



Newsmaking Practices in Uganda: A Comparative Framing Analysis of Two Leading Newspapers

Brian Semujju

Global newsmaking practices can be explained using five factors as articulated by Preston (2009). These include (1) *individual influences*, which deal with how personal characteristics and the background of an individual journalist influence newsmaking decisions; (2) *media routines and norms*, where conventional journalistic work is based on the daily newsroom routine practices like meeting deadlines, sourcing and others; (3) *organisational influences*, with which particular media houses draft mission statements and editorial policies to define journalism practice (Doudaki and Spyridou 2015); (4) *political economic factors*, which link the journalist's work or professional behaviour to the nuances of the economy (like advertising) and other powerful political players; and finally, (5) *cultural and ideological power*, the kind of influence that stems from our socio-cultural setting. The influence that journalists derive from social understandings of life can be traced through signs and codes that journalists use to interpret news for the audience. The last factor therefore focuses on the framing of discourse (Preston 2009) to unearth the underlying ideologies informing and shaping newsmaking practices. It is this factor that informs

B. Semujju (✉)
Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

the methodology of this chapter. Going by this understanding, what is evident in the discussion that follows, however, is the overlapping nature of Uganda's newsmaking practices across the above five news shaping factors. This lack of a clear-cut dichotomy has led to some research from the emerging democracies to call for a reinterpretation of the normative ideals of journalism to better explain newsroom cultures in particular settings.

In Zimbabwe, for example, although the newsmaking practices may pay tribute to some of the above domains, there are 'unplanned factors' that come in to shape the way that journalists carry out their professional duties (Mabweazara 2011). Kenya and Tanzania show some differences too. The main concern is around whether or not journalism practice should be defined on the basis of nation-building, rendering the practice connectivity and its underlying processes geared towards development (Ogola 2015). The Ugandan view has not received a lot of scholarly attention, something that this chapter attempts to redress. The chapter is far from calling for a redefinition of journalism practice in Uganda. Instead, it seeks to locate the Ugandan practice within an already defined arena, as seen in Preston's newsmaking factors above. With an analysis of the elements of newsmaking practices in two of Uganda's leading newspapers, the *New Vision* and the *Daily Monitor*, the chapter concludes that there is no one single factor that can explain newsmaking cultures in Uganda singlehandedly, especially when covering a politically contentious department such as the Electoral Commission.

AN OVERVIEW OF UGANDA'S ELECTORAL COMMISSION

The Electoral Commission (EC), a government body in Uganda tasked with organising elections, is established by the Constitution (Article 60) and the Electoral Commission Act (1997) with seven commissioners on a seven-year term of office, renewable once (Electoral Commission 2016). The chairman of the Commission at the time of conducting this study, Dr Badru Kiggundu, was appointed by the president in November 2002 to replace Hajji Aziz Kasujja, who had presided over the 2001 election. Before the permanent commission, elections in Uganda were organised by special interim government committees, while on other occasions, leaders assumed power through armed struggle.

Since the permanent commission was created, it has organised four presidential elections (2001, 2006, 2011 and 2016), three of which (except 2011) have resulted in Supreme Court petitions against the EC and the president. Two of these petitions (2001 and 2006) were used by the media

to focus the EC towards the 2011 elections. The circumstances behind both petitions are similar. For example, in 2006, when Yoweri Museveni was declared winner of the presidential election, Kiiza Besigye, the leading contender to President Museveni, rejected the results. Besigye filed a petition in the Supreme Court to nullify Museveni's presidency. The Supreme Court in both cases (2001 and 2006) decided that although there had been some irregularities, there was no need to nullify the presidency of Mr Museveni (Sserunjogi 2016). The analysis of the coverage of the conflict that ensued between concerned parties over the same EC being asked by government to organise another election (2011) informs this chapter's attempt to examine how newsmaking cultures here overlap with the Western five-tier model discussed above. Two local newspapers in question, the *New Vision* (government owned) and the *Daily Monitor* (privately owned), took on the argument, with each covering the EC along a parallel political line.

