



RESEARCH PAPER

Managing Conflicts: A Comparative Analysis of Anchorpersons of Political Talk Shows of Pakistan

¹Dr. Maira Qaddos* ² Dr. Noshina Saleem

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Mass Communication, National University of Modern Languages, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Director, School of Communication Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Received: March 26, 2022</p> <p>Accepted: June 25, 2022</p> <p>Online: June 27, 2022</p> <p>Keywords: Anchorperson, Conflict Escalation Conflict Management, Pluralistic Media, Political Talk Shows</p> <p>*Corresponding Author: mairaqaddos@n uml.edu.pk</p>	<p>Pluralistic media is considered to be an independent platform for discussion, debate and exchange of opinions regarding any conflicting issue. Study intends to explore role of anchorpersons in managing conflicts among participants in discussion in political talk shows of Pakistan. The main objective of this study is to explore the role of anchorperson as facilitators to escalate or de-escalate the conflicts. Quantitative Content analysis of political talk shows of the leading TV channels, from Jan, 2012 to Dec, 2012, is conducted to observe the role of anchorpersons in conflict management. Moreover, a survey is also conducted in order to find out the audience perception about handling of conflicts by the anchorpersons. Findings of both the methods are analyzed in the light of theory of common ground. Study concludes that balance of panel and attitude of anchorperson doesn't have any pivotal relationship with escalation of conflict. Language and tone are found to create a strong impact on nature of conflict in the talk shows. Unnecessary interference is found to create issue-oriented impact on conflict escalation and role of guests is found to be equally important or even more than anchorperson on escalation of conflict.</p>

Introduction

Media is dealing with the conflicts all the time as they are evident in all forms of media content like news reports, talk shows, dramas, films, theatre etc. most important of them are talk shows as they are dealing with the everyday conflict with the aim of resolving them. Although there are no hard and fast rules of dealing with a conflict but it may be assumed that if they are discussed by exposing diverse aspects of an issue with flexibility, they may be resolved. By doing so, discussion takes a constructive dimension towards resolution of conflicts. It is the responsibility of talk show hosts to take the conflicts in a positive manner to make it interesting and informative for the audience. For that, many reliable techniques and skills are acquired by the anchors which make them comfortable while dealing the conflicts on air.

Problem is that many of the anchors are still in need of trainings and knowledge to avoid risky practices. Unfortunately, only few of them are properly trained in this respect. That is the only reason of talk shows containing very little content as compared to fights and quarrels. Sometimes, anchors deliberately encourage the conflicts but mostly conflicts are inadvertently mishandled by them. Situation is somehow different on state controlled channels as compared to private and commercial channels which have to make money by exposing and exaggerating the conflicts.

Although the term conflict management is relatively new in field of literature but in practice, numerous researches have been going on in the history about war, diplomatic history, political relations etc. It is assumed that it emerged as a field of study in 1950s when there was a continuous power struggle was going on among big powers which were putting lives of people at risk (Bercovitch, Keremenyuk, & Zartman, 2008). It is not separate from conflict resolution but it may be said that it is its discrete form. Conflict is not a sudden happening but it has a very close linkage with previous issues and managing conflicts mean to settle the issue in such a manner that it is acceptable to all the parties. If it is not settled in this manner, there is another possibility of settling it by changing it from one form to another which is less severe in intensity than the previous one but it will exist for so long (Miall, 2004).

Conflict management is different in every situation but the thing which is in common in all the situations is conflict and face work against conflict. Moreover, there is a need to design the structure of talk shows properly because structure of talk shows determines the form of conflict in it (Atsuko, 2002). If the structure of talk show is not involving difference of opinion, it would be quite unusual. What an anchor supposed to do is to turn this difference of opinion into positive form so that talk show may end up at something fruitful. This is so because it is an essential human activity to resolve the conflicts among individuals. There are differences among people because of the society which they are residing in and the company which they are following (Cohen, 2001).

