

Political Bias in Talk Shows: A Case of MQM in Local Bodies Election 2015

Farahat Ali¹, Bushra H. Rahman²

Abstract

The study through content analysis examines the extent of anchorperson's political bias in Pakistani political talk shows. It argues that for political talk shows to be effective spaces for public political discussions, fair and unbiased role of anchorpersons is essential. As a case, anchorpersons treatment towards MQM political participants in the talk shows before local bodies' elections 2015, was studied. Through random sampling 22 prime-time political talk shows of the leading news channels in which MQM political leaders participated, were selected. To measure bias practices political bias instrument was developed. Political bias of anchorperson was studied through six indicators i.e., the direction of the introduction of political talk shows, ranks of participants, question tone, questions allegation, time given to participants and interruption by anchorperson. The findings show high bias of anchorpersons against MQM participants in prime time political talk shows. Political bias is highest in question design as compared to coverage and content bias.

Keywords: *Political bias, Talk shows, MQM, Pakistan Political Party, Local body elections, Content analysis, Political participation*

Introduction

Over the past decade, emerging technologies have changed the media and political relationships considerably. Among all other changes, the biggest change is the active participation of the politicians in political talk shows (Boukes & Boomgaarden, 2016). In political talk shows mostly on political issues interviews are featured with politicians. In talk shows, opponents respond with

¹ Research Assistant, UMT, Lahore

² Assistant Professor, ICS, PU, Lahore

counter-attacks and present those arguments, evidence, while supporters search for best frames and arguments that can demonstrate their support for given policy.

During electoral process the influence of these political talk shows on public opinion and voting behavior is well recognized (Della Vigna & Kaplan, 2007; Kahn & Kenney, 2002). Political bias in television broadcasts affect audience's views, electoral outcomes and voters' opinion (Hopmann et al., 2012). Political talk shows are a medium for politicians to clarify their stances to influence voters. Political elites get an opportunity to present themselves as skilled and competent politicians to handle difficult situations, questions and party policies (Hagerty, 2010) which helps them in promoting their positive image in front of the viewers. Politicians appear in political talk shows to attract the floating voters. Compare to political talk shows political interviews attract less viewers as in these programs participants appear in structured and uncontrolled situations (McNair, 2000). Through political talk shows audience get the impression that they are receiving information from political elites (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). Viewers rate politicians' performance on the basis of their answers, authenticity, personality, cooperativeness, leadership and appropriateness. Brewer and Cao (2006) argue that when public watch the candidate on a late-night show it increases their knowledge about ongoing campaign and this relationship helps the candidate to inform the public about their actions and works which are not possible in traditional news. Late night shows contain political information to influence public (Cao, 2010).

If on the one hand, this platform provides political success to

politicians while on the other hand political talk shows are also considered as risky attempt. News and political interviews are significant genre in which bias can be found (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Ekström & Kroon-Lundell, 2011). In public speeches and political advertising, they have the power to control the content but in talk shows anchor person's role can be quite challenging for politicians. Talk shows anchor person introduces the guests, decides the topic, determines the guests turn and talking time, asks questions and concludes the program. Anchorperson plays a mediator role between politicians and public, therefore, public expect tough and critical probing. Journalists, as anchor persons are not objective watchdogs anymore, they recognize themselves as advocates of a particular political perspective. Anchorpersons have become disrespectful and tougher towards the participants (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). Through these talk shows politicians are made accountable for their actions and policies.

Neutrality and critical investigation in journalistic profession is now looked differently (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Hutchby, 2006). Proponents of neutrality consider that interviewer should use the impartial and balanced approach towards guests' opinions and statements (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Hutchby, 2006)). Whereas, proponents of participatory society consider that for good journalism interviewer has to be a critical investigator of politicians' political practice. They believe that interviewer has to raise the opposing questions and be vigilant of the politicians' slippery answers. Therefore, in order to seek the truth behind false claims and wrong facts, journalist cannot rely on politicians' answers, they have to critically examine their statements. Anchorperson has to

maintain his neutrality and avoid expression of his personal biases and yet has to maintain critical investigation by asking the questions formed in such a way that does not express his personal stance, likeness or dis-likes (Heritage, 1985). However, journalists show their bias when they allow more speaking time and speaking turns to one party than other. This is coverage bias (D'Alessio & Allen, 2000).

