



Received: 28-07-2025
Accepted: 08-09-2025

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Assessing Effectiveness of Press Freedom in Zambia: A Case Study of Private Radio Stations in Lusaka's Radio Phoenix and Christian Voice

¹ Katongo Kapekele, ² Dr. Sycorax Tiyesa Ndhlovu

¹ Department of School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Information and Communications University, Lusaka, Zambia

² Advisor, Department of Social Sciences, Information and Communications University (ICU), and Zambia Research and Development Center, Lusaka, Zambia

Corresponding Author: **Katongo Kapekele**

Abstract

This study investigates press freedom in Zambia's private media, focusing on challenges faced by two Lusaka-based radio stations, Radio Phoenix and Christian Voice. The research evaluates the extent of journalistic independence, exploring internal and external factors affecting media practices, such as ownership, editorial policies, financial pressures, and legal constraints. Using purposive sampling, 75 media management professionals provided data via structured questionnaires, capturing quantitative and qualitative insights. Results reveal that 62.67% of respondents report ownership influence on editorial decisions, while 46.67% highlight financial constraints as

significant barriers to free reporting. Additionally, 72% note external pressures discouraging coverage of sensitive topics, and 53.33% identify biased editorial policies as drivers of self-censorship. While some improvements were noted, the findings underscore persistent issues impeding independent journalism. Recommendations include legal protections, transparent editorial guidelines, financial diversification, and capacity-building initiatives. This study enhances the discourse on media independence in Zambia, offering actionable steps to foster press freedom within private media organizations.

Keywords: Press Freedom, Private Media, Zambia, Radio Phoenix, Christian Voice, Media Independence, Editorial Policies

1. Introduction

This chapter will focus on the, background of the study, problem identification, purpose, rationale, objectives identification and stating the significance of the study. In addition, the research will outline the theoretical framework.

1.1 Background

Press freedom is a critical component of democratic societies, serving as the foundation for free expression, the dissemination of diverse viewpoints, and the promotion of government accountability. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2020), press freedom ensures that the public remains informed and can participate in national discourse. Despite its recognized importance, the application of press freedom, especially within privately owned media organizations, is fraught with challenges that stem from both external and internal pressures. Private media houses, unlike public or state-owned institutions, often navigate a complex balance between maintaining profitability and adhering to the principles of independent journalism.

Global press freedom has been in decline for several years. According to Reporters Without Borders (2021), only 12% of the world's population enjoys a free press, while 73% of countries have serious issues related to press freedom. Zambia, ranked 115 out of 180 countries in the 2021 World Press Freedom Index, has seen a deterioration in press freedom due to increasing governmental control, self-censorship, and the vulnerability of private media to political and economic pressures. Freedom House (2021) has classified Zambia's press environment as "partly free," highlighting the complex dynamics that inhibit independent journalism, especially in private media.

According to Nyamnjoh (2005), press freedom in Africa is heavily influenced by the political and economic context in which media organizations operate. In countries where political regimes are sensitive to criticism, private media outlets may face covert or overt pressures to align with government narratives. Nyamnjoh argues that private media is not immune to such

pressures, even in democratic states, as governments often employ indirect methods such as economic sanctions or legal threats to curtail media independence.

Overall, the existing body of research reveals that private media organizations across Africa, including Zambia, operate in environments that are shaped by economic, political, and regulatory pressures, all of which influence the application of press freedom. Studies by Nyamnjoh (2005), Ojo (2018), and Skjerdal (2011), among others, highlight the significant challenges that private media organizations face in balancing commercial viability with journalistic independence.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Press freedom in Zambia's private media, particularly at outlets like Radio Phoenix, faces significant challenges despite constitutional guarantees. Economic, political, and regulatory pressures often undermine editorial independence. Heavy reliance on advertising revenue and political interference compromises journalistic freedom, with over 60% of private media outlets reporting financial struggles (ZICTA, 2020). This economic fragility fosters self-censorship and avoidance of politically sensitive topics. Regulatory bodies like the Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA) have been accused of silencing critical voices through license suspensions, with 10 private outlets facing punitive actions in 2020 (MISA Zambia, 2020). These pressures create an environment of fear, restricting critical reporting. A 2019 study revealed 58% of journalists felt constrained by owners or advertisers. Radio Phoenix, like many private outlets, struggles to balance financial independence and unbiased reporting. This study examines these challenges and proposes solutions to strengthen press freedom in Zambia's private media sector.

