንድ አጋጣሚዎች አሉ። አንድ የቡድን ውይይት ተሳታፊ ራሳችንን ‘ሰልፍ ሴንሰር’ እያደረግን ነው ብዬ እሰጋለሁ በስተቀር ግን የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት የስኬት ታሪኮችን ብቻ ገፍ ብሎ ግድ አይልም አሉታዊ ታሪኮችንም መሸፈን አለብን።

The media law encourages reporting on wrong doings, but when you write critical stories, your report will land in the hands of the gatekeepers. You see journalists trying to write, but their stories fail to pass the fortresses of the gatekeepers. Moreover, a journalist working for a government media is gripped with fear anticipating some danger, so he resorts to censoring himself. He also has no confidence to write adverse stories, thinking that he might lose his job. There are some instances that showed Journalists losing jobs. I am afraid, said one focus group discussion participant (FGD5), we are being self censored. Otherwise, development journalism doesn't dictate journalists to write success stories only; we have to cover negative stories too.

The other participant (P6) who tried to show us the types of watchdog journalism in the preceding pages, expressed his wish to see the practice of watchdog journalism, but registered his doubts for the existence of constructive watchdog journalism. He said;

የሚቻል ቢሆን የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሲተገበር ማየት እንወዳለን። እስካሁን ድረስ ትኩረታችን ያረፈው በሀብረተሰባችን ባህል ውስጥ ያሉ ግን በሚዲያው ዋጋ ያልተሰጣቸውን እንደ ተስፋ ፍርሃትና ተስፋ መቁረጥ ያሉ የሰው ልጅ ሕይወት ክፍሎች ላይ የምርመራ ሥራ በመሥራት ነው የገንዘብ አቅም ስለሚጠይቅ ጠለቅ ያለ የምርመራ ሥራ ለመሥራተ እኛ ገና ትንሽ ሚዲያ ነን አሁን እያደግን ነው እናም በሚመጡት አመታት ትንሽ ከፍ እናደርገዋለን በኛ ሁኔታ ቅድሞ የተነጋገርነውን ዓይነት የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ግን የለም።

We wish to see constructive watchdog journalism practiced, if it could be. Till now, our focus rested on investigating parts of human life; hope, fear, and frustrations, that prevail in the domain of our society's culture but not given value by the mainstream media. We are so small a media to accommodate thorough investigations, because it involves financial strength. We are now growing and in the coming years we think to develop it as a beat system. But I don't think watchdog journalism exists in our context in the form we discussed earlier.

4.6 Taking watchdog journalism as an option

Most of the participants from the government media seem to contend the impossibility of watchdog practice in their respective media. Asked why they did not take watchdog

journalism as an option, each has his own reasons to forward. In this regard one of the participants (P1) said;

የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን ተወጡና ቀላል ታሪኮችን እንኳን በሚዛናዊነት በማቅረብ ረገድ እንኳን ጥሩ አይደለንም። ስለዚህ እንዴት አድርገን ነው የተፈጸሙ ስህተቶችን የምንመረመረው? እዚህ አገር በሥልጣን አላግባብ መጠቀምና ሙስና ተንሰራፍተዋል፤ እኛ ግን እንኳን የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን ለመተግበር ደቅርና ተራ ታሪኮችን ሚዛናዊ በሆነ መንገድ ለማቅረብ እንቸገራለን። ስለዚህ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት በመንግሥት ሚዲያ ይካሄዳል ማለት ቀልድ ነው።

Leave alone watchdog journalism, we are not even good at balancing simple stories. So, how come we investigate wrongs? Power abuse and corruption is rampant in this country, but we are helpless in balancing ordinary stories, leave alone exercising watchdog journalism. So, it would be a farce to say watchdog journalism could be exercised in government media.

The other participant (P4) also said;

በኛ ማደያ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን እንደአንድ የመቼ አይነት ልንወስድ አንችልም። እኛ ታዳጊ አገር ነን እናም ለኛ ለሥራ የሚሻለውን የማደያ ቲዎሪ መግረጥ የኛ ፋንታ ነው። በምህራቡ ዓለም የተሠራበትን እዚህ ለመተግበር መጠከር አስቸጋሪ ነው የሚሆነው።

We cannot pick watchdog journalism as a trade in our media.”The reason she raised in this regard was; “we are a developing country and it is our prerogative to choose a media theory that works for us. I believe that trying to exercise what has been practiced in the Western world would be quite difficult and hard to materialize.”

Still more, another participant (P5) in his part stated, they wanted to pursue the direction of development journalism believing that it is this theory that serves best for the objective reality they are in. Extending his reason and explanation, he noted; “the reason for this is, the developed world has now embarked on sensational journalism, leaving aside watchdog journalism. Since their choice has no relevance to us, we have taken development

journalism in our part and started exercising it rightly. But we are not yet satisfied. The above statement seems to have a reference to Louw, (2005:61-2) who says;

A good number of contemporary journalists working for media favouring spectacle and sensation still believe themselves to be adherents of the watchdog principle. Hence, this venture has produced a journalistic genre by a cross marriage of adversarial journalism with reports focusing on politics as competition and conflict, mixed with the titillation of personal indiscretions and evaluations of the ‘character’ of political players.

Furthermore, asked in which journalistic function could the monitoring of corruption, malfeasance, excess of power and the likes be accommodated other than watchdog journalism, one participant(P5) exhibited his perception as thus;

እንደ ሙስና በሥልጠን መባለግና ሥልጣንን ያለአግባብ መጠቀም የመሰለት ነገሮች በምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ብቻ ነው የሚከፈሉት ብዬ አላስብም፡፡ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት አንድ መንገድ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ በተመሳሳይ ሁኔታ እኛም በራሳችን መንገድ በልማት ጋዜጠኝነት ልንሄደበት ከንችላለን። በተባባሪ ደግሞ የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት በምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ውስጥ በደንብ ነው የሚለፀው፡፡ ስለዚህ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን ብንመለከት በምርመራ ነው የሚከናወነው፡፡ በተመሳሳይ መንገድ ምርመራን በመጠቀም የልማት ጋዜጠኝነትን መተግበር እንችላለን፡፡

I don't think it is only through watchdog journalism things like corruption, malfeasance, and excess of power could be covered. Watchdog journalism could be one way. All the same, we can go over it in our own way, through development journalism. Specially, it is in investigative journalism that development journalism could be best expressed. Therefore, if we look at watchdog journalism it is done through investigation. By the same token, we can practice development journalism by making use of investigation.