Panel based political talk shows are considered prestigious variant of television genre. In this type of talk shows a varying number of participants represent their political interests, ideological positions, and stance on different issues, events and policies. Senior cabinet officials, legislators, media analysts and experts, an advocacy group and certified experts of various types participate in panel discussion. The rise of panel format in broadcast journalism stems from its utility and by solving some fundamental issues associated with interviewing. While questioning a public figure, conflict and divergent role is expected from the journalist. This happens in panel interviews when anchorperson is critical and does not allow them to make misleading and untrue remarks. Being adversarial means that public figure is made accountable in front of the public. But this adversarial role also becomes a cause of conflict for journalistic neutrality. Against all this framework and backdrop, the attraction, liveliness and dramatic conflict of these panel format is quite obvious.

In panel format, anchorperson asks questions from different panelists representing different ideologies, thoughts, and interests. Viewers can easily judge by comparing and contrasting anchor person treatment with each panelist. Anchorperson's line of

questionings to panelists can make him vulnerable to the charge of partiality and favoritism. In case of zealous interrogations by anchorperson, the political figure may refuse to participate in the future.

However, anchorpersons' conduct towards different participants and preferential treatment can be detected when multiple participants are co-present. Political talk shows anchors' impartiality and objectivity is also a hotly debated topic in Pakistan. Though, Pakistani journalists do not enjoy the freedom as the USA and UK journalists do people of Pakistan still expect the adherence of media anchor persons with basic professional code of conduct. This debate is not just not about journalistic norms and values but it also deals with journalistic practices. Journalists as anchor persons are criticized and alleged for support and bias regarding different political parties. It is difficult to say how dominant this phenomenon is currently present in Pakistani Political talk shows, as there is no systematic analysis to check anchor persons' bias towards different panelists in the talk shows.

This study is an attempt to empirically examine the bias of anchor persons in the Pakistani political talk shows. To examine the biases or neutrality of the anchorpersons, a case of local bodies' elections December 2015 with reference to MQM political party's leaders' participation in the talk shows is taken. The study also aims to contribute in developing an instrument for measuring bias of anchor persons in talk shows.

Literature Review

In a study on the effects of media biases, DellaVigna and Kaplan (2007) found a significant effect of media bias on the voter during

American presidential elections between 1996 and 2000. They also found bias effect in voter turnout and Senate vote share. In a meta-analysis study of media bias through non-verbal behavior in interviews, Babad, Peer, and Benayoun (2012) found halo effect and media bias in the non-verbal behavior of interviewer. They explained that media bias occurs when viewers rate the interviewee more favorably not because of their personal likeness but due to interviewer's friendly non-verbal behavior. On the effects of media bias on media literacy student by watching non-verbal behavior of interviewer, Babad, Peer, and Hobbs (2012) found that only control group were affected by non-verbal behavior of interviewer and they judged the interviewee more positively when the interviewer was friendlier whereas, there is no media bias effect observed among media literacy student. When anchors show unintentional bias, their favoritism can be detected by viewers (Miller, Coleman, and Granberg, 2007).

Usually in the talk shows politicians are interrupted frequently before they can complete their sentences. Anchorperson sometimes asks high proportions of such kind of questions which makes a politician look extremely unclear. If an anchorperson asks more question from one member of a political party rather than others, it indicates anchor person's bias. If a politician fails to answer the question of an anchor person than politician is perceived as dishonest. It is based on the assumption that when interviewee has a fear of being exposed they respond in the manner of deception and reading this conscious nonverbal communication from interviewee's side, the interviewer tries to uncover the deception, fraud and lies on the part of interviewee's to show interview's

newsworthiness (Grebelsky-Lichtman, 2010, p. 249).

It is the anchor person who launches topics of discussion, statements of disagreement, questions and can exert an influence on the direction of the discussion and can also privilege one side or show favor in the dispute. The question formulation, especially in a negative way by the interviewer, is a strong way to project an expected answer. Eriksson and Lundell (2011) argues that when political issues are discussed among media professionals, the public's interest can falter by hearing the views of a politician in their engaging dialogues. In a study of Albania talk shows, Luku (2013) argues that analysts and pundits of political discussion have become 'the new feudal lords'. He argues that rationality and diversity of thought have been missing in these talk shows because the same journalist appears on different screens. He states that shows are oriented by the logic of advertisement and program host and its participants don't argue about any issue that can damage the economic interests of television and "with the creation of this pseudo-public space hosts look like they speak on behalf of the public opinion, but in fact, they are speaking on behalf of their economic interests or of those of the owners of the television" (p. 578). Similarly, Entman (2010) argues that decision-making biases influence the journalist beliefs system and text they produce but journalist deny such biases.