CONTEXTUALISING THE *NEW VISION* AND THE *DAILY MONITOR*

The *New Vision* has existed since the current government came to power in 1986. Although at its inception the paper was solely owned by government, private individuals were later allowed to buy stakes too. Nevertheless, according to the company's website, 'the majority shareholder is Government of Uganda with a shareholding of 53.3%. The public holds the remaining 46.7%' (*New Vision* 2016). As a majority shareholder, the government can influence management at the paper. For example, the Media Sustainability Index (2008) reports that the paper's former Editor-in-Chief, William Pike, was fired by the government for what President Museveni called 'constant negative reporting from our own paper'. Moreover, before his death, Brigadier Noble Mayombo, who had served as Chief of Military Intelligence, was the paper's chair of the board of directors. The website also notes that '*New Vision* management set an objective and progressive political line, supportive of the National Resistance Movement (NRM) [the party in power] ideals, but critical of failings, as the basis of its editorial philosophy' (*New Vision* 2016). However, as a basis for framing, every story in the paper came to be either about NRM or against any opposing ideology.

The *Daily Monitor*, on the other hand, emerged in 1992 alongside a number of privately owned media outlets in Uganda. Because of the paper's bluntness regarding government policies, it was perceived by the government and its sympathisers as an enemy. For example, in 1997, President Museveni demanded that the newspaper be punished for writing

that the Congolese president, Laurent Kabila, had paid Uganda in gold in order for Uganda to help keep him in power (Mwenda 1997). President Museveni would later maintain that both the reporter and the paper should show him where the gold is or face punishment (Bareebe 2011).

Similar threats and arrests have emerged over the years. On 10 October 2002, the *Daily Monitor* was threatened again for writing that a Ugandan military helicopter had crashed while chasing after rebels of the Lord's Resistance Army, who had defeated government and were amputating and dismembering civilians in Northern Uganda. The paper was shut down and its offices were occupied by state security agents for one week (Balikowa 2006; Tabaire 2007; Rice 2008). At the time of the *Daily Monitor's* conception, political parties had been banned for nearly seven years. Without opposition political parties, the paper found itself playing the role of the opposition (Tabaire 2007). The government's response to this was harsh. Between 1993 and 1997, all government offices were banned from advertising in the *Daily Monitor*, a move that cost the paper over 70% of its revenue (Balikowa 2006). President Museveni further described the *Daily Monitor* as a paper which writes 'hopelessly' and writes nothing. He also said that his government had finished fighting all the big wars (he assumed power through a guerrilla war) and was left with fighting the *Daily Monitor* (Bareebe 2011).

This background of both papers is crucial in setting the ground for the analysis of the individual and organisational influences behind some of the editorial decisions that shape their content. The contextual factors influence the individual journalists' convictions and operational procedures and can be traced in the news content generated, as the findings in this study show. Before discussing these findings however, the framing theory, which aids the chapter's analysis of the *New Vision's* and the *Daily Monitor's* journalism practices, is presented below.

FRAMING: THEORY AND METHOD

Framing happens when the media select attributes of objects according to salience, with these attributes then becoming the public's agenda (McCombs and Reynolds 2002; McCombs and Ghanem 2003; Weaver 2007). Attribute agenda-setting (framing) points out the intention of covering a story by looking at the sources from which a story derived, and the presentation done by the expert journalist. By carefully analysing media texts about the EC, the underlying symbols and their subsequent meaning are laid bare. Most importantly, the signs and codes that appear in such

content represent a bigger picture of how newsmaking cultures in Uganda are inherent in the frames that emanate from sources other than objective observations of media personnel. While the journalistic value of objectivity is claimed by both papers when covering the EC, the sourcing of news (and this points to *media routines and norms* as a source of frames) is influenced by the ideologies that each paper promotes, among other newsmaking influences. Both papers promote ideologies from their shareholders (*organisational influences*) and from ‘professional socialization’ (Gan et al. 2005, 442) among journalists.

On the other hand, the definition of framing helps to situate the *New Vision* and the *Daily Monitor*’s signs and codes under the fifth factor of the global newsmaking cultures—*cultural and ideological power*. To frame is ‘to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described’ (Entman 1993, 391). This, therefore, requires journalists to choose socio-cultural attributes that resonate in society as the audience’s frames of reference to certain events. The selective attribute of framing is suggestive of the role of the media as gatekeepers (Weaver 2007) and this can be affected by all the five factors that influence newsmaking cultures indicated earlier: *individual Influence, media routines and norms, organisational influences, political economic factors* and *cultural and ideological power*.

