

Articulating the Challenges of Mass Communication Research in Nigeria: Emerging Insights

Fred A. Amadi, PhD

Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Nkpolu, Port Harcourt,
NIGERIA.

amadi.fredi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Discussed are challenges that impact social research practices in Nigerian universities – more so, the research trends in (mass) communication departments. Focalized is the monomaniac bias towards the quantitative research method. The myopia that feeds the pathology is identified. The chief component of the myopia was discussed as the politicization and commercialization of research outcomes in the United States at the time the pioneers of communication research in Nigeria were being mentored there. Misconception of the concept of science by many Nigerian communication researchers was also discussed as a challenge. After reviewing how the essence of communication lies in meaning-construction as opposed to meaning-transmission, and after demonstrating how the monometric embrace of the quantitative research method retards communication/social research skills in Nigerian, conclusion urged Nigerian universities to recognize the qualitative research paradigm as a paradigm where co-creation of knowledge as opposed to knowledge discovery undergirds the communication/social research enterprise.

Keywords: Quantitative, qualitative, research method, mass communication research, emerging insights

INTRODUCTION

When a field of study attracts over one hundred definitions as in communication studies, many see that as an evidence of tension (Dance & Larson, 1976). Another challenge that dwarfs that of multiple definitions is the challenge of schools of thought in communication studies. There are two main schools of thought – the “meaning transmission” and the “meaning production and exchange” schools (Beck, Bennett, & Wall, 2004, p. 25; Anderson & Ross, 2002, pp. 254-264). The meaning transmission school or conduit metaphor model is rooted in the Western culture which believes that when person X communicates with person Y, X transmits meaning, information, facts and ideas to the mind of Y (Redding 1968 as cited in Anderson & Ross, 2002, pp. 54 & 55). In this model, talks of “communication failure” crop up if Y fails to be influenced in the manner intended by X (Beck, Bennett, & Wall, 2004, p. 25).

Contrarily, the *meaning production and exchange school* sees communication as a study of how “people interact with messages and texts in order to produce meaning” (Beck, Bennett & Wall, 2004, p. 25). Rather than consider misunderstanding an evidence of communication failure, the meaning production and exchange school emphasizes an elaborated conceptualization of communication. An elaborated conceptualization does not prize encoder’s intention to form an overt message above decoder’s intention to gain a new but different meaning by interpreting the encoder’s message/text (Anderson & Ross, 2002, p. 68).

The elaborated conceptualization promotes communication as a “*rational discourse*” and as a phenomenon where a speaker’s/writer’s statement is challenged so that communication becomes a systematic argument that makes a special appeal to a speaker/writer/encoder to demonstrate the validity of a claim made (Gouldner, 1976, pp. 39 & 49). According to Gouldner, this conceptualization entails a kind of rotating division of labor where the speaker/writer of the moment has a vested interest in their assumptions while the listener/decoder challenges in a manner showing also that the listener/decoder/addressee has a vested interest to challenge the assumptions made by the speaker/encoder and so on. This conceptualization agrees with the idea that communication is an interactional encounter where the most important intention is not “what an encoder intends to accomplish with a particular message or what attributions a decoder makes but how the individuals ultimately negotiate the two perspectives” (Stamp & Knapp, 1990 as cited by Anderson & Ross 2002, p. 69).

THE PROBLEM

Benign as the perspectives on schools of communication seem, there are academic settings where uninformed embrace of only one perspective in disdain for the other distorts communication studies. In Nigeria, the substitution of the “instrumental” for the “developmental” role of communication (Sambo, 1999, p. 154; Uche, 1999, p. 16) distorts the concept of “development communication” (Kunczik, 1995, p. 85) by making it read like the dangerous treatise that Kurt Lenk formulated to defend the autocratic media tradition. As cited in Kunczik (1995, p. 35), Lenk asserts that the media should disseminate only the “things that serve the state, the fatherland and the repute of a nation,” insisting that “all truths are bad or proscribed if they fail to fit in with the will of whoever rules” (p.35). A more compelling reason to challenge this distortion is its indifference to the imposition of epistemic violence on research practices in communication studies. When the research practices in a field of study is threatened by “epistemic violence” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2013, p. 317) or “intellectual cynicism” (Kanpol as cited in Okeke & Ume, 2004, p. 329), every stakeholder in knowledge ought to show concern. If the account in the following paragraphs is enough to convince a reader that communication research practices in Nigeria is diminished by “bad faith” (Jean-Paul Sartre as cited in Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2013, p. 314)), then this paper should be adjudged a clarion call for damage-control measures.