1.3 General objective

The general objective of this study is to assess the effectiveness of press freedom in Zambia, with a particular focus on Radio Phoenix Christian Voice.

1.4 Specific objectives

1. To analyze the degree of press freedom practiced in private media organizations.
2. To identify the challenges that private media organizations face in the application of press freedom.
3. To examine the impact of ownership, editorial policies, and external pressures on press freedom in private media organizations.

1.5 Research questions

1. To what extent is press freedom practiced in private media organizations?
2. What challenges do private media organizations face in exercising press freedom?
3. How do ownership and external pressures affect press freedom in private media organizations?

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study highlights the current state of press freedom within Zambia's private media sector, focusing on Radio Phoenix as a case study. As a prominent private radio station, understanding its challenges provides valuable insights into the broader media landscape. The findings will inform policymakers, media regulators, and stakeholders

about barriers to press freedom, offering actionable solutions to enhance media independence and its role in democratic governance. By exploring how Radio Phoenix navigates financial pressures, political interference, and regulatory constraints, the research provides a lens to evaluate how private media can sustain its watchdog role while maintaining editorial independence.

The study also contributes to academic discourse by addressing the limited research on private media dynamics in Zambia. It bridges gaps in understanding the interplay between economic, political, and ownership factors influencing press freedom in developing countries. For media practitioners, the research offers practical strategies to mitigate challenges while preserving journalistic integrity. Policymakers can leverage its recommendations to create supportive regulations that uphold media independence, while civil society groups and the public can use its findings to advocate for stronger protections for press freedom, ensuring a more informed citizenry and a resilient democratic process.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

This study applies the Social Responsibility Theory of the Press to examine how external pressures—such as financial constraints and political interference—affect press freedom in Zambia's private media sector. Rooted in the mid-20th-century work of the Hutchins Commission, this theory posits that while the media should remain independent of government control, it carries a duty to serve the public interest through accurate, fair, and ethical journalism. Media organizations are viewed as both businesses and democratic institutions with a responsibility to uphold public good (McQuail, 2010).

In Zambia, private media face unique challenges in balancing financial survival with ethical reporting. Social Responsibility Theory provides a framework to explore whether private outlets, such as Radio Phoenix, can genuinely serve the public interest while relying on advertising revenue and navigating political pressures. Additionally, the role of regulatory frameworks, like those enforced by Zambia's Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA), is examined. While regulators are tasked with promoting ethical journalism, research suggests their actions often stifle press freedom, particularly during politically sensitive periods (Chanda & Simutanyi, 2019). This study uses Social Responsibility Theory to assess how private media organizations balance financial imperatives and ethical responsibilities, analyzing whether regulation fosters responsible journalism or perpetuates self-censorship and repression.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Overview

The degree of press freedom practiced in private media organizations is heavily influenced by various factors, including the broader socio-political and economic environment in which they operate. While press freedom is vital for maintaining a vibrant democratic society, private media organizations often find themselves balancing between maintaining editorial independence and dealing with the financial realities of operating in competitive markets. This dynamic is particularly visible in many African countries, where private media struggle to navigate

external pressures from political actors, advertisers, and regulatory bodies.

Mpuang (2018) investigated the relationship between media ownership and press freedom in the country's private media organizations. His study revealed that private media outlets owned by large conglomerates were often restricted in their editorial independence due to internal pressures from ownership. Mpuang found that editors in these organizations were frequently instructed to downplay or avoid stories that could negatively impact the financial or political interests of their owners.

A comparative study by Mugari (2021) on press freedom in Southern Africa indicated that media outlets in countries like Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Malawi share similar challenges in practicing true press freedom. Mugari's research revealed that despite different political contexts, private media across these nations struggle with issues of ownership concentration, financial dependency, and regulatory constraints.

In Uganda, Mulondo (2019) explored the influence of media ownership on press freedom in private radio stations. The study revealed that ownership concentration in the hands of politically affiliated individuals heavily impacted the editorial direction of private media. In Bangladesh, the situation is similar. Hasan (2020) studied the financial challenges facing private media outlets in Bangladesh and found that many private media houses rely on government advertising contracts for a substantial portion of their revenue. As a result, these media outlets are often reluctant to criticize the government, fearing that they will lose their primary source of funding. Hasan found that 60% of private media outlets in Bangladesh reported some level of self-censorship due to their financial dependence on government advertising. This financial vulnerability creates a situation where private media are effectively incentivized to align their reporting with government interests, limiting the scope of independent journalism.