However, it is argued that the format of programs makes them more appealing to citizens and they highlight the political figures among the citizens who have little or no knowledge about current affairs (Ferre-Pavia, Sintes, & Gaya, 2015). Conversational behavior of televised political interviews changes millions of observers'

opinions about the characters of politicians (Beattie, 1982).

Furthermore, when interviewer is aggressive towards interviewees, audiences tend to judge this as adversarial. Craig (2010) argues that debatable and uncertain encounters and disagreement in political interviews are considered as a problem. He suggested that “the function of journalistic interviewers should be cast less in terms of producing consensus and mutual understanding and more in terms of keeping the political discussion open” (p. 76).

In a study of adversarial challenges in interviews, Rendle-Short (2007) argues that sometimes journalists express their own point of view on a given topic and don't maintain their neutral and balanced stance towards participants. He states that “politicians do not overtly accuse interviewers' bias or impartiality, they clearly orient to the challenging nature of the journalists' turn” (p. 390). However, Waddle & Bull (2015) argue that in case of challenging question, politician prompt a variety of responses which also include criticizing an interviewer in an attempt to save their face. They found that politicians use different types of personalization which include mockery, flattery, and advice to calm down the interviewer when they have to face difficult questions in broadcast interviews.

The most important concept which is related to anchorpersons and talk shows is “bias”. McQuail (1992) define this bias as “a consistent tendency to depart from the straight path of objective truth by deviating either to left or right” (p. 191). Media biases provide incomplete information and facts about the candidate who is unfavorable to them and this thing let the voters to listen to

biased media. Even in the case of rational citizens, they cannot recover all missing information which ultimately leads toward wrong electing of candidate (Bernhardt, Krasa, & Polborn, 2008). Budak, Goel, and Rao (2014) found that “news organizations express their ideological bias not by directly advocating for a preferred political party, but rather by disproportionately criticizing one side, a convention that further moderate overall differences”.

In case of Pakistani talk shows Khan and Yousafzai in 2012 argue that anchorpersons lack in professional experience, impose their own points of view on the audience and violate the media ethics during their talk shows. They further argue that anchorperson not only provides analysis in their shows but also gives direction to the audience. Their bias analysis and slanting the facts anchorperson violates the professional ethics (Khan and Yousafzai, 2012).

Research Questions

RQ 1. Did anchor persons in the prime-time political talk shows of leading Pakistani news channels show bias towards MQM political participants before local bodies’ elections 2015?

RQ 2. Was there any difference in the news channels biasness towards MQM political participants in their prime-time political talk shows?

RQ 3. Was there any difference in the talk shows in their biasness towards MQM political participants before local bodies’ election 2015?

RQ 4. Is there a difference in the dimensions of Political bias towards MQM in the prime-time political talk shows of leading Pakistani news channels?

RQ 5. Is there a difference in the types of political bias (content bias, coverage bias, question design bias) in the prime-time political talk shows of leading Pakistani news channel?

RQ 6. Is there a difference in the political talk shows in the prime-time political talk shows in types of political bias towards MQM?

Method

This study is a content analysis to examine the bias of anchor persons in political talk shows of leading five television channels. For this purpose, Muttahida Quami Movement (MQM) political leaders' participation in the talk shows before the local bodies elections December 2015 is taken as a case. The time frame selected is from September 1, 2015, till December 5, 2015. September 2015 as a starting point was selected as it was pre-election time and MQM members resigned from their National and Provincial assemblies' seats due to their reservations from the government regarding Karachi operation. December 5, 2015, was chosen as the last date as local bodies' elections were held on that day.

The channels selected were Geo News, ARY News, Dunya News, Express News, and Dawn News. In the selected time period, different anchor persons covered MQM positions and election-related issues in 44 talk shows. By using stratified sampling technique political talk shows by different anchor person were divided into five strata according to the channels, and then by a simple random sampling technique, 22 talk shows were selected. The five channels were selected because of the highest ranking.