Tensions over Communication Research methods

In Nigeria, the formal study of (mass) communication at the university level commenced after the first half of the last century when reverberations from the first wave of debates about the best method – quantitative or qualitative – of conducting social research had waned (Henwood, 1996, pp. 26-27). Unfortunately, communication research started in Nigeria after some incidents had pushed the quantitative research method into its off-and-on ascendancy. In the early 1960s when the pioneers of communication research in Nigeria were being mentored in the United States, majority of American communication researchers were nothing more than “corporate intellectuals” or “company men” whose commitment to research was not much for the advancement of knowledge and social progress as it was for outcomes that were intended to satisfy the corporate interest of sponsors of social research (Gitlin, 1978; (Gouldner, 1976, p. 183). According to Gitlin, corporate intellectuals distort

research methodology by microscopically “defining research problems in a fashion that yields minimal effect results when the quantitative survey studies are conducted” (p. 206).

After being mentored by their American corporate intellectuals, the founding fathers of communication schools in Nigeria have shackled themselves to only the quantitative method; refusing to engage in the global conversation about the emerging trends in social sciences/communication research and by such refusal, continued to betray their ignorance of the fact that the qualitative research method was the first research method favored by pioneer scholars of the social sciences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013; Loh, 2013; Peredaryenko, 2013; Flyvbjerg, 2006; Okeke & Ume, 2004; Wainwright, 1997; Wodak & Meyer, 2006; Jankowski & Wester, 1991, pp. 46 – 47f; Gobo, 2005; Lanigan, 1988, p. 183). The incidents in parts of the twentieth century which compelled the qualitative to submit to the quantitative as a staple social research method need to be recalled. The emergence of the advertising industry, more so, that of the advertising firm of Ayer and Sons is a case in point (Mayhew, 1997). Of no less consequence was the influence of George Gallup of the Gallup poll fame who in 1928, wrote “A New Technique for Measuring Reader Interest in Newspapers” – a PhD thesis which accentuated the visibility of the quantitative research method (Mayhew, 1997, p.199). Since Amadi (2011) brims with details of how these developments contributed to the checkered ascendancy of the quantitative research method, I will not again dwell in details on it.

Epistemology and the Quantitative/Qualitative Research Method Divide

Epistemology is from the Greek root – *episteme* which means knowledge (Myers, 2009, p. 35). When applied, epistemology refers to assumptions about knowledge and how it could be obtained and used (Hirschleim, 1992). Mimetic and constructionism are theories that convey assumptions about how humans gain knowledge (O’Shaughnessy & Stadler, 2007, pp. 60-61; Henwood, 1996, pp. 27-28; Potter, 1996, pp. 125-127). The tenets of mimetic theory describe a world of pre-existing phenomenal forms where reality and objects exist independent of human apprehension/abstraction. As made clear by Woolgar (1996, p. 16), the “ideology of the prescriptive quantitative epistemology of science expresses the belief that various entities – meanings, motives, things, essences, realities, underlying patterns – pre-exist their surface representations.” Woolgar further dismisses as an irrational epistemological quest, the effort in quantitative social science to ‘discover’ or ‘uncover’ these pre-existing essences/realities that lie covered.