For turning the difference of opinion into positivity, best option is to understand the positions of both the parties and then look deeply to find the underlying interests behind them. There must be some shared interests of both the parties which anchorperson must try to utilize. His attempt should be to satisfy all the parties by making use of their mutual interests and insuring no damage to their positions (Fisher, Roger, Kopelman, & Schneider, 1994, pp. 39-40).

In western world, lighter talk shows are conducted to provide entertainment and information to the people about their politicians. In them, politicians prepare themselves in an entirely different way from the way in which they appear in journalistic interviews (Coleman, Kuik, & Zoonen, 2009). In Pakistan, there are very few shows which provide entertainment and awareness together by giving a lighter side of issues. Ironically number of those shows is greater which include sarcastic, discourteous and offensive vernacular. These talk shows are criticized by people of various fields of life for producing controversies because participants in discussion are only there to share their viewpoints not to listen to others (Akif, Subhani, & Amber, 2012).

Negativity is being spread by these talk shows because negative incidents are considered as standard for newsworthiness (Guggenheim, Kwak, & Campbell, 2011). Anchorpersons have to keep in mind that their guests are not the ones creating impact on the audience but it is actually the content. So, there is a need to work on the content to improve the standard of talk show (Hmielowski, Holbert, & Lee, 2011).

This study has analyzed three issues in politics of Pakistan because they are being discussed in shows very frequently and fate of Pakistan is also dependent upon them. These three issues are;

- a. NATO supply restoration after Salala incident of November 2011.
- b. PM Gilani's contempt of court case.
- c. Memogate scandal.

Theoretical Framework

Theory of Common Ground

This research work is basically related to process of grounding in communication in in-studio environment whether the anchorperson is able to resolve the conflicts among the guests belonging to different political parties participating in discussion. A cognitive approach towards communication and conflict resolution is common ground approach which is used as a base of this work. This demands grounding, an interactive method of understanding each other through shared beliefs and views, to establish a common ground among individuals (Baker, Hansen, Joiner, & Traum, 1998).

Grounding is the process similar to negotiations in views of some other researchers like Moeschler, & Roulet. Negotiations also serve to create common meaning for mutual understanding. Schwartz believes that when a mutual understanding is developed after developing a shared meaning, process of collaborative learning is started (Roulet, 1992). This means participants must move from simply understanding what has been said to a deeper understanding (Baker, Hansen, Richard, & Traum, 1999). The conflicts can be resolved by making use of shared information and common thinking and suppositions for developing collaboration and understandings among people in discussion (Clark & Carlson, 1982; Clark & Marshall, 1981; Lewis D. K., 1969; Schelling, 1960). It is not only the matter of resolving the conflicts but for making any act e.g., playing or shaking hands etc successful common ground is very important to achieve. This common ground is not only to be achieved but updated too every time for collaborative function (Clark & Brennan, 1991).

Grice (1989) says whenever we people talk with each other they have certain pre-suppositions in their minds which are determinants of what people say and how they think that it is interpreted (Grice P. , 1989). These pre-suppositions serve as the background information behind every discussion and may develop a common ground between participants of discussion. These pre-suppositions are the taken for granted things which speakers have in their minds while talking; not the facts (Stalnaker, 1974). If there is a common belief between listener and speaker, it may be used to create a difference between previously held common grounds and the thing which is actually common among them. This is called pre-supposition accommodation (Lewis D. , 1979).

This presuppositions accommodation can be very helpful for talk show hosts who want to settle the conflicts among their guests. This is so because conflicts are too much prevalent in talk shows and it is assumed that participants must show flexibility towards each other to reach a common ground. It is quite challenging to handle a conflict in such a manner that it may become interesting for the audience without escalating it. There are certain ways through which anchors can be trained to manage conflicts. These ways enhance certain skills and train the anchors to analyze things and view them in a manner that they go towards resolution instead of escalation. By doing so, we may ensure a positive contribution of media towards conflict resolution (Howard & Rolt, 2006).