The categories which are used in the study are based upon the work of Feldman (2016), Brantsand and Voltmer (2011) and Huls and Varwijk (2010). All political talk shows were watched carefully

before making the categories to code. Political Bias of anchorpersons was studied through six indicators i.e., the direction of the introduction of political talk shows, ranks of participants (the order in which they were invited), question tone, questions allegation, time given to participants and interruption by anchorperson. For “introduction”, “ranks of participants”, “question tone”, “question allegation”, “time given per answer”, and “Interruption” further three categories were made. After completion of coding each political talk show was assigned to a category in all six categories of political bias (See Annexure 1).

Political bias index was divided into three political bias categories. A total of eighteen score was given to political bias index in six different major categories (each category containing three scores). A score of 3 was given to ‘highly biased’ when the score was between 13 and 18; a score of 2 was given to ‘somewhat biased’, when score was between 7 and 12; and a score of 1 was given to ‘less biased’ when the score was between 1 and 6.

In the light of the above, three further categories were constructed, ‘Content bias’, ‘Coverage bias’, and ‘Question design bias’. ‘Content bias’ included ‘direction of introduction’, ‘Coverage bias’ included ‘ranks of participants’, ‘time given per answer’ and ‘interruptions by anchorperson’ while ‘Question design bias’ included ‘question tone’ and ‘allegation based question’.

Conclusion of talk shows is not included because Pakistani anchorperson do not conclude it with a concluding statement at the end of their political talk shows. Moreover, the footage is also not included in the talk shows categories as it was not available on all talk shows and the footage which was available was not displayed

was not always relevant with the talk shows.

Findings and Discussion

Table 1

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Talk Shows		
Capital Talk	2	9.1
Naya Pakistan	2	9.1
Off the record	3	13.6
Kal Tak	4	18.2
On the front	5	22.7
News Eye	4	18.2
Takrar	2	9.1
Channels		
Geo News	4	18.2
ARY News	3	13.6
Express News	6	27.3
Dunya News	5	22.7
Dawn News	4	18.2

N=22

Table 1 shows that in the 22 political talk shows on issues related to MQM, On the Front had 5 (22.7 %) shows whereas, Capital Talk had 2 (9.1 %), Naya Pakistan 2 (9.1 %), Off the Record had 3 (13.6 %), Kal Tak had 4 (18.2 %), News Eye had 4 (18.2 %) and Takrar had 2 (9.1 %) talks shows on MQM. Express News had 6 (27.3 %) talk shows on the topic while Geo News had 4 (18.2 %), Ary News had 3 (13.6 %), Express News had 6 (27.3 %), Dunya News had 5 (22.7 %) and Dawn News had 4 (18.2 %) panel based political talk shows. In the selected sample, Kamran Shahid 5 (22.7 %) hosted more talk shows than Hamid Mir 2 (9.1 %). Talat Hussain hosted 2 (9.1 %), Kashif Abbasi hosted 3 (13.6 %), Javed Chaudary hosted 4 (18.2 %), Mehar Abbasi hosted 4 (18.2 %) and Imran Khan hosted 2 (9.1 %) political talk shows.

RQ1. Did anchor persons in the prime-time political talk shows of leading Pakistani news channels show bias towards MQM political participants before local bodies' elections 2015?

Table 2: Political Bias

Political Bias	Frequency	Percentage
Highly Biased	12	54.5 %
Somewhat Biased	10	45.5 %
Less Biased	0	0 %

N=22

The findings in Table 2 show that the prime-time political talk shows in the leading Pakistani news channels before local bodies' election 2015, were mostly very biased 12 (54.5 %). Ten shows (45.5 %) somewhat biased. None of the programs were less or not biased towards MQM participants in the panel discussions. The political bias against the anchor persons was quite obvious.

Table 3

Political Bias	Channel				
	Geo News	ARY News	Express News	Dunya News	Dawn News
Highly Biased	50 %	66.7 %	33.3 %	80 %	50 %
Somewhat Biased	50 %	33.3 %	66.7 %	20 %	50 %
Less Biased	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

RQ 2: Was there any difference in the news channels biasness towards MQM political participants in their prime time political talk shows?

The findings in Table 3 show that news channel, Dunya News comparatively was highly biased (80 %) towards MQM participants followed by ARY News (66.7 %). While Geo News (50 %) and Dawn News (50 %) were equally bias towards MQM. Express News had lowest percentage of political bias in their political talk shows against MQM. No channel was less bias towards MQM. These findings indicate that different channels have their own interests and policies, therefore, their treatment towards a particular political

party was also different.