Financial constraints are another major challenge facing private media organizations, particularly in countries where advertising revenue is limited or controlled by a few powerful players. Many private media outlets rely heavily on advertising revenue to remain financially viable, and this dependence often leads to compromises in editorial freedom. In Kenya, Maina (2019) ^[30] found that private media outlets, including Nation Media Group and Standard Group, face significant financial pressure from advertisers, many of whom are large corporations or government entities. Maina's research revealed that 65% of private media outlets in Kenya reported modifying their editorial content to avoid offending key advertisers, particularly on issues related to corruption or political scandals. This economic dependency makes it difficult for private media to report independently, as they must balance the need for financial survival with their journalistic responsibilities.

Journalists working for private media are often targeted for violence, particularly when covering politically sensitive issues. Mukandanga (2020) ^[31] reported that in Rwanda, private media journalists are frequently harassed, threatened, and in some cases, detained by security forces for covering government criticism or human rights abuses. This culture of intimidation creates an environment of fear, where journalists avoid reporting on controversial topics, leading to a diminished capacity for media to serve as a watchdog. Another significant challenge is the lack of financial

diversification within private media. Many media outlets depend on a narrow range of income sources, typically advertising or government contracts, which leaves them vulnerable to economic pressures. Kamanga (2021) noted that in Malawi, private media often depend on government advertising, and this reliance means that they avoid reporting critically on government activities to maintain financial support. This financial dependency compromises editorial independence, as private media outlets have to weigh the potential loss of income against their duty to report truthfully.

Rahman (2021) advocates for the establishment or reform of media regulatory bodies to ensure they operate independently of political influence. These bodies should be staffed by professionals from the media, legal, and civil society sectors who can impartially oversee media operations and address complaints without bias.

2.2 Personal critique of the literature review

Perera (2017) points out the insufficient focus on long-term sustainability for independent journalism. Much of the current research on private media offers short-term solutions, such as foreign funding or temporary grants, to address immediate threats to press freedom. However, Perera argues that more attention should be given to sustainable business models that allow private media to operate independently over the long term. This could include exploring cooperative ownership structures, nonprofit models, or hybrid revenue streams that combine subscriptions, donations, and digital advertising. Research into these alternative business models could provide a more sustainable framework for independent media, allowing them to withstand political and economic pressures without compromising editorial integrity.

2.3 Establishment of research gaps

Alemu (2018) highlights a critical gap in research concerning grassroots media in developing countries, particularly in Africa. Alemu argues that much of the academic focus has been on large, national private media outlets, neglecting the smaller, community-based organizations that serve rural or marginalized areas. These local media outlets often operate under unique pressures, including limited financial resources, local political interference, and community expectations. Alemu stresses that grassroots media play a crucial role in ensuring that underrepresented voices are heard, yet they face more intense challenges related to financial stability and editorial independence compared to their national counterparts. Addressing this gap would provide a more holistic understanding of how press freedom operates at different levels of media production.

3. Research Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design, integrating both qualitative and quantitative approaches to thoroughly examine the effectiveness of press freedom at Radio Phoenix in Zambia. Employing a case study approach enables an in-depth exploration of the complexities surrounding editorial independence, internal processes, and the external pressures shaping journalistic practices (Creswell, J. W. 2014) ^[17].

The target population for this research comprises journalists, editors, and management personnel at Radio Phoenix. A

purposive sampling strategy ensures that participants are information-rich, while a sample size of 75 respondents provides diverse perspectives, thereby enhancing the depth and credibility of the findings. Data collection involves the use of both primary and secondary sources. Primary data is gathered through semi-structured interviews with key informants and questionnaires administered to media practitioners, facilitating the capture of qualitative insights and quantitative data on perceptions of press freedom. Secondary data is sourced from internal documents, editorial guidelines, and previously conducted studies on media freedom in Zambia. Thematic analysis is employed for qualitative data to identify emerging patterns and themes, while descriptive and inferential statistics are used for quantitative data, ensuring a robust interpretation of the results.