Literature Review

Role of Media in Conflict Management

Media's neutrality has been criticized by Bell (1997), in terms of conflict coverage by distinguishing between journalism of attachment and bystanders' journalism (Bell, 1997; Ruigrok, 2008). Former is concerned more about people and later one about violence. He believes must not have to be neutral among good and bad but must care for the people. Amanpour (1996) & Ed Vulliamy (1999) also have argued that while covering a conflict

media must not have to be neutral instead it has to be fair to give due coverage to all sides objectively (Amanpour, 1996; Vulliamy, 1999).

There are many challenges in this way of conflict management like cooperation and betterment in flow of information, conviction, trust and credibility, ethical moral factors (some of them are particular to certain cultures whereas others are universal like ensuring privacy). But because media has an ability to reach a huge audience, thus having power to shape or de-shape the conflicts. It is quite ironical that no serious attempts have been made to find out role of media in conflict prevention (Geelen, 2002). A little bit work has been done to evaluate the contribution of media in this regard and unfortunately, most of the contributions of media are negative as they escalate the conflicts instead of managing it properly (Hume, 1997). But that doesn't mean media cannot play a positive role. In fact, it is assumed media which are insightful for encouraging patience among parties by giving space to variety of viewpoints can have a huge audience because it will not only be informative but entertaining too (Botes, 1996)

Often negative aspect of media is explored in research work and very limited amount of research work is available which highlights positive role of media by exploring and acknowledging its role in conflict settlements (Gilboa; 2005). Contribution of media cannot be ignored in provoking conflicts in Bosnia and Rawanda (Ratson, 2005; Bernard P. E., 2009; Buric, 2000; Malley, 2009).

Another important thing which is to be noticed is that media can not only escalate a conflict but it may even become a reason for creation of conflict e.g., The Danish cartoon controversy (Bonde, 2007; Powers, 2008). Worsening of conflict because of media is noticed by not only researchers but also media practitioners are also worried about it. They are concerned about transforming the negative role of media into positive one in terms of conflict management (Gilboa, 2005). It must be realized that conflict resolution is not easy to achieve because escalation of conflict is always easier than de-escalation of conflict.

There is a need of fair and unbiased journalism for the sake of avoiding, changing or handling the conflicts to counteract that misperception that media can only escalate the conflicts. If media alone is not in a position to handle the conflicts, it may take help from certain non-governmental and governmental organizations. This collaboration will develop a pluralistic environment for conflict resolution among the conflicting parties (Melone, Terzis, & Beleli, 2002).

This potential of media must be utilized in promoting commonalities among groups rather than giving air to differences. When people forget the differences, media must strengthen the common identities which may tie them together. Common interests of conflicting groups may be reminded them to enhance a feeling of collaboration among them. This will lead to development of alternative identities which becomes common ground for all the people (Sofos, 1997). When a media person reaches a common ground in his/her show, it leaves audience with a feeling that issues can be resolved in reality. So there is a need to develop those strategies which may promote co-operation and discourage discriminatory manners for resolving conflicts. This may include all positive activities which contribute towards settling of conflict (Uvin, 1999).

Above literature is serving as a support for this study as it indicates media is responsible for escalating or de-escalating the conflicts because of being an important pillar of society. It suggests that anchorpersons are in need of training for managing difficult situations. This literature gives a broader perspective of conflict management which is beyond in-studio environment as it is showing how effective media can be in conflict ridden states by providing a platform to various parties where they can negotiate for sake of peace building.

It also has facilitated the study by developing an insight of how and through which steps conflicts can be dealt. This insight is helpful in terms of analyzing role of anchorpersons as it may serve as a yardstick on which their role can be tested. This shows power of layman in analyzing role of one of the biggest and influential pillar of state. So, it may be said above literature has broadened the perspective of this study by linking it with certain other extensive concepts like peace building, citizen journalism etc.

