

## **DIALOGUE, NARCISSISTIC MENTALITY, AND THE NIGER DELTA CRISIS**

**Fred A. Amadi (PhD)\***

Senior Lecturer in Mass Communication at the Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Nkpolu, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

---

**ABSTRACT:** *The crisis in Nigeria's Niger Delta rages on. This is despite the fact that different dialogue events have, over the years, been staged to resolve the crisis. The resilience of the crisis and the apparent failure, so far, to solve the crisis by means of dialogue necessitates the need to, as in this paper, examine why dialogue has remained ineffective in the effort to resolve the crisis. The examination is conducted qualitatively. Samples of discourse about the Niger Delta crisis were subjected to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Analysis found that the social mentality in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria is contaminated with narcissism to a degree where interest-bartering stifles the potentials of dialogue to resolve crisis. Conclusion recommends that if the elites of the Niger Delta region of Nigeria are sincere about using dialogue to resolve the crisis, they must free dialogues about the crisis from ideological manipulation.*

**KEYWORDS:** Dialogue, Narcissistic Mentality, Niger Delta Crisis

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Dialogue is a component of discourse. The link between the two is subtle. The subtlety is the reason many overrate the promise of dialogue in social affairs. As part of discourse, many scholars (Gouldner, 1976; Fairclough, 2001 & 2003) believe that dialogue wield positive influence on peace, education, industrial relation, architectural design and so forth. It might not be easy to disprove these claims. But to uncritically attribute these potentials to dialogue without considering the negative influence of discourse on dialogue is to wallow in naivety.

Every culture has its "discourse modalities" (Machin, 2002, p.45). These modalities are imposed. Fairclough (2001, p.73) affirms when he wrote that meaning in discourse is "conditioned either by the victories or defeats of past power struggles." Toynbee (2006, p.160) concurs when she wrote that discourse activities, including media texts, "misrepresent reality in the interest of power." Discourse happens in the social units that make up human societies. When two persons strike up friendship, such relationship becomes a social unit. There other social units – husband and wife and their children, religious institutions, corporate organizations, states, countries and so on. In every social unit, discourse is patterned to conform to the interest of the most powerful members of the unit. When dialogue is enacted for public good, such dialogue fails if the cause it promotes is seen by the powerful as inconsistent with their interest. Loh (2013) provides further insight about dialogue and practices that undermine it. Loh locates these practices in how *doxa* (Sillars & Gronbeck, 2001, p. 57; Bourdieu, 1990, p. 20) is made to operate in the society. According to Loh, *doxa* is different communities' pattern of practices and conceptual

understanding of things in ways that seem comfortable to every member of the community. This explanation underscores the affinity of *doxa* with discourse – more so when discourse (Watson, 2003, pp.50-51; O’Shaughnessy & Stadler, 2007, pp.150 & 180; Gill, 1996, p.143) is defined as “the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part” (Fairclough, 2001, p.20). Loh cites Bourdieu (1977, p.169) to highlight why *doxa* is perpetuated to either sideline or transform mavericks. According to Bourdieu “the dominant classes have an interest in defending and shaping the integrity of *doxa*.” Dominant classes’ defense of *doxa* forbids dialogues that are not in line with the interest of the dominant class (Loh, 2013).

### **The Problem**

Despite the resilience of the crisis in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, many (Ogbondah, 2005; Onojovwo, 2008) believe that dialogue could resolve the crisis. Beyond the Niger Delta crisis, there is ongoing debate in Nigeria as to whether dialogue could be a panacea to the wider ills that afflict Nigeria (Adeyemo, 2013; Alechenu, Obe, Akasike, Josiah, 2013; Aruleba, 2013). If the crisis in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria is used as a measure, the hope that dialogue could be used to solve the crisis in Nigeria might be a false one. It might be false because the crisis in the Niger Delta is festering (Folaranmi, 2013) despite the attempts that have been made to use dialogue to resolve it. This paper examines the fault lines that might account for why dialogues about the Niger Delta crisis has so far failed to lay the crisis to rest.