Triangulation is utilized to bolster the validity and reliability of the research by cross-verifying findings from multiple sources and methods. All ethical considerations, including informed consent, confidentiality measures, and approval from relevant institutional review boards, are strictly adhered to. This comprehensive, structured, and ethically sound methodology ensures that the investigation provides a nuanced and credible assessment of press freedom at Radio Phoenix.

4. Research Findings and Discussions

4.1 Presentations of results based Demographic Information




Fig 4.1: Gender Distribution of Respondents

Fig 4.1 illustrates the gender distribution of the 75 respondents. Out of the total, 42 respondents (56%) are male, while 33 (44%) are female.

Table 4.2: Age Distribution

Variable	Observations (Obs)	Mean	Standard Deviation (Std. Dev.)	Minimum (Min)	Maximum (Max)
Age	75	38.07	11.57	21	59

As shown in Table 4.2, the respondents' ages range from 21 to 59 years, with an average age of 38.07 years and a standard deviation of 11.57 years.




Fig 4.3: Highest Level of Education

In Fig 4.3, the educational qualifications of the respondents are detailed. The largest group holds a Bachelor's degree, representing 39 respondents (52%). Following this, 12 respondents (16%) have a Diploma or Certificate, and 10 respondents (13.33%) completed their highest education at the high school diploma level. Additionally, 7 respondents (9.33%) each hold a Master's degree or a Doctorate.




Fig 4.4: Position in the Organization

Fig 4.4 displays the roles of respondents within their organizations. The highest proportion of respondents, 17 individuals (22.67%), identify as Journalists or Reporters, while 15 respondents (20%) are News Anchors. Other positions include Producers (12 respondents, 16%), Managers (11 respondents, 14.67%), and Administrative Staff (8 respondents, 10.67%). Editors and Technical Staff are represented by 6 respondents each (8%).




Fig 4.5: Department

Fig 4.5 shows the departmental affiliation of the respondents. The News Department has the highest representation, with 25 respondents (33.33%). Programming follows with 14 respondents (18.67%), while the Human Resources, Marketing, and Technical departments each comprise 12 respondents (16%).

4.2 Presentations of results based on the Degree of Press Freedom Practiced in Private Media Organizations.




Fig 4.6: Rating of Press Freedom

Fig 4.6 captures respondents' perceptions of press freedom in Zambia. A significant number, 28 respondents (37.33%), rate press freedom as "Poor," while an additional 13 respondents (17.33%) consider it "Very Poor." Collectively,

these negative assessments constitute 54.66% of the responses, suggesting that over half of the media professionals surveyed feel that press freedom in Zambia is limited. Meanwhile, 12 respondents (16%) rate press freedom as "Excellent," and 9 respondents (12%) rate it as "Good," amounting to 28% with a favorable view.




Fig 4.7: Covering Certain Issues or Events

In Fig 4.7, the data reveal that 54 respondents (72%) have experienced discouragement from covering specific issues or events, while 21 respondents (28%) report not having faced such discouragement.




Fig 4.8: Reasons Provided for Discouragement

For those discouraged from covering certain issues, Fig 4.8 details the reasons given. The most frequently cited reason, mentioned by 19 respondents (35.19%), is a "Fear of backlash from powerful entities," indicating concerns about repercussions from influential individuals or organizations.




Fig 4.9: Instances of Story Censorship

Fig 4.9 illustrates who censors stories, according to respondents. A majority, 30 respondents (40%), report that their stories have been censored by "Owners," while 27 respondents (36%) cite "News editors" as the source of censorship. Only 18 respondents (24%) attribute censorship to "Government."




Fig 4.10: Perception of Laws Affecting Press Freedom

In Fig 4.10, 54 respondents (72%) agree that certain laws in Zambia affect press freedom, while 21 respondents (28%) do not believe this to be the case.




Fig 4.11: Experienced threats or intimidation

Fig 4.11 illustrates the extent to which respondents have experienced threats or intimidation as a result of their reporting activities. A substantial majority, 25 respondents (33.33%), reported experiencing such threats "Sometimes," while 15 respondents (20.00%) indicated they have faced threats "Rarely."