Hypotheses

Following are the hypotheses that are expected to be tested at the end of this study:

- H1: Rude the language of anchorperson increased the tension among panelists.
- H2: Biased the attitude of anchorperson, higher are the chances of escalation of conflict
- H3: Harsher the tone of anchorperson, greater is the chances of frequent conflicting situations in discussion.
- H4: Unnecessary interference of anchorperson in discussion provokes conflict among participants in discussion.
- H5: If the panel is imbalanced, chances of reaching common ground are reduced.
- H6: Greater is the role of anchorperson in conflict escalation as compared to role of guests.
- H7: Lesser the interest of parties in resolving the conflict, lesser is the chances of conflict management.
- H8: More the fights among participants in discussion in talk shows, increase in frustration among people in society.

Material and Methods

Study is making use of a combination of content analysis and survey methods both. Quantitative content analysis of talk shows is conducted to analyze them followed by survey of the audience to find out their perception about the attitude of anchorpersons of talk shows in reaching a common ground which is acceptable for both the parties.

For the content analysis, universe is all the talk shows of Pakistan and Population of the study is talk shows of three leading TV channels from Jan 1, 2012 to Dec 31, 2012. Sample is selected by applying purposive sampling technique and all those talk shows will be picked up which are conducted on political issues. Unit of analysis will be one single talk show.

For the survey, Universe is public sector educational institutes of Lahore and Population of the study for survey is University of the Punjab, LHR, Government College University, LHR, Lahore College for Women University, LHR. Students of Mass communication and political science depts. of above mentioned institutes is the sample of the study selected by random sampling. Each respondent of above mentioned two departments is the unit of analysis.

Results and Discussion

H1: Rude the language of anchorperson increased the tension among panelists.

For finding the relationship between variables tests were applied individually on data of all the shows conducted on various issues by three of the anchorpersons. Findings are presented in Table 1 which is showing that language of Hamid Mir has been rude in his shows to the extent to escalate the conflicts and same is the case with language of Talat Hussain which is having a very weak but positive relationship with escalation of conflict. A slightly different situation was observed for shows of Mubashir Lucman for whom value of correlation is negative although extremely weak. But when cumulative value was taken, it was found that there is a moderately positive relation between language of anchorperson and conflict escalation.

H2: Biased the attitude of anchorperson, higher are the chances of escalation of conflict

Moreover, when relationship between attitude of anchorpersons and conflict escalation was found, it was revealed that Attitude of three of the anchorpersons has been negatively correlated with the escalation of conflict. Cumulative mean, presented in Table 1, also endorsed this fact as its value showed a moderately negative relationship between both the variables. From that it may be assumed anchorpersons are not too biased or if they are, it doesn't have any impact on the escalation of conflict.

H3: Harsher the tone of anchorperson, greater is the chances of frequent conflicting situations in discussion.

While talking about tone of anchorpersons, value of Spearman correlation coefficient, presented in Table 1, is showing positive relationship for three of the anchorpersons endorsing the fact that tone of anchorpersons does contribute towards escalation of conflicts in the shows. So, hypothesis is partially approved with very strong evidence about the relationship of tone of anchorperson with escalation of conflict. Tone is an important determinant of escalation of conflict as the way words are spoken is even more important than the words themselves because they are responsible for give connotative meanings to words. Simple denotative meaning of any word may not be negative but its connotation determines how that word is perceived by the people in discussion. Tone is an important element of connotation and tone of anchorpersons is found to be largely associated with escalation of conflicts in their shows.

H4: Unnecessary interference of anchorperson in discussion provokes conflict among participants in discussion.

Opposite is the case for unnecessary interference by the anchorpersons as negative relationship is observed for Hamid Mir and Talat Hussain but extremely weak still positive relationship is observed for Mubashir Lucman. Overall cumulative value discloses there is negative relationship between unnecessary interference and escalation of conflict. Table 1 is showing all the values which are discussed above. It includes cumulative values for three issues picked up for this study by focusing how these were handled by the anchorpersons in their shows and further their cumulative mean is shown for the sake of partial approval or rejection of hypothesis.