In terms of operationalisation, framing analysis is a method for the examination of discourses (Scheufele 1999). Although this definition reduces the approach to content analysis, which Barelson (1996) sees as dealing with ‘the what’ part of content, framing analysis includes what the communicator says, how he says it and who says it. It is about ‘how people use [these] interpretive frames strategically to shape others’ meaning-making processes’ (Coburn 2006, 346). The focus is placed on the way different forces frame ‘a contentious issue’ (Creed et al. 2002). As a process, framing analysis in media studies is done by gathering information from media and sorting it out using empirical methods of quantitative and qualitative content analysis (König 2010).

Based on the above arguments, content from these two leading newspapers (by circulation), the *New Vision* and the *Daily Monitor*, was analysed. The selected content was published between 1 March and 15 April 2010, a period during which the EC received sustained coverage due to demonstrations held against it by the opposition at its offices in the capital. The other reason for choosing that period is based on the global news selection behaviour (used in

Uganda) of treating conflict as having a high news value. The conflict between demonstrators and the police therefore fetched a substantial amount of coverage compared to days when the situation was calm.

The underlying meaning of various elements of layout or frame-building (Burgers et al. 2016) was sought by analysing the length and breadth of stories, diction, the nature of space in which items about the Commission were placed, headlines, flags, pictures, cartoons, plus other illustrations. This was done in order to understand the coverage and the influence of that coverage (whether ideological/cultural, organisation, political etc.). This chapter creates two data units to manage the elements that come from the analysis. All references to the EC as a rigging machine for government are put under a theme referred to as ‘Rigging Machine’ frame unit. The other elements that implied that the EC was competent and that the opposition was just witch-hunting, are organised under a frame unit referred to as ‘witch-hunt’. In addition to the content analysis, two journalists (one from each newspaper) were interviewed to make sense of the findings from the content. The journalists were chosen purposely because they specifically cover the EC for their respective papers. So, they were selected because of their expertise on the EC and due to the fact that they wrote most of the stories about the EC during the period under study. Additionally, both journalists agreed to be interviewed on condition of guaranteed anonymity, due to the sensitivity of the issue at hand. The next section discusses how the two papers framed the Commission and the implications of their coverage on newsmaking practices in Uganda.

HOW THE NEWSPAPERS FRAMED THE EC: THE SALIENT AND THE STRONG FRAME

The EC had eighty items (referred to as mentions in framing research (Dimitrova and Strömbäck 2005)) divided between the *Daily Monitor* (fifty-one) and the *New Vision* (twenty-nine). In March of the period under study, for instance, the *New Vision* ran thirteen stories, two commentaries, one cartoon, one letter to the editor in form of an SMS, and a picture. In the *Daily Monitor*, there were eighteen stories, four commentaries, two letters to the editor, four cartoons, three editorials and one picture. In April, there were fourteen items in both papers. Compared to the first fifteen days of March, there were twenty-two mentions in the *Daily Monitor*. By April of the same period, the paper had decreased its coverage of the EC. On the other hand, the *New Vision* increased its mentions in April to fourteen from

only seven in March. In general, though, the *Daily Monitor* showed more enthusiasm in covering the Commission than the *New Vision*. Although most framing research assumes the influence of the salient frame (Entman 1993; Scheufele 2000), which comes after a newspaper repeats the same message several times (for example, the *Daily Monitor* had fifty-one mentions of the EC while the *New Vision* had twenty-nine), Chong and Druckman (2007, 104) offer an alternative hypothesis by suggesting that in a debate where there is a contentious issue, ‘the strongest frame will exert the greatest influence on individual opinion, regardless of repetition’. This helps to inform the fact that although the *Daily Monitor* built more frames to discredit the EC, the paper failed to change public opinion in its favour. The *New Vision*’s frame therefore might have appeared fewer times, but it was stronger and convinced people to understand the EC as competent. The issue of the failure of the salient coverage to win public opinion can be explained further by the fact that since both sides could not have had the same amount of resources (Pan and Kosicki 2003), the political players promoting the EC as a capable entity had more resources than the opposing side.