### **Niger Delta Region and Narcissistic Mentality**

There is, at least, one thing that dialogues about the crisis in the Niger Delta have achieved. Intervention agencies like the defunct Oil Mineral Producing Area Development Commission (OMPADEC) and the current Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC) are established as a result of dialogues about the crisis. Even the creation of new states in the region results from dialogues about the crisis in the Niger Delta. These intervention measures miss a critical point. The establishment of intervention agencies and the creation of states are measures that address the crisis from the standpoint of Nigeria’s federal government. The intervention agencies were established in a way that did not factor in what the ordinary folks of the area crave. The cravings of the ordinary folks of the area is encapsulated in a question an ordinary citizen from Ogoni land, the heart of the Niger Delta, asked in 2005 during a conference on the Niger Delta crisis organized by Nigerian Guild of Editors. The question was directed at Onyema Ugochukwu, a former chairman of OMPADEC. The ordinary Ogoni folk wanted the former chairman to explain why ordinary folks from oil-bearing communities would not be allowed by riot police personnel to gain access to the commission’s premises except persons that are well-connected. Notwithstanding the security rationalizations that were mouthed as the answer to the question, the question demonstrates the hollowness of establishing intervention institutions as measures of addressing the Niger Delta crisis. The question asked by the Ogoni folk premises the existence, in the region, of a kind of democratic despotism that denies citizens the ability to participate in what they have a stake in. In the view of Tocqueville, as cited by Tucker (1998), when a citizen is denied such ability, the citizen feels atomized to a degree that makes it impossible for the citizen to feel she/he still has a worthy attachment to the ethos of public good and virtue.

There is an obsession amongst the ‘connected, of the Niger Delta. The display of wealth in a fashion that glorifies selfishness and vain individualism is on the rise in the Niger Delta. It is on the rise amid majority that is ravaged by poverty. This hedonistic attitude aggravates the feeling of alienation amongst the atomized citizens of the Niger Delta. “Narcissistic mentality” (Tocqueville in Tucker, 1998. p. 158) is expressed in hedonism. Hedonism itself is expressed in exaggerated love of self. When hedonism coalesces into exaggerated love of self, such anomaly makes the perpetrators that promote it to connect everything to themselves. The anomaly also goads the perpetrators into seeing the world and people outside their close circle of friends as dangerous. This feeling makes it difficult for the perpetrators of hedonism to dispense opportunities and favors on merit. The failure or unwillingness to dispense opportunities/favors on merit elicits more hostility from atomized citizens. It does so because atomization forces citizens into a state of general indifference. Being in a state of indifference compels atomized citizens to value things that are injurious to public decorum and etiquette as normal.

### **Dialoguing in a Setting Suffused with Narcissistic Mentality**

The question the Ogoni folk asked implies a tacit indictment. That question pragmatically states that the intervention institutions in the Niger Delta are not there to serve the interest of the ordinary citizens of the region but to promote the interest of the connected. Tucker (1998) cites Jurgen Habermas to demonstrate why attempts at using dialogue to check restiveness in a situation like the one in Nigeria’s Niger Delta gets compromised by the culture of corporatist bargaining and interest-bartering. Tucker believes that one deleterious effect that corporatist bargaining wields in dialogue is depriving the procedure the verve of critical rationality. According to Habermas, (2001, p.200), (Kunczik, 1995, p.217) and (Gripsrud, 2002, p.238) when dialoguing is deprived of the vitality of critical rationality, such deprivation makes a dialogue-proceeding to resemble “*refeudalized* public sphere.” To be certain, a *refeudalized* public sphere exists, according to Habermas, where interests – be they political, private or corporate – seek public legitimation or acceptance in a way that tends to shield the legitimation process from the rigors of an open critical debate.

When a dialogue situation resembles proceedings of a *refeudalized* public sphere, it means that advantaged parties in the dialogue usually force through their views without allowing the crucible of critical and rigorous open debate to legitimize such views. When views are forced in manners akin to that of *refeudalized* public sphere, the parties that are forced to accept the uncontested view usually bottles up its frustration/helplessness with a tacit resolve to sabotage any supposed agreement that might accrue from the dialogue. This reality is amongst the challenges of using dialogue to solve the Niger Delta crisis.