Table 1
Value of Spearman Correlation Coefficient for relationship of variables with conflict escalation

Names of anchorpersons	Language	Attitude	Tone	Unnecessary interference	Role of anchorpersons			Role of guests				
					NATO Supply	Contempt of court	Memogate	Mean	NATO Supply	Contempt of court	Memogate	Mean
Hamid Mir	0.2305	-0.068	0.158	-0.372	0.907	0.137	-	0.522	0.627	0.459	-	0.542
Mubashar Lucman	-0.0295	0.5515	0.369	0.046	1	0.883	1	0.961	1	0.730	1	0.91
Talat Hussain	0.84	-0.557	0.58	0.28	0.632	-0.649	-	-0.008	0.866	0.354	-	0.61
Cumulative Mean	0.338	-0.39	0.369	-0.026				0.466				0.687

Important thing to be discussed over here is that value of correlation coefficient couldn't be computed for Talat Hussain's shows on memogate scandal because only a single show was conducted which was analytical in nature. That didn't include any panel, so is of no worth for this study. Moreover, value of correlation coefficient for shows of Hamid Mir on memogate scandal couldn't be computed also because N=1 which means sample size is too short to compute. This was why, its values were calculated by descriptive statistics. Table 2 is showing values of descriptive statistics for his shows on memogate scandal.

Table 2
Descriptive statistics for shows of Hamid Mir on Memogate Scandal

Hamid Mir	Language	Tone	Unnecessary interference	Attitude	Role of anchorperson	Role of guests
	2	1	1	1	2.11	1.38

Table 2 indicates that anchorperson has been somehow rude in his language throughout the shows and his tone has been harsh while conducting the discussion. He interferes in the discussion very often and his attitude is extremely biased.

H5: If the panel is imbalanced, chances of reaching common ground are reduced.

Another important hypothesis is related to balance of panel in the shows and for that a separate category of guests' command over subject is developed in the coding sheet. Table 3 is showing values for guests' command over subject in the discussion which indicates somehow imbalanced panels in the shows. The panels cannot be said to be completely imbalanced as the guests are ranging between excellent knowledge about subject to good knowledge but no one is in the category or poor knowledge or fairly good knowledge. But statistics indicate that guests invited in the show are not of same caliber. Situation, when viewed individually for three anchorpersons, disclosed that panel is almost balanced in the shows of Talat Hussain whereas for other two anchors situation is not that good as panel is having guests of different calibers which may result in escalation of conflict. Cumulative values are also not showing favorable statistics for balance of panel in talk shows.

Table 3 describes what people think about balance of panels in the talk shows and numerical value for this question shows that their opinion is close to imbalanced panel not completely but somehow. This finding is exactly in accordance with the findings of content analysis.

Table 3
Descriptive statistics for content and survey categories

Name of anchorpersons	Balance of panel (content analysis)				Balance of panel (Survey data)	Role of anchorpersons (survey data)	Reasons for conflicts not being resolved	Conflict escalation results in increased frustration in society
	NATO Supply	Contempt of court	Memogate	Mean				
Hamid Mir	2.46	3.29	1.86	2.5	3.63	1.94	2.3478	3.89
Mubashir Lucman	2.85	1.95	1.3	2.03		1.98		
Talat Hussain	1.97	1.61	2	1.86		1.26		
Cumulative mean	2.55	2.83	1.72	3.25		1.96		

H6: Greater is the role of anchorperson in conflict escalation as compared to role of guests.

After that cumulatively role of anchorperson was viewed which includes language, unnecessary interference, attitude, command over subject, body language including tone, gestures, eye movement, facial expressions and postures. Value of spearman correlation for shows of Hamid Mir shows that there is a moderately positive relationship between role of anchorperson and conflict escalation which means anchorperson plays an important role in escalating conflict while conducting shows on NATO Supply restoration. Moreover, findings of Spearman correlation coefficient also show a pivotal relationship between attitude of guests and conflict escalation. This means both the factors cannot be ignored in the course of escalation of conflict. Same was the situation when it is applied on data of PM Gillani’s contempt of court case. Value for memogate scandal is computed by descriptive statistics because N=1 which is too small to be computed.