In addition, the papers employed cartoons to frame the EC. The *New Vision* used two cartoons within the analysis period. The *Daily Monitor*, on the other hand, had five cartoons, with one showing Kiggundu, the Commission’s Chairman, sitting in a frying pan while the Uganda Joint Christian Council (UJCC) added paraffin into the hot embers. Other layout elements used include: flags, which are placed on the cover page to hint on what is inside a newspaper, opinions (commentaries, editorials and letters to the editor) and kickers. The table below summarises the layout elements used to frame the Electoral Commission (Table 7.1).

Table 7.1 Summary of the separate layout elements used by the *New Vision* and the *Daily Monitor* to frame the Electoral Commission (1 March–15 April 2010)

<i>Items used</i>	<i>New Vision</i>	<i>Daily Monitor</i>	<i>Total</i>
1. Stories	22	27	49
2. Cartoons	2	5	7
3. Pictures	1	1	2
4. Commentaries	2	4	6
5. Letters	1	3	4
6. Flags	1	3	4
7. Editorials	–	4	4
8. Kickers	–	4	4
9. Total mentions	29	51	80

FRAMING USING LANGUAGE AND LAYOUT

The use of layout elements or media packages such as visual images, graphics, catch phrases (Van Gorp 2005), and figurative devices like metaphors and hyperbole (Burgers et al. 2016) meant that each newspaper directed the relationship between the coverage of the EC and how the audience interpreted it to support a certain side (Scheufele 2000; Lecheler et al. 2009; Zhou 2008). The *Daily Monitor*, for example, used metaphors such as ‘bloodshed’ and phrases such as: ‘MPs taunt government’; ‘MPs walk out of parliament’; ‘Protests to continue’; ‘Uganda’s EC very incompetent’ and ‘questionable credibility’ to promote a certain view of the EC. Statements like ‘MPs taunt government’ and ‘Uganda’s EC very incompetent’ fit well into Burgers et al.’s (2016) description of hyperbole. In the first statement, the paper wanted to imply that all members of parliament did not agree with the government over the EC, and yet, the government had the biggest number of MPs in the house. Regarding the second statement, surely the EC that had organised previous elections could not fit the description of being ‘very incompetent’.

The *New Vision*, on the other hand, rarely mentioned or used the sort of metaphors and hyperbole employed by the *Daily Monitor*. Instead, the *New Vision* counter-framed by emphasising the opposite of the *Daily Monitor*’s coverage. To promote the view that the EC was being ‘witch-hunted’, the *New Vision* used phrases like ‘opposition did not march out; they went to consult their party leaders’. The paper tactfully presented the idea of MPs walking out of parliament as being to the government’s advantage because walking out had been done several times in Uganda’s parliamentary history. For example, opposition MPs walked out of the house in 2006 in protest of the president’s appointees to the National Citizenship and Immigration Board (Nandutu and Mugerwa 2006); they walked out again on 12 June 2008 after being denied to pass a motion that would ask the Inspector General of Police, Kale Kayihura, to resign (Nalugo et al. 2008); and again in 2009, this time protesting against a government motion, the Supplementary Appropriations Bill, which sought to allocate Sh6.5 billion to the President’s Office to promote patriotism. Since there was already an existing frame of reference about the act of walking out by MPs, the paper presented the act as irresponsible, fruitless and as a standard by which to measure the MPs’ indiscipline. The reporting of that isolated act of walking out, using historical allusions already in the audience’s mind, also known as ‘the event-processing schemata’ (Entman 1993; Scheufele 1999), means that what occurred was

individual framing—where audiences use their prior knowledge to make sense of an event. The *New Vision*, in a way, influenced the audience’s ‘learning, interpretation and evaluation’ (de Vreese 2005, 52) of the EC by alluding to events that the public still remembered or by reminding the public of other things that happened in the past.