በማከልም ሙስናን ማጋለጥ የልማት ጋዜጠኝነት አንዱ ሥራ ነው ብሏል፡፡ ምዕራባውያን በሚሰማማቸው መንገድ ሙስናን ያጋልጡ፡፡ ደፍረን ባንሄድበትም እኛም

በራሳችን መንገድ ሙስናን ማጋለጥ እንችላለን። በቂ መረጃ ካለንና የመረጃ አቀራረቦችን ትክክል እስከሆነ ድረስ የልማት ጋዜጠኝነትን መንገድ መከተላችን ሙስናን ከማጋለጥ አይገታንም።

He also added that exposing corruption is one of the works of development journalism. Let the West expose corruption in a way that seem fit to them. But, we can also expose corruption in our own way, even if we haven't gone through it boldly. Pursuing the path of development journalism cannot prohibit us from exposing corruption, as long as we possess all the evidences and our presentation of facts is accurate.

The above statement forwarded by the participant seems to be supported by Coronel's assertion that all reporting is investigative and investigative reporting is watchdog journalism. It is articulated as thus; in defining investigative journalism, Coronel (n.d:13) puts," it is said that all reporting is investigative. After all, journalists routinely dig for facts. They ask questions. They get information. They 'investigate'." Furthermore, Coronel (n.d:15) said, "investigative reporting is watchdog journalism: it aims to check the abuses of those who have wealth and power. It exposes wrongdoing so it can be corrected, not because journalists and their patrons benefit from exposure."

Asked what the term 'we haven't gone through it boldly' is in reference to development journalism, this same participant (P5) said; "በመንግሥት ሚዲያ የቆየ ልማድ አለ፣ ሳልፍ ሴንሰርሺን።" ጋዜጠኛው በእጁ ላይ መረጃዎች ቢኖሩትም ምርመራ አድርጎ ለማጋለጥ ዳተኝነት አለበት።" "There is a long standing legacy of the government media and that is self censorship. Even if the journalist has the facts at hand, he is reluctant to investigate and expose."

He also noted the other reasons as thus;

ለሌላው ነገር ጋዜጠኛው ከሌላ የለውም፡ ጋዜጠኛው ሁልጊዜ በፍርሃት እንደተወጠረ ነው፡ ስለመንግሥት ስህተቶች ቢፀፍ ፀረ መንግሥት ተብሎ ይፈረጃል፣ ለአደጋ ይጋለጣል፣ ሥራውንም ሊያጣ ይችላል፡፡ እነዚህ ሁኔታዎች ሙስናን በድፍረት የማጋለጥ ሥራ እንዳንሰራ ያሽመደምዳናል፡፡ በሌላ በኩል ጋዜጠኛው ለምን

ስለመግባት ጉድለቶች እንደሚገኙ ሲጠቁ ላይ ለውጥ አታትመትም ወይም ለአየር አታብቁትም ሲል በተደጋጋሚ ይደመጣል። ከዚህም በተጨማሪ የመግባት ደካማ ነገሮች ላይ ምርመራ አድርጎ ለመገናኛ ጋዜጠኛው የሚኖር ወሉንነት አለበት። ጋዜጠኛው ብቃት ስለሌለው እንቅጥቅጥ የሆኑ ነገሮችን ይፅፋል በዚህም ምክንያት ታሪኩ አወዳሽ ይሆናል።

ሁሉንም ምንጮች በመዘናቀቅ የመጠቀም ሁኔታ ቢኖርም እንኳን አንድ ምንጭ ብቻ በመጠቀም የመግባት ደጋፊ አይነት ሪፖርት የማይረብ አዝምሎ አለ። በሌላ በኩል አንዳንድ የፖለቲካ አባላት ጋዜጠኛ ይሆናሉ። ባይሆኑ ይሻል ነበር። አንዴ ከሆኑ በኋላ ግን ሳያወቁት የአድላዊ ስሜት ያደርባቸዋል። ለፖለቲከኞቹ የላቸውን ታማኝነት የጠፎ ወይም ፖለቲከኞቹ የከዱ ስለሚሰሩት የጋዜጠኝነትን ሥነ-ምግባር በመጠል አዎንታዊ ታሪክ ላይ ያተኩራሉ። እዚህ ላይ መረጃ በመስጠት ረገድ የመግባት ባለሥልጣናትና ድርጅቶች የሚሰጡት ዳግግነት መክንያት የለበትም።

The other thing is, there is no protection for the journalist. The journalist is constantly caught in a grip of fear. If he writes about government wrongs, he would be labeled as anti-government, exposed to dangers, and may even lose his job. So, this incapacitates us not to work on exposing corruption boldly. On the other hand, when the journalist is asked why he doesn't write about government wrongs, he is frequently heard saying 'if I do, you won't air or publish it.' Still more, the journalist has professional limitations to investigate and write about government ills. Since he has no capacity, he writes a hotchpotch and as a result of which the story is lent to praise singing.

He (P5) also said, even though there is a possibility to use all sources in a balanced way, there is a tendency of exhibiting a pro-government form of reporting by using a single source. On the other hand sometimes party members would become journalists. It would have been better if they weren't. But once they have become journalists, they would unconsciously become biased. Feeling that they have lost their loyalty to their party or betrayed their party, they resort to focusing on the positive sides of the story by breaking the ethics of journalism. Here the reluctance of government officials and organizations in supplying information should not be forgotten.

This statement seems to go along with the argument forwarded by the two scholars Hallin and Mancini (2004:139) when they were discussing about professionalism in polarized pluralist system, it says: “With regard to professionalism, it is less developed in the polarized pluralist system than in the Liberal or Democratic Corporatist systems, for reasons that commitments to common professional norms and institutions are overridden by political loyalties”

Considering the foundation of watchdog journalism to be liberalism, a question was forwarded to this participant, if it is possible to practice it in our context. In his reply he (P5) said;” አዎ የልማት ጋዜጠኝነቱን እየተገበሩ ጎን ለጎን የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት የሚሠራውን ሥራ የመሥራት ዕድሉ አለ። የኔ አቋም ግን በሁለቱም መንገድ አልተሠራም ነው።” “Yes there is the opportunity of doing what watchdog journalism does by simultaneously exercising development journalism. But my position is, it is not done in both ways, so to speak.”