When test was applied for shows of mubahsir Lucman, it was found that in all the shows his contribution is extremely negative as his role has a very strong relationship with escalation of conflict which indicates that he needs to revise his contribution. Furthermore, interesting findings were found for Talat Hussain for whom value of coefficient is positive for NATO Supply restoration but negative for PM Gillani’s contempt of court case.

Above values indicate that role of Mubashir Lucman in escalation of conflict is very pivotal as value of Spearman coefficient, presented in Table 1, is near to perfection for him. A comparatively better but still worse situation is observed for shows of Hamid Mir where relationship is moderately positive but interestingly situation is different in case of Talat Hussain where relationship is extremely weak but negative. These findings show that first two anchors have a pivotal role in escalation of conflict whereas last one is comparatively better.

Table 2 indicates that role of Hamid Mir is also negative in his shows on Memogate scandal as value is 2.11 which is close to somehow negative and guests too are found to be negative in their contribution more than anchorpersons.

To check the findings of content analysis, a direct question was added in survey questionnaire. That question was about role of anchorpersons in eyes of people. Table 3 is showing the comparative values for role of three of the anchorpersons.

These findings have endorsed the findings of content analysis that role of Talat Hussain is appreciable whereas of other two is condemnable but cumulatively role of anchorpersons is destructive thus condemnable.

H7: Lesser the interest of parties in resolving the conflict, lesser is the chances of conflict management.

Role of guests is found to be very important determinant of conflict in talk shows. Study couldn't ignore the important part of discussion as it is not one-way (from anchor to panel) but it is multidimensional (from anchorperson to panel and vice versa and also among the panelists).

While analyzing individually, it is found that attitude of guests in shows of all the anchorpersons on all the issues is highly uncompromising resulting in frequent conflicting situations among participants in discussion. Cumulative value for correlation coefficient, presented in Table 1, shows that there is a moderately positive relationship between role of anchorperson in conflict escalation and strongly positive relationship between roles of guests in conflict escalation. This is a comparative view which shows that attitude of guests is quite uncooperative to resolve the conflict but it doesn't make anchorperson free of responsibility of mismanaging the conflict during his shows. Anchor's responsibility is to manage the conflict and if guests are in conflict, this means he has not properly managed the conflict among the participants in discussion.

Moreover, another important hypothesis is about the reasons for conflicts not being resolved in talk shows and for that a direct question was asked in survey questionnaire. That has options lack of interest of anchorperson, lack of flexibility in conflicting parties, nature of conflict or any other. Table 3 is showing the values for this question.

This shows that most of the people blame guests not anchorpersons as they believe that conflicts are not resolved in talk shows because of lack of flexibility in conflicting parties.

H8: More the fights among participants in discussion in talk shows, increase in frustration among people in society.

A separate category of audience perspective is designed to get the data for partial approval or rejection of hypothesis. When the audience was asked because of talk shows feeling of disappointment is increasing among people that situation of this country will never improve, most of the people opted for option 4 (somehow agree). This means people believe in increased frustration in society which is resulting in disappointment among masses.

At the end of talk show, are you left with a feeling that conflicts among political parties can be resolved in talk shows was another question asked to partially approve or reject the hypothesis and its answers, presented in Table 3, also supported what was assumed in the hypothesis that people believe members of political parties come in talk shows to convey their viewpoints only not to develop a mutual consensus. Most of the people have opted for option # 4 which is somehow agreed with the statement. This means if the members of political parties will keep on fighting in the shows, they will lose the trust of audience as people condemn their attitude which results in escalation of conflict and ill-mannerism on air.

On the basis of above discussion, it may be assumed that last hypothesis is approved partially as people believe that fights will go on and issues among political parties will never be resolved. They believe that participants in the discussion are not ready to listen to opinion of each other as they don't think they have anything common with each other to serve as point of consensus. This hypothesis has tried to assume people's feelings about political parties and approval of this hypothesis shows how negatively talk shows are playing their role.