Such historical allusion not only reminded the audience but also the journalists, who happen to be from the same society as everyone else of course. The newsmaking factor at play here is that of *cultural and ideological power*. The mediated socio-cultural environment is full of debates about MPs walking out of parliament, Supreme Court judgements and various other events. Eventually, these cultural and ideological influences shape the way journalists understand life. This alone, however, may not be adequate to explain why journalists take sides in the newsrooms. The ideological influences have to be supported by *media routines and norms*, alongside *organisational influences*, to create the nature of content observed in the data. This is why, for example, a journalist working for the *Daily Monitor* emphasised the decision of the three judges who stated that the irregularities were enough to annul Mr Museveni’s presidency, while a *New Vision* journalist emphasised the decision of the majority judges. As another journalist noted, most cover the EC using the information they have, for example the court judgements. To highlight the role of *media routines and norms*, *organisational influences* and *cultural and ideological power* as key newsmaking factors in Ugandan newsrooms, the *Daily Monitor* journalist underplayed the influence of sources, solely attributing the frames to journalists. ‘Sources and players are always busy trying to get their story to be told. It’s up to the journalist and the entire publication to do the balancing’ (Key Informant I 2016).

In terms of prominence, both papers had three front-page stories in March but with different angles. While the *Daily Monitor* flashed ‘Lead Donors warn EC over vote rigging’, accompanied by a kicker emphasising that donors had asked the polls’ body to win the trust of all players, the *New Vision* did not carry any that day. A front-page story is the most powerful one of the day. Hagerty (2002) contends that it has the most universal appeal. The *New Vision* did not run a story on its front-page within that period that falls under the opposing ‘rigging-machine’ frame category. Instead, it had a second-lead story on the front page of 22 March but talked about by-elections in a county called Rukiga and how foreign observers were going to observe them. The 29th of March saw the *Daily Monitor* run another single-page story, ‘Kabale polls divide NRM’. Carried

on page two, the story said that ‘Banyenzaki [an MP from the ruling party] had also raised accusations of rigging’.

The above coverage led to a general observation that the EC is construed through two dominant frames. One of them is the Commission as a ‘rigging machine’ for the government, and the other frames such allegations as an opposition ‘witch-hunt.’ Such categorisation points to content bias, an idea in the framing research tradition where journalists cover news by presenting only one side of a conflict (Entman 2007). The conclusion made here is that when it comes to a politically contentious issue, like the EC, the *New Vision* and the *Daily Monitor* publish biased content. Additionally, behind such content slanted approaches are two other framing ideas on which Entman (2007, 2010) reflects. One is the fact that content bias is an inherent bias within decision-making where journalists are motivated to report for a particular side due to the influence of their ‘personal attitudes and orientations’ (Zhou 2008, 118). This is attested by data from two key informants, who said that coverage is a representation of the reporters’ perception of the EC. It is such perception that is informed by journalists’ societal orientation.

THE INFLUENCE OF JOURNALISTS AND POLITICIANS

The journalists, in their choice of sources and design elements, were using long-standing knowledge of the relationship between the papers and the government. The *organisational influences* create a hierarchy of editors or gatekeepers who assign story ideas to journalists with specific angles in mind. The journalists therefore try to fit within the overall vision and mission of the paper. The *media routines and norms* eventually work to fulfil the paper’s editorial line. Apart from revealing the influences on news, the data indicate the nature of coverage as mostly episodic or generic (Lecheler et al. 2009), emphasising passing events without an assessment of the issues behind them.

However, upstream of journalists’ decision-making bias, facilitated by *media routines and norms*, *organisational influences* and *cultural and ideological power*, are the political figures who dedicate resources to slant media coverage of an issue to be in their favour (Entman 2010). The first culprits here are the owners of both newspapers. As noted earlier, the Ugandan government commands the majority shares at the *New Vision* and so it (the government) tries to make sure that journalists cover the EC in a way that reflects positively on all the politicians who are sympathetic to the govern-

ment. The *Daily Monitor's* ownership, on the other hand, is solely private, with a history of adversarial coverage towards government. The adversarial side was well reflected in the 'rigging-machine' angle of the coverage.