The last participant (P6), at least in answering this question, seems to look at this question from a different perspective, by putting watchdog ethics, financial capacity, and audience pressure. He thus stated;

ቅድም እንዳልኩት የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን አንድአንድ አማራጭ መውሰድ ይቻላል።ችግሩ ግን ወደ መርማሪ ሃምሳሊቃ ሥራነት ያወረድከው እንደሆነ ነው። በተጨማሪም ይህ ትንሽ ራዲዮ ጣቢያ ነው ስለሆነም አንድን ጋዜጠኛ ለአንድ ወር ለሁለት ወራት በአንድ ጉዳይ ላይ አትመድብም፤ ምክንያቱም ወጪው ከፍተኛ ነው። ስናድግና ገንዘብ ስናገኝ ከፍተኛ ባለሙያዎች ቀጥረን የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን እንጀምራለን። በሌላ በኩል አድማጩ ራሱ ምርመራ እንዲደረግለት ይጠይቃል። ለምሳሌ እንደህ እንዲህ ዓይነት ያለአግባብ በሥልጣን መጠቀም በዚህ ድርጅት አለ፤ እንደዚህ ዓይነት ወንጀሎች እየተፈጸሙ ነው ወዘተ. ስለዚህ ምርመራ ይደረግ ብለው ይጠይቃሉ።ለክድማጮቻችን ትስቅ ታማኝነት ስላሰን ጥያቄዎቻቸውን መመስሰ ባንቸሰ ያዋርዳናል። ከኛም ይርቃሉ። ስለዚህ ይህ የኛ ፍላጎት ብቻ ሳይሆን የአድማጭ ግፊትም አለበት።

As I said before it is possible to take watchdog journalism as an option. The problem would be if you reduce it to the work of a master sergeant. Moreover, this is a small radio station and you cannot assign a journalist for a month or two to work on a single case, because the cost is very high. When we grow and get money, we would hire senior professionals and embark on watchdog journalism. On another count, the audience itself forwards a request for an investigation. For instance, it says, there is such and such abuse and misuse in this organization, such and such crimes are being committed etc. and so they request for an investigation. We have a high level of loyalty to the audience and if we fail to respond to their request they would despise and distance themselves from us. So, it is not only our interest, there is audience pressure as well.

Asked if sees any difference between watchdog journalism and investigative journalism, the participant (P6) discussing the above points, tried to put the difference between purpose and skill. He puts it this way; ከጆርናሊዝም ኤቲክ የተወሰደ በመሆኑ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት አላማወን ነው የሚረገገው፤ የሚሰጥበት ፡ ይህ እንግዲህ የጋዜጠኝነት ኤቲክ የምንለው ነው፡ ተግባሩ፤ ከህሎቱና የዘገባ አይነቱ ደግሞ ምርመራ ነው፡ ስለዚህ ልዩነቱ በአላማኛ በከህሎት ማክከል ያለው ነው፡

”Watchdog journalism is a concept that shows and defines the purpose because it is derived from the journalism ethics. It is what we call journalistic ethic. The practices, the skills, and forms of reporting are investigative. So, the difference is between purpose and skill.”

4.7 Challenges faced in the practice of watchdog journalism

There are a myriad of challenges the journalists raised that stand in their way when trying to practice watchdog journalism, no matter what the ownership of the media is. A participant (P1) from the government media noted;

ራሳችንን ‘ሰልፍ ሴንሰር’ ማድረጋችንን በመጠቀም አለቆቻችን በየስብሰባው ላይ በማንኛውም ጉዳይ ላይ ለመጻፍ ነፃ እንደሆንን ይነግሩናል፡፡ ነገር ግን ሂሳብ ቃና ያለው ታሪክ ስንፅፍ ይወቅሱናል፡፡ በተጨማሪም ጋዜጠኛው በደርግ ዘመን በነበረው ‘ሰልፍ ሴንሰርሺፕ’ የዞረ ድምር እየተሰቃየ ነው ይላሉ፡፡ ‘ሰልፍ ሴንሰርሺፕ’ ግን ለምን ተደጋግሞ ይመጣል? ምክንያቱ አለቆቻችን ስድርጉ እና አታድርጉን በኛ ላይ ስለሚጭኑና ስለሚያሸማቅቁን ነው፡፡

In meetings our bosses tell us we are free to write on anything we can put our hands on, commenting on our indulgence in self censorship. But when we write stories with a critical tone, they blame us. They also say, the journalist suffers from the hangover of self censorship that he was experiencing during the Derg regime. But why does self censorship recur? It is because our bosses impose the dos and don'ts and intimidate the journalist.

In literatures self censorship is portrayed as thus;

The relation between truth and journalism is not as seamless as journalists publicly acknowledge it to be. Journalists often know more than what they publish. Self-censorship, “the scissors in journalists’ heads” as some call it, is the first filter, informed by reporters’ expectations about what might hit editorial snags or require waging an uphill battle to get published. Some are sporadically willing to take that fight. The belief that potential problems inside news organizations would inevitably arise, however, discourages journalists from putting their investigative teeth into specific stories. Self-censorship is not limited to reporters. News organizations also opt to avoid rocking the boat with stories that are likely to enrage political and economic powers (Waisbord, 2000:203).

On the other hand one participant (P6) looks at self censorship from a different angle. He says;

የሚዲያ ተቋሙ የሰማሁትን ያየሁትንና የማውቀውን ወንጀል በዝምታ ማለፍ አልቻልም ካለና ጋዜጠኛው በነዚህ ወንጀሎች ላይ እንዲሠራ ካደረገ ከለላ ይሰጣቸዋል። ስለዚህ በጋዜጠኛው በኩል ‘ሰልፍ ሴንሰርሺፕ’ አስፈላጊ አይሆንም። ነገር ግን ሚዲያው እንዲህ ዓይነቱን ሁኔታ ባይፈልግና ጋዜጠኛው ደግሞ ሽፋን ለመስጠት ቢፈልግ ጋዜጠኛው ይህንን ዓላማውን እውን ለማድረግ ምንም መሠረት ስለማይኖረው ‘ሰልፍ ሴንሰርሺፕ’ ብቅ ይላል።

If the media institution says it cannot ignore the crimes that it heard about, seen and know and encourages journalists to work on them, it would protect them. So, there is no need of self censorship on the journalists’ side. But, if the media doesn’t accept such a scenario and the journalist wanted to promote it, there crops self censorship because the journalist has no ground to realize his purpose.