Table 4: Talk Shows-wise level of Political Bias

Political Bias	Talk Shows						
	Capital Talk	Naya Pakistan	Off the Record	Kal Tak	On the Front	News Eye	Takrar
Highly Biased	50 %	50 %	66.7 %	25 %	80 %	50 %	50 %
Somewhat Biased	50 %	50 %	33.3 %	75 %	20 %	50 %	50 %
Less Biased	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

RQ 3: Was there any difference in the talk shows in their biasness towards MQM political participants before the local bodies' election 2015?

Table 4 illustrates that *On the front* showed highest bias (80 %) towards MQM before local bodies' election 2015 followed by *Off the Record* (66.7 %). Moreover, in the remaining talk shows an equal level of high bias was shown towards MQM including *Capital talk* (50 %), *Naya Pakistan* (50 %), *News Eye* (50 %) and *Takrar* (50 %).

Table 5: Dimension-wise Political Bias

Dimension of Political bias	Frequency	Percentage
Direction of Introduction (Anti MQM)	1	4.5 %
Rank of Participants (Greater than MQM Participant)	11	50 %
Question Tone (Unfavorable to MQM)	11	50 %
Allegation on MQM in Questions (Without Source)	9	40.9 %
Time given to answer (More time to MQM Participant)	12	54.5 %
Interruption (More interruption towards MQM participant)	11	50 %

RQ 4: Is there a difference in the dimensions of Political bias towards MQM in the prime-time political talk shows of leading Pakistani news channels?

The overall variation in different dimensions of political bias in prime time political talk shows as seen in Table 5 indicates that in the introduction of prime-time political talk shows, there is less bias towards MQM (4.5 %) and most of the introductions were neutral

regarding MQM. In case of the rank of participants (50 %), MQM representative rank remained low in almost 11 political talk shows and anchor persons didn't invite all the participants with equal rank. In the rank of the participant, the political bias of talk show anchor person is quite obvious. In question tone, most of the questions which were asked to MQM representatives in prime time political talk shows were unfavorable to MQM (50 %). Moreover, without source allegation raised in the form of the question against MQM were found to be 40.9 % in all questions. In case of time for answers, MQM representative got more time to speak than other participants. Here political talk shows remained favorable to MQM representatives (54.5 %). The dimension of interruption of political bias also shows that MQM representatives were interrupted more (50 %) than any other participants.

Table 6: Comparative Type-wise Political Bias

Types of Bias	Percentage
Content Bias	4.5 %
Coverage Bias	59.1 %
Question Design Bias	63.6 %

RQ 5: Is there a difference in the types of political bias (content bias, coverage bias, question design bias) in the prime-time political talk shows of leading Pakistani news channel?

As seen in Table 6 the lowest political bias is of content bias 4.5 %. Whereas coverage bias is 59.1 % and question design bias is 63.6 % in prime time political talk show. Overall, highly biased percentage is in question design bias. As questions are designed by anchorpersons their agenda and opinions are hidden in the way they frame the questions. Sometimes, they show their political bias

through direct allegation and sometimes framing a question by quoting a source.

Table 7: Comparison between types of Political bias and prime talk political talk show

	Content Bias	Coverage Bias	Question Design Bias
Talk Shows	Highly Biased	Highly Biased	Highly Biased
Capital Talk	0 %	100 %	50 %
Naya Pakistan	0 %	100 %	50 %
Off the Record	0 %	66.7 %	33.3 %
Kal Tak	25.0%	25 %	75 %
On the Front	0 %	80 %	80 %
News Eye	0 %	50 %	75 %
Takrar	0 %	0 %	50 %

RQ 6. Is there a difference in the political talk shows in the prime-time political talk shows in types of bias towards MQM?

Table 7 illustrates that only *Kal Tak* had 25.0 % of content bias while all other political talk shows were not highly biased towards MQM in the introduction of the talk shows. In case of coverage bias, *Capital Talk* and *Naya Pakistan* has 100 % coverage bias, while *Off the Record* has 66.7 %, *On the Front* 80.0 %, *News Eye* 50.0 %, and *Takrar* had no highly biased coverage. Moreover, in question design bias *On the Front* has maximum share of highly biased (80 %) while *Kal Tak* and *News Eye* have 75 % bias followed by *Capital Talk*, *Naya Pakistan* and *Takrar* remained 50 % highly biased towards MQM. While *Off the Record* had the lowest share of highly bias 33.3 % in Question design bias.