The influence of elites, especially rich political players, can be understood using *political economic factors*, an element already identified to have great influence on newsmaking practices. Although journalists made choices of sources in most cases, there were people who placed themselves as sources in order to promote their own agenda. Therefore, the journalists were not the only sources of frames, since any political message that appears in the media has to have a messenger (Druckman 2001; Lecheler et al. 2009). While creating frames, the sources include words to signify facts, and omit words to signify non-facts (Tuchman 1978). This implies that the elites managed to use media to front their agendas. Consequently, the two perspectives that resonate (the EC being good or bad) in the media represent the position of elites, some of whom benefit from the EC being good while others want it to look bad. Media/journalists fail to recognise the different sources of frames independent of themselves and end up being used by expert framers such as politicians, the rich and famous and other influential people (Entman 1993). 'They (politicians) take things personally and will follow every story with keen interest. If it is a story that would destroy their careers, they would do whatever it takes to kill it' (Key Informant II 2016). Several of these sources represented institutions that have the political, military and financial power to dictate terms to the media.

The two dominating influences discussed, elites and journalists, have been hinted at by Gan et al. (2005, 442) as representing 'professional socialization and journalistic ideology' and by McQuail (2006, 511) as evidencing the constructive variant process (held beliefs). The actions of the two newspapers analysed in this chapter inform of the newsmaking practices in Ugandan media, especially when covering political news stories. Lack of independence from the journalists themselves and the presence of elites determine the direction of political news stories. Framing the EC in a certain way made the public see it just how it was presented by the media (Entman 1993). When the media change the position of attributes and place a different one at the top of the agenda, the public understanding of an issue (for instance the EC) also shifts to match the new emphasis of the media (Weaver 2007; Scheufele and Tewksbury 2007; Lecheler et al. 2009). The negative frames about the EC that the *Daily Monitor* put at the top of its agenda and the positive ones posited by *New Vision* presented a tendentious view of the EC to the

public. This put both newspapers' objectivity at risk. Both lost their fourth estate position by framing as in or out information that could have created an informed citizenry. The papers thus had no basis on which to claim that they were objective, balanced and fair.

The in-depth interviews have further revealed the reasons why the coverage was biased. One reporter commented that 'What you see in terms of reporting in the *Daily Monitor* and the *New Vision* will, in most cases, be a reflection of what reporters and editors perceive the EC to be' (Key Informant II 2016). The reporter admitted that journalists and media workers can be the sources of frames, while another noted that 'newspapers would cover the EC in a certain perspective for fear of being closed by government powers' (Key Informant I 2016). The *New Vision* journalist added that editorial independence is not so much there because there is always political influence over negative stories and demands that positive stories get more space. In general, the major sources of frames were the elites or the politicians who use their direct influence, and the journalists who cover the EC based on their prior beliefs. The source of such beliefs, as the *Daily Monitor* reporter stresses, is that 'the institution (EC) has been mired in so much controversy that in recent years, a good number of journalists are likely to approach it with bias' (Key Informant I 2016).

In the end, Museveni won the election by 68%, while his lead contender had 26% (Ross 2011). The predictions of the framing theory that the resonating frame will manage to change public opinion matches with the outcome of the Supreme Court, which ruled that the EC had violated several laws—citing this as something that dented the process of free and fair elections. It is not very clear, however, if it had any impact on the public's choice of candidate. The public connection can only be made loosely here because the two newspapers sampled are elitist and so are not accessed by 87% of Ugandans, who are semi-illiterate and survive on subsistence farming in rural areas (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2015). The framing theory would predict that the resonating frame managed to change the opinions of those who accessed the information about the EC. This can be connected to the 26% of votes gained by the leading contender and the fact that most of these votes came from urban areas where people have access to both newspapers. It is also possible that people understood the two newspapers as being a supporter of the incumbent government (the *New Vision*) and a supporter of the opposition (the *Daily Monitor*) due to their well-known histories on controversial issues. On the other hand, the possibility that the strong frame does not necessarily need to be the salient one (with most mentions) (Chong and Druckman 2007) is a reason to conclude that the *New Vision*, with more

resources than the *Daily Monitor*, managed to convince the public that the EC was being witch-hunted, leading to fresh victory by the incumbent president.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has noted that there are well-established factors pertaining to newsmaking practices in the global North. The factors include *individual influence*, *media routines and norms*, *organisational influences*, *political economic factors* and *cultural and ideological power*. However, research from the global South seeks alternative theories to explain newsroom practices that are unique to the developing nations. This chapter has continued from that tradition by undertaking a framing analysis of how two leading newspapers in Uganda, the *New Vision* and the *Daily Monitor*, covered the Electoral Commission.