Conclusion

After analyzing the data of survey and content both, it is concluded that genre of talk shows is not serving its purpose properly in our country. Anchorpersons of talk shows are all following their own interests as they simply want to add spices to their shows by showing fights among participants. When participants in discussion are at loggerheads, rating of shows is assumed to be increased. Many categories were developed for the analysis of shows which were further divided into many sub-categories and almost all the categories have showed that anchorpersons are involved in escalation of conflicts.

Tone and language of anchorpersons is found to have strong relationship with the escalation of conflicts in the shows. But no strong evidence is found for role of attitude of anchorperson or unnecessary interference in discussion and balance of panel in escalation of conflicts. It is found unnecessary interference does contribute towards escalation of conflicts but not for all the issues. This means a new dimension came into knowledge by this study which is issue oriented impact of variables on escalation of conflicts. But a new dimension of impact has come to light by the findings that impact of variables on conflict escalation may vary from issue to issue as value of Spearman correlation coefficient shows there is very strong positive relationship between both the variables for two of the anchors on PM Gillani's contempt of court case but for rest of the two cases relationship is negative. This means on basis of cumulative data this hypothesis is rejected partially but a new dimension is added to our knowledge which is issue-oriented impact of unnecessary interference on the escalation of conflict among participants in discussion.

Role of anchorperson is found to have strong relationship with conflict escalation but important thing to be noted is guests' involvement towards escalation of conflicts in the talk shows. Study has ended up at a very important point that conflict management is a very challenging hence compromising task as it involves mutual understandings and willingness to respect each other's viewpoints.

So, it may be concluded that reaching common ground is not an easy task to achieve especially when the participants are not ready to cooperate with each other. It is true that conflicts are being escalated in the shows and it doesn't necessarily involve anchorpersons' intention of escalating them. Sometimes, anchorpersons sincerely want to avoid fights among the panelists but their guests don't consider their serious intentions of developing a common ground. There is a need to develop compromising behavior if not collaborative to focus upon real issues of country.

Study has concluded Talat Hussain is comparatively better and credible journalist as content analysis and survey both support this fact. Rest of the two journalists are not fulfilling the expectations of people in terms of conflict resolution. Overall contribution of anchorpersons and guests both is found to be negative and condemnable. Some serious attempts are to be taken to revise the behavior of anchorpersons towards nature of conflict to improve the situation.

References

- Akif, S. H., Subhani, M. I., & Amber, U. (2012). Satire in talk shows: Pakistan's media. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/40380/1/MPRA_paper_40380.pdf
- Amanpour, C. (1996). Television role in foreign policy. *The Quill*, 84, 16-17.
- Atsuko, H. (2002). Conflict management in Japanese public affairs talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(5), 573-608.
- Baker, M., Hansen, T., Joiner, R., & Traum, D. (1998). Grounding for intersubjectivity and learning. *Fourth Congress of the International Society for Cultural Research and Activity Theory (ISCRAT 98)*. Denmark: University of Aarhus.
- Baker, M., Hansen, T., Richard, J., & Traum, D. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches*. (P. Dillenbourg, Ed.) Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Bell, M. (1997). How far should we go? *British Journalism Review*, 8, 7-8.
- Bercovitch, J., Keremenyuk, V., & Zartman, W. (2008). Introduction: The nature of conflict and conflict resolution. *The Sage Handbook of Conflict Resolution*. The Sage Publications.
- Bernard, P. E. (2009). Eliminationist discourse in a conflicted society: Lessons for America from Africa?., *Marquette Law Review*, 93(1), 191-200.
- Bonde, B. (2007). How 12 cartoons of the Prophet Mohammed were brought to trigger an international conflict. *Nordicom Review*, 28, 33.
- Botes, J. (1996). Journalism and conflict resolution. *Media Development*, 43(4), 6-10.
- Buric, A. (2000). The media war and peace in Bosnia. In A. Devis, (Ed.), *Regional Media in Conflict : Case Studies in Local War Reporting* (pp. 64-99). London: Institute for War and Peace Reporting.
- Clark, H. H., & Brennan, E. S. (1991). Grounding in Communication excerpt. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 127-149). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Clark, H. H., & Carlson, T. (1982). Hearers and speech acts. *Language*, 58(2), 332-337.
- Clark, H. H., & Marshall, C. R. (1981). *Elements of discourse understanding*. (A. K. Joshi, B. L. Weber, & I. A. Sag, Eds.) Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, R. (2001). Language and Conflict Resolution: The limits of English. *International Studies Review*, 3(1), 25-51.
- Coleman, S., Kuik, A., & Zoonen, L. V. (2009). Laughter and liability: The politics of British and Dutch Television satire. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 11, 652-665.
- Creveld, A. V. (1991). *The Transformation of War: The most Radical Interpretation of Armed Conflict since Clausewitz*. Simon & Schuster.
- Fisher, Roger, Kopelman, E., & Schneider, K. A. (1994). Look Behind Statements for Underlying Interests. *Beyond Machiavelli: Tools for Coping with Conflict*. Book News, Inc.