### **The Mass Media and the Flaw of Therapeutic Discourse**

When the examination of why dialogue has so far failed to solve the Niger Delta crisis is subjected to critical analysis, the Nigerian mass media will not escape censure. Critical analysis could implicate Nigeria’s media of trading critical rationality for dissemination of images of power and wealth in the effort to use dialogue to solve the Niger Delta crisis. Gripsrud, (2002)

brims with insight on how a media system that is obsessed with the dissemination of images of vanity fails in the duty of utilizing dialogue to solve problems. Gripsrud's (2002, pp.238; 252) analysis of mass media's public sphere is instructive here. According to him, mass media's public sphere is no longer a space where rational discourse spawns the formation of public policy and opinion but an arena where opinions and policy decisions taken behind the scenes by selected party minions and their corporate executive conspirators are displayed in a fashion, wittingly/unwittingly, designed to give transparency illusion to the gullible masses. This line of reasoning compels Gripsrud to argue that all the parliamentary debates in assemblies are not real but publicity stunts used by the media, wittingly/unwittingly, to help the powerful disguise their power to make important public policies in secret.

### **Exemplars of Media's Therapeutic Discourse in the Niger Delta**

To be sure, mass media (re)presentations are adjudged therapeutic when they are structured by some arcane corporate interest than when they are structured by the ethos of seeking the truth and telling it, unbiased, undiluted, to power holders (Tucker, 1998, p. 169f; Habermas, 2001, p. 200). The media texts displayed in the Text-Box below are sampled because they are adjudged as exemplars of therapeutic discourse. They are also sampled in a manner that is consistent with the procedure of sourcing data in qualitative research. It should be stated that the qualitative method of conducting Social Science research "involves procedures that result in rich, descriptive, contextually-situated data based on people's spoken or written words and observable behavior" (King, 1996, p. 175). It should also be noted that what constitutes data in qualitative research ranges from "talk, gestures and sentences" (Lindlof and Taylor, 2002, pp. 4 & 18) to "anything that the researcher could observe or capture, be it one-word quotation or a lengthy story-like quotation" (Keyton, 2001, p. 70). It is generally agreed that what matters when using these things as data is the "meaning the researcher can use them to construct" (Lindlof and Taylor, 2002, pp. 4 & 18). Another reason I used the newspaper texts in the text-box as data is because the persons who uttered those words uttered them without knowing the words would be used as data in this paper. This simple reason enhances the data quality of the texts given the fact that the texts are free from researched or subject-reactivity (Lang and Lang, 1991, p. 195).

### **METHOD OF TEXTUAL ANALYSIS**

My construction of explanation with the textual data drew on both "researcher construction" and "subjective valuing" (Keyton, 2001, p. 70). These two approaches of deconstructing or interpreting textual data emphasize the use of subjective introspection in writing up what the author or researcher has gleaned from the texts. In using subjective insight, I "attributed a class of phenomenon to segments of the texts (Fielding & Lee, 1998, p. 41). Scholars of the qualitative community (Meyers, 2009, p.166) agree that drawing on various analytic tools like Hermeneutics, Semiotics and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) gives a fruitful foothold on data analysis. This is more so in the light of the fact that there is no off-the-shelf approach to qualitative data analysis. The standard procedure of qualitative data analysis is custom-built and "choreographed" according to the task in hand. The pass word is learn by doing" – meaning that it is intuitive and iterative (Creswell, 2007, p.150).

### **Validity Concerns**

In order to avoid the mistake of substituting the criteria for assessing validity in qualitative research for the ones used in quantitative approach, it is considered necessary at this point to state scholars' take on issues bordering on assessment of validity in qualitative research. Scholars, (Keyton, 2001, P. 72; Maxwell, 1996, P. 86; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, P. 209f) are unanimous in stating that the criteria of reliability and validity were initially developed for quantitative research method. They also state that qualitative researchers view these concepts differently. In articulating her view respecting how qualitative researchers account for validity, Keyton (2001, P. 72) states:

**Rather than focusing on what is found, most qualitative researchers focus on the reliability and validity of the techniques or process used in collecting and analyzing data. In qualitative research, validity is achieved when the written account or description represents accurately the features of the communication observed.**