The findings suggest that Uganda's newsmaking practices can indeed be convincingly explained by the above factors. This was observed in the frames that both papers used to cover the EC. The chapter has shown that the greatest influence comes from beliefs already held (a result of both *individual Influence* and *cultural and ideological power*), which McQuail (2006, 511) calls the constructive variant process. The *Daily Monitor's* fifty one mentions of the EC, all falling in one frame unit, is evidence of persistence, compared to twenty nine in the *New Vision*. Although this salient or resonating frame would have an impact on public opinion (Entman 2004), the *New Vision's* mentions were stronger, with more powerful political and economic players behind that publication.

Most importantly, however, the chapter has suggested that framing analysis is a good approach for understanding newsroom practices and their impact on both the practice of journalism and the audience, as it helped the chapter to show how newsrooms in Uganda make choices and how the journalists generally cover political and contentious issues.

REFERENCES

- Article 60, Section 1 of the 1995 Constitution of Uganda. n.d.
- Balikowa, David O. 2006. *Behind the Monitor's October 10th Shutdown*. Kampala: Fountain publishers.
- Bareebe, Solomon. 2011. The Rise and Rise of *The Monitor*. Available at http://ebooks.tutajua.com/chapter.php?tutcom_ebooks_chapter_id=4&ebooks_book_id=1. Accessed 10 Mar 2012.

- Barelson, Bernard. 1996. Content Analysis in Communication Research. In *Media Studies: A Reader*, ed. Paul Marris and Sue Thornham, 405–415. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Burgers, Christian, Elly A. Konijn, and Gerard J. Steen. 2016. Figurative Framing: Shaping Public Discourse Through Metaphor, Hyperbole, and Irony. *Communication Theory* 26 (4): 410–430.
- Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. A Theory of Framing and Opinion Formation in Competitive Elite Environments. *Journal of Communication* 57 (1): 99–118.
- Coburn, Cynthia E. 2006. Framing the Problem of Reading Instruction: Using Frame Analysis to Uncover the Microprocesses of Policy Implementation. *American Educational Research Journal* 43 (3): 343–349.
- Creed, Douglas W.E., Jeffrey A. Langstraat, and Maureen A. Scully. 2002. A Picture of the Frame: Frame Analysis as Technique and as Politics. *Organizational Research Methods* 5 (34): 34–55.
- de Vreese, Claes H. 2005. News Framing: Theory and Typology. *Information Design Journal + Document Design* 13 (1): 51–62.
- Dimitrova, Daniela V., and Jesper Strömbäck. 2005. Mission Accomplished? Framing of the Iraq War in the Elite Newspapers in Sweden and the United States. *Gazette* 67 (5): 399–417.
- Doudaki, Vaia, and Lia-Paschalia Spyridou. 2015. News Content Online: Patterns and Norms Under Convergence Dynamics. *Journalism* 16 (2): 257–277.
- Druckman, James N. 2001. On the Limits of Framing Effects: Who Can Frame? *Journal of Politics* 63 (4): 1041–1066.
- Electoral Commission. 2016. A Brief History of Elections in Uganda. <http://www.ec.or.ug/?q=content/history-ec>. Accessed 8 Feb 2016.
- Entman, Robert. 1993. Framing: Towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 43 (4): 51–58.
- . 2004. Framing: Towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. In *McQuail's Reader in Mass Communication Theory*, ed. Denis McQuail, 390–397. London: Sage publication.
- Entman, Robert M. 2007. Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power. *Journal of Communication* 57 (2007): 163–173.
- . 2010. Media Framing Biases and Political Power: Explaining Slant in News of Campaign 2008. *Journalism* 11 (4): 389–408.
- Gan, Faith, Joo Leng Teo, and Benjamin H. Detenber. 2005. Framing a Battle for the White House: A Comparison of Two National Newspapers' Coverage of the 2000 United States Presidential Election. *The International Journal for Communication Studies* 67 (5): 441–467.
- Hagerty, Bill. 2002. Hold—on to—The Front Page. *British Journalism Review*. <http://bjr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/2/31>. Accessed 8 Dec 2010.