Fig 4.12: Organization's policies protect journalists

The Table explores respondents' perceptions of how well their organization's policies protect journalists who report on sensitive or controversial topics. The data suggests that a significant number of journalists lack confidence in their organization's ability to safeguard them when tackling challenging stories, which may deter them from engaging in investigative journalism or reporting on controversial issues.




Fig 4.13: Practice of Self-Censorship

Fig 4.13 explores the prevalence of self-censorship among respondents. A majority, 45 respondents (60%), admit to practicing self-censorship, whereas 30 respondents (40%) report not engaging in this practice.




Fig 4.14: Frequency of Self-Censorship Due to Anticipated Reactions

Fig 4.14 examines how often respondents engage in self-censorship due to anticipated organizational or external reactions. A substantial number, 19 respondents (25.33%), indicated that they "Sometimes" engage in self-censorship, while 18 respondents (24%) do so "Rarely." Conversely, 14 respondents (18.67%) reported "Always" practicing self-censorship, whereas 11 respondents (14.67%) said they do so "Often." Only 13 respondents (17.33%) claim to "Never" engage in self-censorship.




Fig 4.15: Internal policies

Fig 4.15 explores the extent to which internal policies support or hinder the ability to practice press freedom. A striking 38 respondents (50.67%) feel that internal policies "Strongly Hinder" their ability to operate freely, while 8 respondents (10.67%) believe policies "Somewhat Hinder" their practices. In contrast, only 9 respondents (12%) feel that policies "Somewhat Support" press freedom, and 10 respondents (13.33%) think they "Strongly Support" it.




Fig 4.16: Pressure to Produce Content Quickly

Fig 4.16 examines whether the pressure to produce content quickly affects the quality and depth of reporting. A significant number, 33 respondents (44%), report that this pressure "Significantly Affects" their work, while 16

respondents (21.33%) say it "Somewhat Affects" it. Only 6 respondents (8%) claim it "Does Not Affect" their reporting.



Fig 4.17: Access to Resources for Story Exploration

Fig 4.17 explores respondents' access to necessary resources for fully exploring the stories they cover. A notable 24 respondents (32%) reported "Rarely" having access to such resources. The data indicates that many journalists face challenges in obtaining the resources needed for comprehensive reporting, which may hinder their ability to produce high-quality, well-researched stories.

4.3 Presentations of results based on the Challenges That Private Media Organizations Face in the Application of Press Freedom




Fig 4.18: Internal Factors Limiting Press Freedom

Fig 4.18 identifies the internal factors that respondents feel limit press freedom within their organizations. Together, these internal barriers depict a workplace environment where fears and unclear policies may stifle journalistic autonomy.




Fig 4.19: External Factors Threatening Press Freedom

Fig 4.19 explores external threats to press freedom. The most significant external factor, identified by 25 respondents (33.33%), is "Government censorship," reflecting a strong perception that governmental influence poses the greatest challenge to independent reporting. These external pressures

highlight the precarious nature of working in private media, where legal and physical threats add to the complexity of pursuing journalistic independence.




Fig 4.20: Legal Action Due to Reporting




Fig 4.21: Justifiability of Legal Action

For those who experienced legal action, Fig 4.21 indicates whether it was perceived as justifiable. Of the 47 respondents involved in legal proceedings, 25 (53.19%) felt the action was "Justifiable," while 22 respondents (46.81%) deemed it "Unjustifiable."




Fig 4.22: Impact of Legal Action on Future Reporting Decisions

Fig 4.22 examines the impact of legal action on future reporting. Among the 43 respondents who have experienced legal action, 14 respondents (32.56%) reported that it "Significantly" influenced their future reporting decisions, while another 14 respondents (32.56%) stated that it affected them "Somewhat." Meanwhile, 15 respondents (34.88%) said it did not affect their reporting.

4.4 Presentations of results based the Impact of Ownership, Editorial Policies, and External Pressures on Press Freedom In Private Media Organizations.




Fig 4.23: Influence of Ownership Structure on Editorial Decisions

According to Fig 4.23, a majority of respondents, 47 individuals (62.67%), report that the ownership structure of their station influences editorial decisions, while 28 respondents (37.33%) feel it does not.




Fig 4.24: Ownership Influence on Editorial Content

Fig 4.24 explores whether respondents feel ownership influences editorial content to reflect personal or business interests. These findings highlight that over half of respondents feel editorial content is not always driven solely by journalistic standards, but rather by the interests of ownership, which could impact the objectivity and trustworthiness of reporting.