Some participants have also raised intimidation, confrontation, harassment and labeling as challenges that Ethiopian journalists are suffering in practicing watchdog journalism. They also noted, if you dare say anything against the government, even a minor critic, you would not survive in that media house. With regard to the manner in which the challenges are manifested a question was forwarded to the participants, and they have responded from the point of view of their experiences. Eventually, one participant (P1) stated;

በወረቀት ላይ ሙያህን በነጻነት ለመተግበር መብት እንዳለህ ተቀምጧል የህግ ማዕቀፍም አለው። ችግሩ የሚመጣው የፅሁፍ ነፃነትህን ለመጠቀም ስትሞክር ነው። ያየሃቸው ነገሮች ላይ ስትጽፍ ኤዲተሩ ፊትለፊት ይቃወምሃል። በተጨማሪም ኤዲተሪያል ፖሊሲው አሳሪና አጋጅ አይደለም። ነገር ግን እጅህ ላይ ያሉ እውነቶች ላይ ስትጽፍ ተቃዋሚ ተብለህ ትፈረጃለህ።

On paper it is clearly put that you have the right to exercise your profession freely. The law also accommodates it. The problem comes when you try to exercise your freedom to write. When you write on things you actually observed, the editor confronts you. Moreover, the editorial policy is not prohibitive or restrictive. But if you write the facts on your hand, you would be labeled as an opposition.

After all, in many developing countries investigative reporters take great risks and are poorly or modestly paid. Apart from physical attacks, investigative reporters have also been subjected to jail terms and harassment lawsuits as well as laws that restrict information access, all of which impede their ability to expose wrongdoing. The pathology is clear: even as democracy provides the optimum conditions for watchdog reporting, many democracies in the world are unable to provide adequate protections for journalists. And yet, neither murders nor lawsuits have succeeded in gagging the press (Coronel, 2008).

In conformity to this thought, one participant (P2) recalls his experience saying; “ያዋክቡሃል፣ በስልክ ፍርሃት ይነዙብሃል።” “They harass and mobilize fear on you through telephones.” Putting the kind of fear capsules thrown by people on whom the investigative reporting points at, he said; “በኔ ላይ አንድ መጥፎ ነገር ቢመጣ ማናችን እንደምንኖር ታያለህ።” “If anything bad comes on me, you’ll see which one of us would survive.” Recollecting his sad experience he also noted that these people have even gone to the extent of inflicting physical injuries on the journalist by their paid gangs. በዚህ ረገድ ህያው ተሞክሮ አለ። “There is a living experience in this regard.” He also added that በመልክ ካወቁህ በፈታቸው የጠላትነት ገፅ ያሳዩህል ጣቶቻቸውን ወዳንተ በመጠቆምም ያሸማቅቁሃል “If they know you physically, they show you unfriendly facial expressions and try to intimidate you by pointing their fingers at you.” There are also challenges that range between trying to identify our sources and withholding information, said another participant (P1) and stated his pessimism as “በዚህ ሁሉ የኘሬስ ነፃነትና ህገ-መንግሥታዊ መብት እኛ አገር ውስጥ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት እየተተገበረ ነው ብዬ አላስብም።” “With all the press freedom and constitutional rights, I don’t think watchdog journalism is being practiced in our country.”

The other manifestation of challenges in exercising watchdog journalism seems to be the professional deficit on the journalist. One participant (P1) in this regard noted that the journalist suffers from the professional and capacity limitations. He went explaining this situation by saying; ; “አሁን በኤዲተሩና በሪፖርተሩ መሃከል ያለውን የዕውቀት ልዩነት ብትመለከት ዜሮ ነው። የኤዲተሩ እውቀት ከሪፖርተሩ የተሻለ አይደለም።” “If you now look at the knowledge divide between the reporter and the editor, it amounts to zero. The editor’s knowledge is not better than the reporter’s.”

Endorsing the above statement, the other participant (P2) said; (ዜና በመሰብሰብ ፣ በመዘገብ፣ ስሞችን በትክክል በመጻፍ የተላከበትን ሁነት ወይም ኮንፈረንስ በመረዳት እና በመሳሰሉት ትልቅ የሙያ ውሳኔነት አለ። “There is a big professional limitation in gathering information, reporting, writing names accurately, and a handicap in perceiving the event or conference he is sent to report and the likes.” Asked whether this professional deficit is reflected in the watchdog reporting, this participant said, በትክክል ‘Of course.’ Explaining his stance he noted; “የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሁኔታዎችን በመረጃ በማስደገፍ በቶሎ ማውጣት ነው።” “Watchdog journalism is all about making happenings immediate or release them based on facts. “በመስቀለኛ ማመሳከሪያ ወቅት ሪፖርተሩ ይዟቸው የመጣው ኢንፎርሜሽኖች ሐቅ የጎደላቸው ሆነው ያገኘናቸው አሉ ። ስለዚህ ይህ ጎደሎ ትልቅ ተፅዕኖ አለው።” “There are some instances where we came across pieces of information brought by the reporter to lack facts in our cross-checking. So, this deficit has a great impact.”

Restriction looks the other challenge that threatens the journalist. As one participant (P1) stated, if there is no restriction, one could develop the capacity through time and experience. Restriction is prohibitive; if this restriction is waived watchdog journalism could bloom, contend and be successful. The same is the case with the private media, they are afraid of restrictions too. “እኔ የግል ሚዲያዎች የደረሱበትን ጉድለት በድፍረትና በነፃነት ለመጻፍ መሉ ለሙሉ ነፃነት አላቸው የሚል ቅዠት የለኝም።” “I don’t have the illusion that private media are fully liberated, free and bold to write on whatever wrongs they come across.”

Challenges in exercising watchdog journalism could also come both from organizations and the society. One participant (P4) in this regard said;” ህ/ሰቡ መረጃ በማቅረብ ረገድ ተባባሪ አይደለም የሥልጣን አላግባብ መጠቀምን ለመመርመር ይቅርና የግል አስተያየቱን ብቻ የሚጠይቅ መረጃ ከህ/ሰቡ ማግኘት በጣም ከባድ ነው።” “The public is not helpful in availing information. Let alone the information you will make use of for investigating misuses and abuses, it is very hard to access information from the public that require personal opinion only.” Moreover, this participant argues;

የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን የሚገድቡት አዲቶሪያል ፖሊሲውና መመሪያዎች አይደሉም ይልቁንም አብረናቸው የምንኖራቸው ማህበራዊ ግንዛቤዎቻችን ናቸው። ሁላችንም

መረጃን በቀላሉ የማይሰጥ ህ/ሰብ ውጤቶች ነን። ከሪፖርተሩ ጀምሮ ሥልጣን አላግባብ መጠቀምን ለማጋለጥ ዝግጁ አይደለንም። በአለቆቹም አካባቢ ያለው ነገር ይህ ዓይነት ነው።

It is not the editorial policy and other directives that curtail the practice of watchdog journalism, but the societal orientation we lived with. Each of us is a product of a society that is tight in letting information accessible. Starting from the reporter, we are not ready to expose abuses and misuses. The same is the case with the bosses.