- Key Informant I. 2016. Interview with Brian Semujju, Personal interview, Kampala, March 19, 2016.
- Key Informant II. 2016. Interview with Brian Semujju, Personal interview, Kampala, March 27, 2016.
- König, Thomas. 2010. Frame Analysis: Theoretical Preliminaries. <http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/methods/publications/frameanalysis/>. Accessed 10 Oct 2010.
- Lecheler, Sophie, Claes de Vreese, and Rune Slothuus. 2009. Issue Importance as a Moderator of Framing Effects. *Communication Research* 36 (400): 400–425.
- Mabweazara, Hayes M. 2011. Newsmaking Practices and Professionalism in the Zimbabwean Press. *Journalism Practice* 5 (1): 100–117.
- McCombs, Maxwell, and Salma I. Ghanem. 2003. The Convergence of Agenda Setting and Framing. In *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World*, ed. Oscar H. Gandy Jr, Stephen D. Reese, and August E. Grant, 67–81. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- McCombs, Maxwell, and Amy Reynolds. 2002. News Influence on Our Pictures of the World. In *Media Effects: Advances in Theories and Research*, ed. Jennings Bryant, Dolf Zillmann, and Mary B. Oliver, 1–18. New York: Longman Publishers.
- McQuail, Denis. 2006. *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*. London: Sage Publication.
- Media Sustainability Index. 2008. *Development of Sustainable Independent Media in Africa*. Washington: Kirby Lithographic Company.
- Mwenda, Andrew. 1997. Kabila Paid Uganda in Gold. *Sunday Monitor*, September 21
- Nalugo, Mercy, Muhumuza, Rodney, Mugerwa, Yasiin, and Kasasira, Risdell. 2008. Ugandan MPs Walk Out of Parliament in Protest Over Police Brutality. *The Monitor*, June 13.
- Nandutu, Agness, and Mugerwa, Yasiin. 2006. Opposition MPs Walk Out of Session. *The Monitor*, November 10.
- New Vision. 2016. Company Profile. <http://www.visiongroup.co.ug/>. Accessed 16 Feb 2016.
- Ogola, George. 2015. African Journalism: A Journey of Failures and Triumphs. *African Journalism Studies* 36 (1): 93–102.
- Pan, Zhongdang, and Gerald M. Kosicki. 2003. Framing as a Strategic Action in Publication Deliberation. In *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World*, ed. Stephen D. Reese, Oscar H. Gandy Jr, and August E. Grant, 35–66. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Preston, Paschal. 2009. *Making the News: Journalism and News Cultures in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Rice, Andrew. 2008. When Uganda Arrests its Most Prominent Journalist. http://andrewmwendasblog.blogspot.com/2008_11_01_archive.html. Accessed 10 April 2011.

- Ross, Will. 2011. Uganda Election: Yoweri Museveni Wins Fresh Term. BBC online. <http://m.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-12516562>. Accessed 13 June 2013.
- Scheufele, Dietram A. 1999. Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. *Journal of Communication* 49 (1): 103–122.
- . 2000. Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication. *Mass Communication & Society* 3: 297–316.
- Scheufele, Dietram A., and David Tewksbury. 2007. Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models. *Journal of Communication* 57 (1): 9–20.
- Tabaire, Bernard. 2007. The Press and Political Repression in Uganda: Back to the Future? *Journal of East African Studies* 1 (2): 193–211.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making News*. New York: Free Press.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics. 2015. *Statistical Abstract*. Kampala: UBOS.
- Van Gorp, Baldwin. 2005. Where Is the Frame? Victims and Intruders in the Belgian Press Coverage of the Asylum Issue. *European Journal of Communication* 20 (484): 485–507.
- Weaver, David. 2007. Thoughts on Agenda Setting and Framing. *Journal of Communication* 57 (1): 142–147.
- Zhou, Xiang. 2008. Cultural Dimensions and Framing the Internet in China: A Cross-Cultural Study of Newspapers' Coverage in Hong Kong, Singapore, the US and the UK. *International Communication Gazette* 70 (117): 116–136.