Wainwright (1997) says the same thing but in another style. According to him,

**At the heart of the qualitative approach is the assumption that a piece of qualitative research is influenced by the researcher's individual attributes and perspective. The goal is not to produce a standardized set of results that any other careful researcher in the same situation or studying the same issues would have produced. Rather it is to produce a coherent and illuminating description of and perspectives on a situation that is based on and consistent with detailed study of the situation**

In disclosing that many qualitative researchers doubt the existence of 'reality' Maxwell (1996, P. 86) states that validity is a goal rather than a product. According to him, validity in research is a relative goal. He insists that validity has to be assessed in relation to the purposes of a research rather than being seen as a context-independent property of methods and conclusions. Maxwell argues further that "validity threats are made implausible by evidence not methods" insisting therefore that "methods are only a way of getting evidence (data) that help a researcher rule out validity threat" (Maxwell, pp. 86 – 87). To strengthen this view, Maxwell (1996, pp. 87 – 88) stresses that "we don't need an observer-independent gold standard to which we can compare our accounts to see if they are valid. All we require is the possibility of testing these accounts against the world – giving the phenomenon that we are trying to understand a chance to prove us wrong." Polkinghorne (2007, p. 474) also reports that "validity is a function of inter-subjective judgment. According to him, validity "depends on a consensus within a community."

**Text Box 1: Exemplars of the therapeutic media discourse**

S/No	Nigerian newspapers	Exemplars	Date
1	<i>Guardian</i>	<b>Our Northern brothers tried to mislead the conference by requesting to know how monies allocated to the States of the Niger Delta Region had been used (p.8)</b>	13/7/05
2	<i>Punch</i>	<b>We own the resources, so we don't need to convince somebody how we will utilize it (p.11)</b>	10/3/05
3	<i>Punch</i>	<b>Every Nigerian must ask Niger Delta governors where the money meant to bring help to their people have gone.</b>	31/3/05
4	<i>Punch</i>	<b>Ikpatt also warned that any derivation principle that denied individuals ownership of their resources would continue to hinder stability and development in Nigeria.</b>	30/6/05

**Analytic interpretation**

To appreciate the texts displayed as data in the Text Box above requires that they be considered from the perspective of articulation theory. Articulation theory urges media practitioners to seek out connections that coordinate one reality to another when they are faced with the challenge of covering dialogue proceedings. Articulation theory links certain practices to some effect; this text to that meaning; this meaning to that reality, and this experience to those politics (Anderson & Ross, 2002, p. 222; Slack, 2004, pp.114-115). The beauty of examining newspaper text from this theoretical scope is to avert the much criticized flaw whereby the media usually gloss over contradictions that are inherent in the practices and discourses of the powerful (Fiske, 2004, p. 214; Gripsrud, 2002, pp. 35,237-238; Beharrell & Philo, 1978, p. x). It has been documented that when contradictions in the discourses of the powerful are glossed over by the mass media such inaccuracy leaves the audience with the pathology of learned helplessness (Kunczik, 1995, pp.202 & 213). Also documented is the position that when the mass media connive at contradictions; they sacrifice meaning production and proper perspective on issues on the altar of merely exhausting themselves in the process of staging meaning (Fiske, 2004, p. 219; Taylor, 2000, p. 140).

In the light of the foregoing, no analyst will fail to notice how the media connived at the flaws in the texts displayed in the above Text Box. For instance, the narcissistic views entailed in exemplars 1 and 2 typify the discourses of the powerful in the Niger Delta. The utterers of exemplars 1 and 2 are persons who occupy high positions in the system of things in the Niger Delta. The entailments of exemplars 1 and 2 stand in sharp contrast with the entailments of exemplars 3 and 4. Exemplars 3 and 4 are, of course, the views of the ordinary folks of the Niger Delta. In a setting where media practice reflect the tenets of articulation theory, the narcissistic views entailed in exemplars 1 and 2 would have warranted a broader treatment. If the newspapers that reported the narcissistic views had paid heed to the tenets of articulation theory, they would have cajoled the utterers of those views to justify their flippant retort in the context of what exemplars 3 and 4 entail.

It is important to state the context in which the elitist views of exemplars 1 and 2 were expressed.