- Geelen, M. V. (2002). *The Role of the Media in Conflict Prevention, Conflict Management and Peace Building: An Overview of Theory and Practice*. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands & The Netherlands Association of Journalists
- Gilboa, E. (2005). The CNN Effect: The Search for a Communication Theory of International Relations. *Political Communication*, 22, 27, 25.
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press &
- Guggenheim, L., Kwak, N., & Campbell, W. S. (2011). Non-traditional news negativity: The relationship of entertaining political news use to political cynicism and mistrust. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 23(3), 287-310.
- Hmielowski, J. D., Holbert, R. L., & Lee, J. (2011). Predicting the consumption of political TV satire: Affinity for political humor, the Daily Show and the Colbert Report. *Communication Monographs*, 78(1), 96-114.
- Howard, R., & Rolt, F. (2006). *Radio talk shows for peacebuilding: A guide* (2nd ed.). Search for Common Ground.
- Hume, M. (1997). *Whose war it is anyway: The dangers of journalism of attachment*. BM Inform Inc.
- Lewis, D. K. (1979). Scorekeeping in a language game. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 8, 339-359.
- Lewis, D. K. (1969). *Convention: A philosophical study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malley, L. M. (2009). Observations from an American conflict resolution professional in Serbian: The effects of accessibility of international media. *Marquette Law Review*, 93, 241, 245.
- Melone, D. S., Terzis, G., & Beleli, O. (2002). Using the media for conflict transformation: The common ground experience. *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation: The Common Ground Experience*.
- Miall, H. (2004). *Conflict Transformation: A multidimensional task*. Research Centre for Constructive Management.
- Powers, S. (2008). Examining the Danish Cartoon affair: Mediatized cross-cultural tensions? *Media, War and Conflict*, 1, 339-59.
- Ratson, D. T. (2005). *Justice on the grass: A story of genocide and its redemption*. New York: Free Press.
- Roulet, E. (1992). *Searle on conversation*. (H. Parret, J. Verschueren, & J. R. Searle, Eds.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishers.
- Ruigrok, N. (2008). Journalism of attachment and objectivity: Dutch journalist and the Bosnian war. *Sage Journals*, 1, 293.
- Schelling, C. T. (1960). *The strategy of conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sofos, S. A. (1997). Mass communication and nationalization of the public sphere in former Yugoslavia. *Res Publica*, 39(2), 259-270.
- Stalnaker, R. (1974). Presuppositions. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2, 447-457.

- Uvin, P. (1999). *The Influence of Aid in Situations of Violent Conflict*. Paris: Development assistance committee: informal task force on conflict, peace.
- Vulliamy, E. (1999). Neutrality' and the absence of reckoning: A journalist's account. *Journal of International Affairs*, 52, 603.