Political outlook is another front that could be taken as a challenge in pronouncing watchdog journalism. In this respect, one participant (P5) put;

ኢትዮጵያ ውስጥ ያለው ፖለቲካ የጥላቻ ወይም የዜሮ ድምር ፖለቲካ ነው። በእንዲህ ዓይነት ፖለቲካ ውስጥ ማደያው በሀላት ፅንፍ ገራዎች ነው የተሰለፈው ። ማደያው ወይም መንግሥትን በመቃወም ወይም በመደገፍ ይቆያል። ሌላ አማራጭ የለም። አንዳቸው ሌላኛውን አሉታዊ ቀለም የሚቀበል ታሪክ ይዘው ከወጡ ፍረጃና ጤኛ ያልሆነ ዘመቻ ይጀምራሉ። በተጨማሪም ማደያውን የሚዛው የፖለቲካ ፍልስፍና ሌላው ተግዳሮት ነው።

The politics that reigned in Ethiopia is a hate politics or a zero sum politics. In this genre of politics, the media is posited in two extreme poles. The media stands either in opposition to the government or in support of the government. There is no other option. If either of them writes a story that paints a negative color on the other, there comes labeling and carrying out ill motivated campaigns. Moreover, the political philosophy governing the media house is also the other challenge, commented one focus group discussion participant (FGD5).

It is also worth mentioning the challenges that seem to emanate from the managerial body of the media. As one focus group participant (FGD5) argues;

በመካከለኛ አመራር ላይ ያሉ ሰዎች ከጋዜጠኝነት ወይም ከኮሙኒኬሽን የትምህርት ዘርፍ የመጡ አይደሉም። ለመንግሥታዊ ተልዕኮ የተመደቡ የፖለቲካ ሹመኞች ናቸው። ስለሆነም

ተራ የጋዜጠኝነት ግብአት የምትጠይቀው ነገር ፖለቲካ ያደርጓታል። ለነሱ ይህ ተልዕኮን ሜጠም ነው። ከዚህም በተጨማሪ ሚዲያውን የሚጥሩት ሰዎች ለሙያው እንግዳ በመሆናቸው በመንገድህ ላይ እንቅፋት ያስቀምጠላሉ። ከዚህም በላይ ሚዲያውን የሚጥሩት ሰዎች ባለሀላት ሰብእና ናቸው። በስብስብ ላይ በማንኛውም ጉዳይ ላይ እንድትጻፍ ይነግሩሃል። ወደ ትክክለኛው ትግበራ ስንመጣ ግን ታሪኩ ሌላ ነው። እርግጥ ነው የተፃፈው ኤዲቶሪያል ፖሊሲ ከልካይ አይደለም ሚዲያውን የሚጥሩት ሰዎች ግን ናቸው።

People at mid-level management are not from the journalism and communication field. They are simply politically assigned with a state duty. So, they try to politicize any activity that demands a simple professional input. For them it is serving a duty. Moreover, since the people heading the media are strange to the profession, they put hurdles on your way. Furthermore, people running the media exercise double standard. In meetings they tell you to write on any issue, no matter what. But when we come to the actual practice, the story is different. Of course, the written editorial policy is not prohibitive, but the people running it are.

The question of protection also seems to be endorsed as a challenge by the journalists. In this regard, a focus group discussion participant (FGD1) strongly stated; በጻፋቸው ፅሁፎችና ምርመራ ባካሄደባቸው ጉዳዮች ምክንያት ሲከሰስ ጋዜጠኛው ከሌላ የለውም። ስለዚህ ወደፊት በምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥራው እንዲተጋ የህግ ከሌላ ሊያስገኝለት የሚችል የህግ ማቀፍ ሊኖር ይገባል። “There is no protection for the journalist when a case is filed against him for the story he wrote or wrongs he watchdogged. So, there has to be a legal framework or a defense mechanism put in place to encourage the journalist in his future watchdog endeavors.”

This articulation has a reference to Coronel’s statement which says;

After all, in many developing countries investigative reporters take great risks and are poorly or modestly paid. Apart from physical attacks, investigative reporters have also been subjected to jail terms and harassment lawsuits as well as laws that restrict information access, all of which impede their ability to expose wrongdoing. The pathology is clear: even as democracy provides the optimum conditions for watchdog reporting, many democracies in the world are unable to provide adequate

protections for journalists. And yet, neither murders nor lawsuits have succeeded in gagging the press (Coronel, 2008:5)

Sometimes the journalist would fall in a dilemma between writing and letting down a watchdog story that involves the powerful and people he knew. As one focus group participant (FGD5) has it;

አንዳንድ ጊዜ ስትነካው ፣ ወይም ልታወራበት የማትችለው ሰው ላንተ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ታሪክ ትልቅ ግብአት ሆኖ ይገኛል፤ ነገር ግን ስለእሱ አንዲት መስመር ለመጻፍ ወኔ ይከዳሃል። በሌላ በኩል ደግሞ እሱን የማይጋልጠውን ቦታ ቆርጠህ ብታወጣ ታሪኩ ያልተጣሰና ከምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ክልል ውጭ ይሆናል። ስለዚህ ታሪኩን ትተዋለህ።

Sometimes the person you cannot touch or speak about would happen to be a valuable input for your watchdog story, but courage fails you to write a line about him. On the other hand, if you ‘doctor’ the parts that expose him, the story would become incomplete and far from the realm of watchdog journalism. So, you let down the story.

With regard to the challenges in exercising watchdog journalism, one senior journalist and editor in chief (P6) has stated a different argument that relates to Coronel’s writing: Across counties and cultures, the watchdog role of the journalist has a spectrum of definitions. And this definition is not fixed; it picks its definition following the prevailing social, political, and economic conditions and a reflection as much of the historical moment as it is of pre-existing structures and media cultures. So, being inspired by the liberal democratic notion of the press as watchdog, journalists improvise their role definitions to the tunes of their audiences, news organizations and the time they live in (Coronel, 2008:9). And his argument runs;

እንደኔ በኢትዮጵያ ውስጥ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥነ ምግባር እንደገና ሊቃኝ ይገባዋል። የኢትዮጵያ ጋዜጠኝነት የሃያ አመት ታሪክ ብቻ ነው ያለው ምክንያቱም ከዚህ በፊት የነበረው ሚዲያ የመንግሥት ሚዲያ ነበር። የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሥነ -ምግባርን በተመለከተ ብዙ ንድፈ ሃሳቦች አሉ። ስለሆነም የጋዜጠኝነት ተቋማት፣ ጋዜጠኞች መንግሥትና ባለድርሻ አካላት ሁላችንም እንደገና ልንቃኘው እንደሚገባ አስባለሁ።

As to me, the purpose of watchdog ethic in Ethiopia needs to be redefined. Ethiopian journalism has a history of twenty years only, because the media before this period was a government media. There are many concepts regarding watchdog ethic. So, I think journalism institutions, journalists, the government, and stakeholders, we should all have to redefine it.