Conclusion

Political talk shows are supposed to provide public spaces for free political discussions. It is argued that political talk shows should provide sufficient information to the public and correctly determine

which candidates best will represent their interests (Baum and Jamison, 2006). However, this space is manipulated and controlled by the anchorpersons. Journalists as anchor persons are not objective watchdogs anymore, they recognize themselves as advocates of a particular political perspective. Anchorpersons have become disrespectful and tougher towards the participants (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). This study, while taking the case of MQM political participants tried to empirically examine how the political bias of the anchor persons can be studied in the Pakistani talk shows. Findings of the present study show that anchorpersons of political talk shows were not impartial. Political shows discussions were controlled and regulated by anchorpersons. This was reflected in the order in which they called MQM participants, they framed the questions, through the tone of their questions, time given to participants and number of times MQM participants were interrupted and were not given a chance to finish their answers. Anchorpersons interrupted the participants and legitimized their accusatory questions and incorporated their hidden agenda to make the participant look dumbfounded.

Anchorpersons are now considered as political experts, “pundits of political discussion” (Luku, 2013) in Pakistani society and due to this perception, the way they control the talk shows is not in line with journalists’ neutrality, but as authorities making judgments. Rationality and diversity are missing. Political talk shows appear to look like public spaces for public opinion but in reality, hosts seem to be talking of their own interests or of the interests of the owners (Luku, 2013). Thus, anchorpersons’ role to provide a neutral platform, in the talk shows, to represent all the

politicians equally has been shifted to a very biased platform.

To reap the full fruits of democracy it is essential that the media industry play a more responsible role. Political shows are effective spaces to guide public opinion. For political talk shows to be a public space for free political discussions, fairness and objectivity are required, regardless of any personal feelings from anchor's end (Miller, Coleman, and Granberg, 2007). They need to offer a different kind of positions to ensure objectivity, neutrality, unbiased framing and independence (Gerth & Siegert, 2012). Even if they cannot produce consensus and mutual understanding at least they should try to keep the political discussion open (Craig, 2010). To re-emerge as neutral anchor persons, they need to become more conscious in giving balanced treatment to all the participants.

Limitations

One of the major limitations of the study is that the answers of all participants are not included in this study, only the answer time is taken into account. Bias can also be found in politicians' responses but it requires qualitative work. In addition to this, question variable is tested in a limited way and questions other dimensions such as toughness and face threatening value is not measured as all programs were related to MQM, so they were the main target for anchorperson. Therefore, there were chances that they have to face tougher and face threatening questions. Another limitation of this study is that it only includes the panel based political talk shows, other formats of political talk shows are not included. Moreover, the time period that this study is only based on the time period before the local bodies' election 2015. The selection of leading Pakistani news channels is also a limitation in this study as all news channels

are not included. Examining the other channels may provide more detailed analysis of the political talk shows treatment and framing towards a particular political party.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study only includes the political talk shows as some of the anchorperson also write the column in a different newspaper and a comparative study can be done that how anchorpersons frame a political party in their talk show and in their written articles. Future studies should include the newspaper for study and other channels can also be included. In addition to this, a comparative analysis of male and female can also be seen. Besides this, a survey can also be conducted from the viewers that how they perceive neutrality of anchorpersons.

References

- Babad, E., Peer, E., & Benayoun, Y. (2012). Can multiple biases occur in a single situation? Evidence from media bias research. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(6), 1486–1504.
- Babad, E., Peer, E., & Hobbs, R. (2012). Media literacy and media bias: Are media literacy students less susceptible to nonverbal judgment biases? *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 1*(2), 97–107.
- Baum, M. A., & Jamison, A. S. (2006). The Oprah effect: How soft news helps inattentive citizens vote consistently. *Journal of Politics, 68*(4), 946–959.
- Beattie, G. W. (1982). Turn-taking and interruption in political interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan compared and contrasted. *Semiotica, 39*(1-2), 93–114.