Fig 4.25: Editorial Policies and Protection of Journalistic Integrity

In Fig 4.25, the data show that a majority, 40 respondents (53.33%), "Disagree" that editorial policies are designed to protect journalistic integrity over business interests, while 6 respondents (8%) "Strongly Disagree." Only 10 respondents (13.33%) "Agree" with this statement, and 5 respondents (6.67%) "Strongly Agree," while 14 respondents (18.67%) remain "Neutral."




Fig 4.26: External Attempts to Influence Editorial Content

Fig 4.26 examines whether external entities (such as advertisers or political groups) attempt to influence editorial content. This frequent influence from external entities reflects the challenges faced by private media organizations

in resisting outside attempts to shape content, which may impede the practice of independent journalism.




Fig 4.27: Conflicts of Interest Between Advertising and Editorial Content

Fig 4.27 assesses the presence and enforcement of policies on conflicts of interest between advertising and editorial content. These responses point to a need for clear, enforced policies to uphold editorial integrity and avoid potential conflicts between revenue and content.




Fig 4.28: Importance of Separating Ownership Interests from Editorial Decisions

Fig 4.28 examines the perceived importance of separating ownership interests from editorial decisions. This divergence suggests that while many advocate for editorial autonomy, some may feel ownership influence is an inevitable or even beneficial aspect of media operations.



Fig 4.29: Training and Resources to Support Press Freedom

Fig 4.29 explores the types of training or resources respondents believe would help uphold press freedom in their work.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1 Conclusion

This study assessed the effectiveness of press freedom in Zambia's private media sector, focusing on the challenges faced by Radio Phoenix and Christian Voice in Lusaka. It emphasized the critical role of press freedom as a foundation for democracy and accountability, while identifying the

internal and external pressures that impact journalistic independence. The literature review revealed systemic issues such as ownership interests, regulatory constraints, and insufficient protections for journalists, which often compromise the media's mission. By employing a structured case study approach, involving 75 media management professionals, the study provided a detailed understanding of how ownership, editorial policies, and external influences shape press freedom within private media organizations in Zambia.

The findings highlighted significant constraints, including internal factors like unclear editorial guidelines and fear of job loss, alongside external pressures such as government censorship, financial dependency, and legal challenges. Despite some improvements noted by respondents, substantial obstacles remain that hinder journalists' ability to work independently. Ownership influence was identified as a key factor affecting content, often aligning reporting with business or personal interests. These findings underscore the urgent need for stronger legal protections, transparent editorial policies, and financial diversification to safeguard journalistic integrity. The recommendations in the next section aim to address these challenges, offering actionable steps for strengthening press freedom and fostering a more independent and accountable media environment in Zambia.

5.2 Recommendation

To foster a stronger environment of press freedom in Zambia's private media sector, this study recommends strategic actions focused on legal protections, editorial transparency, financial independence, and capacity building. Robust legal safeguards should be implemented to protect journalists from lawsuits, harassment, and censorship, empowering them to pursue stories of public interest without fear. Transparent and consistently applied editorial guidelines, overseen by independent boards, can reduce self-censorship and address conflicts of interest between ownership and editorial content, promoting unbiased reporting. Financial independence is critical to minimizing external pressures; media organizations are encouraged to diversify revenue streams through grants, partnerships, and audience-driven funding models to reduce reliance on advertisers or sponsors with conflicting interests. Continuous training programs are also vital, equipping journalists with skills in ethics, legal frameworks, and stress management to navigate professional challenges effectively. Encouraging a culture of whistleblowing can further ensure accountability and uphold journalistic standards. These recommendations aim to strengthen the integrity and independence of Zambia's private media, contributing to a freer, more resilient press and fostering a supportive environment for independent journalism.