Those views were expressed during the 2005 National Political Reform Conference in Nigeria. During the conference, it was easy for newspapers to access newsmakers for clarification. More so, the mood of the conference demanded that newspapers drop their accustomed mentality of day-topical (Kunczik, 1995, pp. 49 & 197) treatment of issues/news. A critical discourse analysis-informed reading (Fairclough, 2003; Wodak & Meyer, 2006) of the first two exemplars in the above Text Box would uncover the logic that spawned those views. The logic of corporatist interest-bartering informed the views. In a dialogue proceeding, the logic of interest-bartering stifles rational discourse (Gouldner, 1976, pp. 39 & 49; Littlejohn, 1996, p.233). The elitist views displayed in the Text Box ought to have compelled the media to engage the utterers in a debate for clarification before they published it. But the media did not do that. Such failure vindicates the belief that in a setting that brims with narcissistic mentality, the media can neither pursue and tell the truth to power holders (Habermas, 2001, p.200) nor can the media champion critical debate on public issues (Tucker,1998). If the media were interested in critical debate on public issues, at least within the context of the opportunity provided by the Reform Conference, they would have pursued to logical extreme, the ignored but popular views of exemplars 3 and 4 of the Text Box. For this article, the failure of the newspapers to give those popular views the robust treatment they deserved is interpreted as a consequence of pathology of interest bartering as induced by narcissistic mentality.

## CONCLUSION

Jurgen Habermas (Tucker, 1998) raises concern about the consequences of dialoguing under certain conditions. The recommendations of this paper are grounded on Habermas's concerns. Dialogues and/or discourses miss their target when they are not grounded on sincerity, objectivity and fairness. The data presented above demonstrate that Niger Delta dialogues are not held in atmosphere that is free from ideological (Sillars & Gronbeck, 2001) manipulation by the elites of the Niger Delta region. The use of the pronouns 'our' and 'we' in exemplars 1 and 2 in the Text Box is a case in point. When the elites of the Niger Delta imprecisely used those pronouns, their intention could hardly be far from falsely assimilating the elites to the ordinary people of the Niger Delta (Fairclough, 2001, pp.106, 148; O'Shaughnessy & Stadler, 2007, pp. 162-167). The trick in using 'we' was to confuse lay readers who cannot discern whether the 'we' was referring to the elite ruling class alone, or by such usage, the elites were referring to the ruling class plus the ordinary folks. The elites of the Niger Delta usually deploy such strategy of fudging non-existent solidarity between them and the ordinary folks.

This manner of fudging of a non-existent solidarity between elites and ordinary people during Niger Delta dialogues accounts for the reason dialogues have, so far, failed to stem the tide of violence (Folaranmi, 2013) in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. If dialogue will solve the issue of the Niger Delta, there is a need to conduct the dialogue in line with the tenets of rational discourse (Littlejohn, 1996, p. 233; Gouldner, 1976, pp. 39, 49). To be sure, *rational discourse*, Gouldner informs, is a kind of discourse that demands that a speaker's statement be challenged so that communication becomes a systematic argument that makes a special appeal to a speaker to demonstrate the validity of a claim made in a proposition. In this view, according to him, communication entails a kind of a rotating division of labor where the speaker of the moment has

a vested interest in their assumptions while the listener challenges in a manner showing also that the listener has a vested interest to challenge the assumptions made by the speaker and so on. This view resonates with the idea that communication is a process in a “constant creative flux and, therefore, cannot be *manipulated* at will” (Anderson & Ross, 2002, p. 57). Unfortunately, Nigerian elites are often opposed to this type of discourse (Oji, 2013). Discourse might solve the Niger Delta crisis only when Nigerian elites allow it to flow in the channel of rational discourse.