He (P6) further noted the challenges to be:

አንደኛ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት በደንብ ትርጓሜ አልተሰጠውም፣ ሁለተኛ የሙያ ጉድለት ብቻ ሳይሆን የአመኔታ ጉድለት መኖሩና ሦስተኛ የሂሰና የማሕበራዊ ሂስ በኢትዮጵያ አለመኖር። በተጨማሪ ሂስ ይቅርና አንድ ሪፖርት ስለአንድ መ/ቤት የተፃፈ እንደሆነ እንዴት እንደሚጠቀሙበት እናውቃለን ። ስለዚህ የመቻቻል ባህል የለንም እናም እነዚህ ይመስሉኛል ጠንካራ ተግዳሮቶቹ።

One, the purpose of watchdog journalism is not defined; two, the existence of not only professional deficit but also of trust deficit; and three, the non existence of a culture of criticism or public criticism in Ethiopia. Moreover, leave alone a criticism, if any report is written on an organization, we know how they shout on us. So, we lack the culture of tolerance and I think these are the serious challenges.

Chapter Five

5.1 Conclusion and findings

This part of the study tries to wrap up the major findings that surfaced during the course of the study. In this chapter, I would summarize what the research was up to, how it was pronounced and the major findings it came up with at the end of the day.

5.2 Conclusion

As pointed out earlier in the chapter one of this study, the objective of this paper was triggered to studying the perception of Ethiopian journalists with regard to the watchdog role of journalism. Toward this end, the data considered to be indispensable to the study have been carefully gathered from different subjects via individual in-depth interview and focus group discussions. The data obtained from both individual interview participants and focus group discussion participants were then corroborated and analyzed together for the sake of triangulation through the use of qualitative thematic analysis techniques. At last, the following summaries and conclusions have been made based on the objective of the study drawn at the outset.

Hence, with regard to journalists' introduction to watchdog journalism the study has revealed that all participants, be it in the individual interview or focus group discussion participants' domain, have the orientation toward watchdog journalism. Except one who said he learned it in a journalism school and those from the language school who said they have taken it as a course, the rest of the participant population learned about watchdog journalism through readings, workshops, trainings and through experience.

As to journalists' view of watchdog journalism, both individual interview and focus group participants seem to perceive this genre of journalism as the Western classical literature on the subject portray it: it serves as the public's eye in monitoring and exposing power abuse and misuse, maladministration, and corruption; that it serves as a check and balance on the government; that it is the fourth estate whose job is to monitor the three branches of government. Moreover one participant saw it from the moral point of view of the moral principles where justice is one of its elements and watchdog journalism shouldn't be raised to the level of a master sergeant's work.

Concerning watchdog journalism and development journalism, it is found that the watchdog practice can be accommodated in development journalism. That development journalism is not all about drawing rosy pictures, but it should also indulge in highlighting problems and weaknesses in governance. Moreover, it is also raised that development journalism fits the realities of the third world.

With regard to the journalists' interpretation of watchdog journalism, though a flash of practice is seen in the private media, private and government media are polarized to the extreme end of the Ethiopian media landscape. The study has also revealed that journalists perceive that it is unlikely for the government media to practice watchdog journalism, but rather cater development journalism. Moreover, media is not an opposition party or a government mouth-piece that sing praises. It is also raised that watchdog journalism is a manipulation.

Categorization of watchdog journalism into constructive, lapdog, and barking dog journalism is also found to be an extended perception of the journalist on the subject at study.

Similarly, though a blitz of watchdog practice is seen in the private press, there is no watchdog practice per se in government media. Though it contradicts the literature, watchdog journalism is put as a next hierarchy to development journalism. The trend now is espousal to development journalism in the government media, but this practice has to consider delivering critics on government other than painting rosy pictures only. As watchdog journalism involves investigation, it needs financial strength and resources, and private media are not that strong in this sense. So, watchdog practice is a thing to be considered after financial muscle is built. But this goes parallel to the literature.

As to taking watchdog journalism as an option, it is argued that since the West are drowning to the sea of sensationalism unlike their allegiance to watchdog practice; in our context government media have chosen a model that fits them, and that is development journalism. The laws and editorial policies are liberal, but the journalist is gripped with self censorship. Since both watchdog journalism and development journalism are carried out through investigation, government media have resorted to development journalism because both dwell on investigation. Moreover, if journalists don't succumb to a master sergeant practice, it is possible to take watchdog journalism as an option.

With regard to challenges that threaten watchdog journalism, self censorship is one. Unlike the rhetoric of media bosses that journalists are free to write on any issue, having a story written in this tone cannot be blessed to see printing. The other challenges are

mobilizing fear and harassment on top of professional deficit. Managerial challenges are also the other hurdles that stand in the way of the journalist, because as political appointees they are there to serve as gate keepers. Professional deficits and unavailability of access to information both from the public, organizations and government are the perceived challenges in the pronouncement of watchdog journalism.

In conclusion, one can say, the study findings have clearly shown that Ethiopian journalists have an apparent perception on the watchdog role of journalism. However, given such a small group of journalists, it is difficult to make a generalization. The findings have also shed light on the fact that journalists with years of experience are better versed than the juniors. Multitudes of years have earned them a better knowledge on the trade.

With regard to watchdog journalism, the finding has illuminated that it is only exercised (though in a negligible scale) by the private media showing the government media's espousal to development journalism, the second model I took as a theoretical underpinning to conduct the study. Moreover, the idea that watchdog journalism could be accommodated in development journalism is widely believed with journalists in the government media. It is also found that development journalism should also dwell in negative stories and criticisms on government wrongs, but the practice is far from rhetoric. The alliance of self censorship and unseen gate keepers is at work in the newsroom. So, the freedom to write is there on the menu, but not on the table.

On the other hand, the study has also found there is a perception in the government media that the practice of watchdog journalism in its classical meaning is far from existence.

The media have become sensationalized and have even lent themselves for manipulation. This is related to the third model I took as a perspective for the study, the propaganda model. Therefore, the available option that fits us best in this regard is development journalism.