6. References

1. Banda Abdulrahman S. Press Freedom in Sudan's Transitional Government: Challenges for Private Media. *Journal of African Media Studies*. 2020; 14(2):35-50.
2. Adjavon L. The Role of International Organizations in Protecting Press Freedom in Togo. *West African Media and International Relations Journal*. 2018; 8(3):22-37.
3. Banda F. An Appraisal of the Applicability of Development Journalism in the Context of Public Service Broadcasting in Zambia. *Media, Culture &*

- Society. 2004; 26(5):693-712.
4. Banda F. *Citizen Journalism & Democracy in Africa*. Grahamstown: Highway Africa, 2010.
 5. Banda F, Mwansa C. *Challenges of Editorial Independence in Zambia's Private Media*. Lusaka: Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA), 2019.
 6. Banda F, Mwansa C. *Media Independence in Zambia: Challenges and Opportunities for Private Media*. Lusaka University Press, 2019.
 7. Bangura A. Challenges of Private Media in Post-Conflict Sierra Leone. *Journal of African Media and Conflict Studies*. 2021; 9(1):27-41.
 8. Bowen GA. Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*. 2009; 9(2):27-40.
 9. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2006; 3(2):77-101.
 10. Chanda A. *Challenges Facing Press Freedom in Zambia's Private Media*. Lusaka: University of Zambia Press, 2019.
 11. Chanda K. Political Interference and Press Freedom in Zambia's Private Media. *African Media Studies Journal*. 2017; 12(4):45-61.
 12. Chanda R. Political Interference in Zambian Private Media During Election Cycles. *MISA Zambia Report*. 2019; 12(4):18-30.
 13. Chikankheni J. The Role of Private Media in Promoting Democratic Governance in Malawi. *Southern African Media Review*. 2020; 11(4):18-29.
 14. Chirwa C, Mulenga M. Media Ownership and Editorial Independence in Zambia's Private Media. *African Journalism Studies*. 2015; 39(4):99-117.
 15. Chirwa E, Mulenga T. Regulatory Pressures and Press Freedom in Zambian Private Media. *Media Regulation Journal*. 2020; 10(2):25-40.
 16. Chirwa M, Mulenga S. The Role of Regulatory Bodies in Limiting Press Freedom in Zambia: A Case of the Independent Broadcasting Authority. *Zambian Journal of Communication Studies*. 2020; 8(2):32-47.
 17. Creswell JW. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, 2014.
 18. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, 2018.
 19. Curran J, Seaton J. *Power without Responsibility: The Press, Broadcasting, and New Media in Britain*. Routledge, 2010.
 20. Da Silva P. Press Freedom in Angola's Private Media Sector: Challenges and Realities. *Lusophone Media Journal*. 2019; 8(3):44-59.
 21. Denzin NK. *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. McGraw-Hill, 1978.
 22. Diouf A. Private Media Ownership and Editorial Control in Senegal. *West African Media Studies Review*. 2021; 13(1):19-34.
 23. Djebbar A. Government-Imposed Restrictions on Press Freedom in Algeria's Private Media. *North African Media Review*. 2011; 10(2):52-66.
 24. El Mansouri H. Navigating Press Freedom in Morocco's Private Media. *Moroccan Media Studies Journal*. 2019; 7(2):28-42.
 25. Field A. *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, 2013.
 26. Freedom House. *Freedom in the World 2021: Zambia*, 2021. Retrieved from: <https://freedomhouse.org>
 27. Freedom House. *Freedom of the Press 2021: Zambia Country Report*, 2021. Retrieved from: www.freedomhouse.org
 28. Hutchins RM. *A Free and Responsible Press: A General Report on Mass Communication: Newspapers, Radio, Motion Pictures, Magazines, and Books*. University of Chicago Press, 1947.
 29. International Press Institute (IPI). *Zambia: Media Freedom Deteriorating*, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://ipi.media/zambia-media-freedom-deteriorating>
 30. Maina J. Financial Pressures and Editorial Independence in Kenya's Private Media: A Case of Nation Media Group and Standard Group. *Kenyan Journal of Media Studies*. 2019; 12(3):45-60.
 31. Mukandanga F. Harassment and Intimidation of Journalists in Rwanda's Private Media. *East African Media Review*. 2020; 11(2):18-33.
 32. Kamanga D. Balancing Editorial Independence and Financial Sustainability in Malawi's Private Media. *Malawi Media Journal*. 2021; 14(3):16-30.
 33. Kamanga D. Balancing Editorial Independence and Financial Sustainability in Malawi's Private Media. *Malawi Media Journal*. 2021; 14(3):16-30.
 34. Kambale J. Private Media in Conflict Zones: The Case of the Central African Republic. *African Conflict Journalism Journal*. 2021; 7(2):28-42.