## REFERENCES

- Adeyemo, A. (2013, October, 4). “A test for Okorounmu’s committee.” *ThisDay*, p.16.
- Alechenu, J; Obe, E.; Akasike, C.; Josiah, O. (2013, October, 5). “Confab: we won’t accept no-go areas.” *Punch*, p.6.
- Anderson, R. & Ross, V. (2002). *Questions of communication*, 3rd edition. Boston & New York: Bedford/St. Martins.
- Aruleba, S. (2013, October, 4). “National confab: end to marriage of convenience.” *Punch*, p. 27.
- Beharrel, P. & Philo, G. (1978). (Eds.). *Trade unions and the media*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of theory of practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Longman Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Fielding, N. & Lee, R. (1998). *Computer analysis and qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fiske, J. (2004). Opening the hallway: Some remarks on the fertility of Stuart Hall's contribution to critical theory. In D. Morley & K. H. Chen (Eds.), *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (pp.212-220) London: Routledge.
- Folaranmi, F. (2013, October, 23). “Movement for the emancipation of the Niger Delta claim responsibility; declares hurricane exodus.” *DailySun* pp. 1& 11
- Gill, R. (1996). Discourse analysis: practical implementation. In John T.E. Robinson (Ed.) *Handbook of qualitative research methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*, (pp.141-156). Garsinton Road, Oxford, UK; BPS Blackwell.
- Gouldner, A. (1976). *The dialectics of ideology and technology*, 1st edition. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Gripsrud, J. (2002). *Understanding media culture*. London: Arnold.
- Habermas, J. (2001). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*, 12th edition. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Keyton, J. (2001). *Communication research*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- King, E. (1996). The use of the self in qualitative research. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for Psychology and Social Sciences* (pp. 175-188). Garsington Road, Oxford, Uk: BPS Blackwell.



- Kunczik, M. (1995). *Concepts of journalism North and South*. Bonn: Friedrich Ebert Foundation.
- Lang, K. and Lang, G.E. (1991). Studying events in their natural settings. In K. Jensen and N. Jankowski (Eds), *A handbook of qualitative Mythologies for mass communication research* (pp. 193-215). London: Rutledge.
- Lindlof, T. & Taylor, B. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Littlejohn, S. (1996). *Theories of human communication*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Toronto: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Loh, J. (2013). Inquiry into issues of trustworthiness and quality in narrative studies: A perspective. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(65), 1-15. Accessed on August 28 2013 from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR18/loh65.pdf>
- Machin, D. (2002). *Ethnographic research for media studies*. New York: Arnold.
- Maxwell, J. (1996). *Qualitative research design: an interactive approach*. London: Sage Publications.
- Myers, M.D. (2009). *Qualitative research in business & management*. London: Sage Publications.
- Myers, M. (1997). Qualitative research in information system. <http://vrw-%v.qual.auckland.ac.nz/> Retrieved September 2007.
- Ogbondah, C. (2005). The role of the press in conflict resolution: A critical analysis of the Niger Delta crisis. A paper presented at the Nigerian Guild of Editors Seminar, Port Harcourt, November 24.
- Oji, G. (2013, October, 23). "Call for sovereign confab, invitation to anarchy – Ekweremandu." *National Mirror*, p. 13.
- Onojovwo, D. (2008, July 16). "Niger Delta: still preparing to talk". *Punch*, p. 4.
- O'Shaughnessy, M. and Stadler, J. (2007). *Media and society: an introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (2007). Validity issues in narrative research. *Qualitative inquiry* 13(4), 471-486.
- Sillars, M. & Gronbeck, B. (2001). *Communication criticism*. Illinois: Weaveland Press Inc.
- Slack, J. (2004). Theory and method of articulation in cultural studies. In D. Morley & K. H. Chen (Eds.), *Critical dialogue in cultural studies*, (pp.112-127). London: Routledge.
- Taylor, J. (2000, February). Problems in photojournalism: realism, the nature of news and the humanitarian narrative. *Journalism studies*, 1(1), 129-144.
- Toynbee, J. (2006). The politics of representation. In M. Gillepsie and J. Toynbee (Ed.), *Analyzing media texts*. (pp.157-186). Berkshire, England: McGraw Hill.
- Tucker, K. (1998). *Anthony Giddens and modern social theory*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wainwright, D. (1997). Can sociological research be qualitative, critical and valid? *The qualitative report* 3(2). Available: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-2/wain.html>
- Watson, J. (2003). *Media communication: an introduction to theory and practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2006). *Methods of critical discourse analysis: introduction, to qualitative method*. London: Sage Publications.