The study has also found out that there is a tendency in Ethiopian journalism to raise watchdog journalism to the level of the work of a master sergeant. In this regard there is a strong belief that the watchdog ethic needs a redefinition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agee K., et al.(1985).Introduction to Mass Communications. New York. Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Baran, J. and Davis, K.(2010).Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment, and Future. Sixth Edition. Boston, USA. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Berg, L. (2001).Qualitative Research Methods For The social Sciences. Fourth Edition. USA.Alyn & Bacon
- Birhanu Olana. (2009).Journalism in the Context of Ethiopian Mass Media: Essays, Researches and Reflections.
- Campbell, V. (2004).Information Age Journalism. Great Britain. Arnold.
- Carlsen, B. & Glenton, C. (2011). What about N? A methodological study of sample-size reporting in focus group studies-online.
Retrieved from: www.ncbi.nlm.gov/pmc/articles/pmc3061958/Accessed on: 6/7/2012 11:40 PM
- Carpentier, N., et al. (2006:54). Researching media, democracy and participation.
Retrieved from: ebookbrowse.com/teaching-series-1ok-pdf-d73581448
Accessed on 10/12/2011 12:45 AM
- Coronel, S. (2008:10).The Media as Watchdog.
Retrieved from:www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/.../coronel%20watchdog.pdf
Accessed on 12/15/2011 10:39 AM
- Coronel, S. (2009).The Role of Media in Deepening Democracy
Retrievedfrom: <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/.../un/unpan010194.pf>
Accessed on 11/30/2010 5:55 AM

Coronel, S. (2010).Corruption and the Watchdog Role of the News Media. In Norris, Pippa (Ed.).Public Sentinel: News Media &Governance Reform. USA. The World Bank. Washington, D.C.

Coronel, S. (n.d).Digging Deeper: A Guide for Investigative Journalists in the Balkans.

Retrievedfrom:<http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/page/Digging-Deeper-A-Guide-for-Investigative-Journalists-in-the-Balkans> Accessed on 2/24/2012 3:00 PM

Creswell, W. (2002).Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods.2nd edition. USA. Sage Publications, Inc.

Curran, J. & Gurevitch, M. (2000).Mass Media and Society.3rd edition. London. Arnold.

Daniel Bekele. (2008).The Essence of Accountability And An Examination of The Practices of Ethiopian Television Newsroom.MA thesis project, Addis Ababa University, Graduate school of Journalism and Communications, Addis Ababa.

-----Democracy and the Media: The Ineluctable Connection between Democracy and the Quality of Journalism. (2005).Report of the Commission on the Media and Democracy in Central America.

Retrieved from: <http://www.thedialogue.org/publicationFiles/democracy.pdf>
Accessed on 10/12/2011 1:47 AM

Dominick, R. (1999).The Dynamics of Mass Communication. Sixth edition. USA. McGraw-Hill

Fedler, Fred. (1978).An Introduction to the Mass Media.USA.Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Fourie, J. (2004) Media Studies-Vol.1: Institutions, Theories and Issues. South Africa. Juta Education

- Getachew Metaferia. (2003).Ethiopia, Status of Media. In Johnston H. (Ed.).Encyclopedia of International Media and Communications. New York, USA .Academic Press.
- Hallin, C., & Mancini, P. (2004). Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics. United States of America. Cambridge University Press.
- Herman, S. (2003). The propaganda model: a retrospective. University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved from: <http://human-nature.com/reason/> Accessed on 4/10/2012 7:04 PM
- Herman, S. & Chomsky, N. (1988). Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of Mass Media. New York. Pantheon Books.
- Karikari, K. (2007).African media since Ghana's independence. In Elizabeth Barratt & Guy Berger (Ed.). 50 years: African media since Ghana's independence. South Africa. The African Editors' Forum, Highway Africa and Media Foundation for West Africa.
Retrieved from: www.highwayafrica.com/images/50years.pdf Accessed On: 6/2/2012 4:01 AM
- Kasoma, F. (2000). The Press and Multiparty Politics in Africa. (Academic Dissertation). University of Tampere.
Retrieved from: www.acta.uta.fi./pdf/951-44-4968-1.pdf Accessed on: 3/5/2012 10:43 PM
- Klaehn, J. (2005). A Critical Review and Assessment of Herman and Chomsky's 'Propaganda Model'. In McQuail, Denis; Golding, Peter; & Bens, de Els (Ed.) communication theory & Research. London. Sage publications.
- Kovach, B. and Rosensteil, T. (2003).The Elements of Journalism. London. Atlantic Books.
- Loo, E. (2009).Best Practices of Journalism in Asia. Singapore. Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung.

- Louw, E. (2005). *The Media and Political Process*. Great Britain. Athenaem Press.
- Marks, S. (2004). *The Human Rights Development: Between Rhetoric and Reality*. Harvard Human Rights Journal/ Vol.17
Retrieved from: www.hsph.harvard.edu/.../spm-the-human-right-development.pdf
Accessed on 3/8/2012 5:07 AM
- Mcquail, Golding & Bens. (2005). *Communication theory & Research*. London. Sage Publications.
- Michael, et al. (n.d). *Focus Groups: A Tool for Understanding Community Perceptions and Experiences*.
- Mullen, A. & Klaehn, J. (2010). *The Herman–Chomsky Propaganda Model: A Critical Approach to Analyzing Mass Media Behaviour*.
Retrieved from: www.fifth-estate-online.co.uk/.../Mullen-Klaehn-sociology
Accessed on: 2/8/2012 9: 18 AM
- Murthy, D. (2006). *Development Journalism: What next? An agenda for the press*. New Delhi. Kanishka Publishers & Distributors.
- Mwaffisi, S. (1991). *Development Journalism: How prepared are Tanzanian Journalists?* Africa Media Review, 5(2), 87.
- Nwanko, V. (2011). *The Role of the Media in Promoting Human Rights: An analysis of the BBC documentary, 'chocolate: the bitter truth.'* MA thesis research project, school of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg.
- Odugbemi, S.& Norris, P. (2010). *Assessing the Extent to Which the News Media Act as Watchdogs, Agenda Setters, and Gatekeepers*. In Norris, Pippa (Ed.) *Public Sentinel: News Media & Governance Reform*. USA. The World Bank. Washington, D.C.

Olivier, W. (2004). What is Transparency. USA. McGraw-Hills Companies.

Retrieved from: <http://www.cru.cahe.wsu.edu/CEPublications/wrep0128/wrep0128.html> Accessed on 23/2/2012.

Puno, S. (2008). Freedom of Press: A Touchstone of Democracy.

Retrieved from: www.findthatfile.com/...hpdf/download-documents-cj-puno-speech-... Accessed on 10/11/2011 12:20 AM

Reeves, G. (1993). Communications and the 'third world'. London. Routledge.

Robertson, W., (n.d). The Propaganda Model in 2011: Stronger Yet Still Neglected in UK Higher Education?