- Bernhardt, D., Krasa, S., & Polborn, M. (2008). Political polarization and the electoral effects of media bias. *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(5-6), 1092-1104.
- Boukes, M., & Boomgaarden, H. G. (2016). Politician seeking voter: How interviews on entertainment talk shows affect trust in politicians. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 22.
- Brewer, P. R., & Cao, X. (2006). Candidate appearances on soft news shows and public knowledge about primary campaigns. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 50(1), 18-35.
- Budak, C., Goel, S., & Rao, J. M. (2014). Fair and Balanced? Quantifying media bias through crowdsourced content analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(S1), 250-271.
- Cao, X. (2010). Hearing it from Jon Stewart: The impact of the daily show on public attentiveness to politics. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 22(1), 26-46.
- Clayman, S. E., Heritage, J. (2002). *The News interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Craig, G. (2010). Dialogue and dissemination in news media interviews. *Journalism*, 11(1), 75-90.
- D'Alessio, D. and Allen, M. (2000). Media bias in presidential elections: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Communication*, 50, 133-56.
- DellaVigna, S., & Kaplan, E. (2007). The Fox news effect: Media bias and voting. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3), 1187-1234.
- Ekström, M., & Lundell, A. K. (2011). Beyond the broadcast interview. *Journalism Studies*, 12(2), 172-187.

- Entman, R. M. (2010). Media framing biases and political power: Explaining slant in news of campaign 2008. *Journalism*, 11(4), 389–408.
- Ferre-Pavia, C., Sintes, M., & Gaya, C. (2015). The perceived effects of televised political satire among viewers and the communication directors of political parties: A European case. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*. 19(4), 299–31.
- Gerth, M. A., & Siegert, G. (2012). Patterns of consistence and constriction: How news media frame the coverage of direct democratic campaigns. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(3), 279–299.
- Grebelsky-Lichtman, T. (2010). The relationship of verbal and nonverbal behavior to political stature: The political interviews of Israel's Prime Minister Ariel Sharon. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 9(4), 229–253.
- Hagerty, B. (2010). TV's political host with the most. *British Journalism Review*, 21(1), 19–27.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 95–119). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Hopmann, D. N., van Aelst, P., & Legnante, G. (2012). Political balance in the news: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism*, 13(2), 240–257.
- Hutchby, I. (1992). The Pursuit of Controversy: Routine Skepticism in Talk on “Talk Radio”, *Sociology*, 26(4), 673–94.

- Hutchby, I. (2006). *Media Talk: Conversation Analysis and the Study of Broadcasting*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Kahn, K. F., & Kenney, P. J. (2002). The slant of the news: How editorial endorsements influence campaign coverage and citizens' views of candidates. *American Political Science Review*, 96(02), 381-394.
- Khan, M.K., Yousafzai, F.U. (2012). Anchorperson: An emerging phenomenon in the electronic media. *Journal of Mass Communication and Journalism*, 02(10).
- Luku, E. (2013). A look at the public sphere in talk show programs in Albania. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 4(10), 574-579.
- McNair, B. (2000). Journalism and democracy: A millennial audit. *Journalism Studies*, 1(2), 197-211.
- McQuail, D. (1992). *Media performance: Mass communication and the public interest*. London, Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Miller, A., Coleman, R., & Granberg, D. (2007). TV Anchors, elections & bias: a longitudinal study of the facial expressions of Brokaw rather Jennings. *Visual Communication Quarterly*, 14(4), 244-257.
- Rendle-Short, J. (2007). Neutralism and adversarial challenges in the political news interview. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(4), 387-406.
- Waddle, M., & Bull, P. (2015). Playing the man, not the ball: Personalization in political interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 35(4), 412-434.

Annexure 1

Measuring Instrument

Political Bias Index to measure bias of political talk shows towards a particular political party.

Six dimensions of Political bias index:

1. Direction of introduction
2. Ranks of Participants
3. Question Tone
4. Allegations in question
5. Time given to answer
6. Interruptions

Indicators for the direction of introduction:

- i. Pro MQM
- ii. Neutral
- iii. Anti MQM

Indicators of Ranks of participants:

- i. Rank less than MQM Participant
- ii. Rank equal to MQM Participant
- iii. Rank greater than MQM Participant

Indicators of Question tone:

- i. Favorable
- ii. Neutral
- iii. Unfavorable

Indicators of The allegation in questions:

- i. No allegation
- ii. Allegation with source
- iii. Allegation without source

Indicators of Time given per answer:

- i. More time to MQM participant
- ii. Equal time to all participants
- iii. Less time to MQM participant

Indicators of Interruption:

- i. Less interruptions towards MQM participant
- ii. Equal interruptions towards all participants
- iii. More interruptions towards MQM participant