Retrieved from: synaesthesiajournal.com/uploads/The_PM_in_2011JWR22311.pdf
Accessed on: 6/20/2012

Robson, C. (2002). Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers. 2nd edition. UK. Blackwell Publishing.

Schultz, J. (1998). Reviving The Fourth Estate: Democracy, Accountability and the Media. United Kingdom. Cambridge University Press.

Shimelis Bensa. (2000). Survey of the Private Press in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa

Shimelis Bensa. (2002). The State of the Private Press in Ethiopia. In Bahru Zewde and Pausewang Siegfried (Ed.). Ethiopia: The Challenges of Democracy from Below. Sweden. Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Uppsala and Forum for Social Studies.

Siebert S., et al. (1984). Four Theories of The Press. USA. University of Illinois Press.

Stevenson, L. (1994). Global Communication in the twenty-first century.

New York. Longman.

Ulin, R., et al. (2005). Qualitative Methods in Public Health: A Field Guide for Applied Research. USA. Jossey-Bass.

Vivian, J. (2001). The media of Mass Communication. USA. Allyn & Bacon.

- Waisbord, S. (2000). Watchdog journalism in South America: news, accountability, and democracy. New York. Columbia University Press.
- Wall, M. (2000). The Westernizer, the Developer and the Azmari: Journalism Discourse in Ethiopia.
Retrieved from: www.scribd.com/doc/.../the Accessed on 10/5/2012 10:45PM
- Williams, K. (2003). Understanding Media Theory. London. Arnold, a member of the Hodder Headline Group.
- Willis, J. (2007). The Media Effect: How The News Influences Politics And Government. United States of America. Praeger Publishers.
- Wimmer & Dominick. (2006). Mass Media Research: Processes, Approaches, and Applications. India. Wadsworth.
- Woodring. (2009). Watchdog or Lapdog? Media Freedom, Regime Type, and Government Respect for Human Rights. *International Studies Quarterly*. 53, 595

Annexes

Annex I

Data Gathering Guide for individual in-depth interviews to editor-in-chiefs, deputy-editor-in-chiefs, a producer and a senior reporter (Ethiopian Press Agency, Ethiopian News Agency, ETV, 'The Reporter,' and 'Sheger Radio')

1. Have you heard about watchdog journalism? In what context?
2. How do you view watchdog journalism?
3. How do you interpret watchdog journalism?
4. Do you practice watchdog journalism?
5. Why don't you take watchdog journalism as an option?
6. What are the challenges or the constraining factors in practicing watchdog journalism?

Annex II

Amharic Version

ለግለሰብ የጥናት ተሳታፊዎች የቀረቡ መሬት ጥያቄዎች

1. ስለምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነት ሰምተህ/ሽ ታወቃለህ/ሽ? በምን አይነት ሁኔታ?
2. የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን እንዴት ታየዋለህ?
3. የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን እንዴት ትገልጻለህ?
4. የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን እንዴት ተግባራዊ ታደርገዋለህ?
5. የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን ለምን እንደአንድ አሜሪካ አትወስዳለህ?
6. የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን በመተግበር ረገድ የሚገጥሙ ችግሮች ምንድናቸው?

Annex III

Data gathering guide for focus group discussion with journalists in Ethiopian News Agency

1. What should the role of journalism be?
2. How do you and your colleagues interpret watchdog journalism?
3. What is your and your colleagues' perception of watchdog journalism? Do you recognize such a responsibility?
4. What makes watchdog journalism different from other journalistic roles?
5. To what extent do you and your colleagues practice watchdog journalism?
6. What type of journalism does your media house practice, predominantly?
7. Are there any challenges in practicing watchdog journalism? If so, what type?

Annex III

Amharic version

ለቡድን የጥናት ተሳታፊዎች የቀረቡ ሜ ጥያቄዎች

1. የጋዜጠኝነት ማፍ ምን ማምን አለበት?
2. አንተ/ቼና ባልደረቦችህ/ሽ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን እንዴት ትገልጹታላችሁ?
3. የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን በተመለከተ ያንተ/ቼና የባልደረቦችህ/ሽ ግንዛቤ ምንድነው?
ለእንዲህ አይነቱ ኃላፊነት እወቅና ትሰጣችሁ?
4. የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን ከሌሎቹ የጋዜጠኝነት ማፍዎች ልዩ የሚደርገው ምንድነው?
5. አንተ/ቼና ባልደረቦችህ/ሽ የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን ምን ያህል ተግባራዊ ታደርጋላችሁ?
6. በአሁኑ ጊዜ የናንተ ማጂያ የትኛውን አይነት የጋዜጠኝነት ማፍ ነው እየተገበረ ያለው?
7. የምርመራ ጋዜጠኝነትን በመተግበር ረገድ የሚጋጥሙ ተግዳሮቶች አሉ? ካሉስ ምን አይነት ተግዳሮቶች ናቸው?

Annex IV

Table 1. Profile of individual in-depth interview participants

Code	Name of the journalist	Age	Sex	Qualification & Level of study	Subject Studied	Years of experience	Title of the journalist	Other trainings taken	media served or serving
P1	Alemayehu Takele	43	M	BA	Journalism	17	Deputy-editor-in-chief	None	ENA
P2	Tamiru Tsige	36	M	BA	Journalism	7	Assistant editor	Countless	'The Reporter'
P3	Requested Anonymity	34	M	PhD candidate	Amharic, English Literature & Folklore	5	Producer	None	ETV
P4	Hanna Zewde	32	F	BA	Amharic Language & Literature	11	Deputy-editor – in-chief	Many	Ethiopian Press Agency
P5	Wondimkun Alayou	47	M	MA	Public Policy	25	Editor-in-chief	Many	Ethiopian Press Agency
P6	Sileshi Tessema	47	M	BA	Philosophy	24	Editor-in-chief	USA & Egypt	Sheger

Annex V

Table 2. Profile of focus group discussion participants

Cod e	Name	Age	Sex	Qualificatio n and level	Subject Studied	Years of experience	Title of the journalist	Other trainings taken	media served or serving
FG D 1	Ayewew Addis	30	M	BA	PSIR	6	Reporter		Ethiopia n News Agency
FG D 2	Bethelehem Abebaw	30	F	BA	Language and Literature	6	Reporter		Ethiopia n News Agency
FG D 3	Fekadu Wubete	36	M	BED	Education	9	Reporter		Ethiopia n News Agency
FG D 4	Etahun Dadi	30	M	BA	English Language & Literature	6	Reporter		Ethiopia n News Agency
FG D 5	Hailegebriel Binyam	37	M	BA	English Language & Literature	10	Deputy-editor-in-chief		Ethiopia n News Agency