The adepts of the quantitative method in Nigeria appreciate the method more from the reductionist formulations of the Cochrane and Campbell criteria movements (Denzin, 2013, p. 518). Under the illusion of advancing the so-called Science Based Research (SBR), the Cochrane and Campbell movements betray their ignorance/disdain for contemporary global discourses where prescriptive articulation of science (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 473; Woolgar, 1996, pp. 14-19) is rejected in preference of “*Wissenschaft*” – a German word which expresses *science* as nothing more than a way of gain knowledge (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 226). To free-thinking intellectuals, the essence of “science” is elusive and varies “philosophically, historically and sociologically” and definitely “not primarily an individualistic and mentalistic activity” but a social process that takes place within the prevailing values, beliefs and expectations of a community (Woolgar, 1996, pp. 13-19). This view of science agrees with those of Smith and St, Pierre who insist that the “science that beckons in social research” is no longer the “outdated, ruptured, ruined, prescriptive and idealized Popperian

perspective” that imposes structures like “*research design, data collection, data analysis and presentation*” (Smith, 1996, p. 189, 191; St. Pierre, 2013, p. 452). In the words of St. Pierre, the science of contemporary social science is the “science of deconstruction at its best” where science is deconstructed as “rigorous reimagining, a capricious science that cannot be defined in advance – such science is science of *differance* – not repetition” (p. 452). St. Pierre’s words find resonance where Woolgar derides the “*men-in-white-coats*” pretenses by reminding the quantitative method pretenders that “scientists have in practice little opportunity to reflect on the ‘truth’ or otherwise of a particular result” but are more interested in “pragmatic attitude that makes them to get excited by a published result not because it reveals ‘truth’, but because it enables the setting up of another, perhaps, decisive experiment” (p. 15).

All over the world, except in Nigeria, these revealing articulations about science have started weakening the cocoon which the fastidious proponents of the prescriptive view of science wrap themselves in. For instance, one of the erstwhile fanatic organizations that promote the idealized view of science – The American Education Research Association (AERA) – now recognizes as empirical, methods of humanities-oriented qualitative research in areas of film, drama, dance and so on (Denzin, 2013, p. 533). Encouraging this recognition, according to Denzin, is the realization by AERA that the interpretive methods of textual analysis used in the qualitative methods are “empirical” (Anssi & Ruusuvouri, 2013, p.278). According to Denzin, AERA acknowledges such research as “inextricably empirical” like its quantitative counterpart because such research method uses “evidence that justifies its conclusions in a manner that demonstrates internal and external coherence” (Denzin, 2013, p.533).

Rather than uphold these global research trends, some Nigerian communication research elites have shackled themselves to the abandoned Science Based Research (SBR) tradition where science is distorted as “systematic procedures and protocols, mechanistic in technique, statistically manipulated in pursuit of causal structures, replication, generalizability” and a “tradition of prediction and accumulation where knowledge is thought of as the one produced by science” (St. Pierre, 2013, pp. 465 & 474).

An analysis by Flyvbjerg’s (2006, p.223) provides an additional premise to question what SBR promotes. After proving that the pursuit of “predictive theory, universals and scientism in the study of human affairs remains at eternal beginning” i.e. impossible, Flyvbjerg further notes that “more discoveries have arisen from intense observation than from statistics applied to large groups” (p. 226). Raising another observation that dovetails with Woolgar’s (1996, p. 14) “scientific knowledge does not develop through the progressive linear accretion of findings” Flyvbjerg insists that a “good social science is problem driven and not methodology driven in the sense that it employs those methods that for a given problematic, best help answer the research question at hand” (p. 241). It warrants being stated that the SBR tradition valorized by Nigerian communication research megalomaniacs has also drawn such scathing comments like:

The field also shared the basic tenets of the social sciences of the time, namely the belief in a world that is knowable through the application of scientific techniques which stressed the plurality and equality of facts, through the belief in the objectivity of expert observations and the power of empirical explanations. Since such a procedure treats mass communication as a series of specific, isolated social

phenomena, it resulted in a narrow understanding of communication and in conduct of studies without appreciation for the importance of their historical environment.

(Hardt, 2004, pp. 107 & 109)

These furry of critical comments against mono-method tradition in social research ought to wean Nigerians off their “nomothetic” obsession (Babbie, 2005, p. 21; St. Pierre, 2013, p. 471). But instead of that, calcified thinking/uninformed bias continues to shackle them to the tradition of “mono-centric” (Birck, 1989, p. 16) “quantitative pathology” (St. Pierre, 2013, p. 471) which Okeke & Ume (2004) have decried. In a study that investigated the state of the art with respect to social research trends in post-graduate schools of major Nigerian universities, Okeke & Ume reported that the zeal to show off statistics skill fools social researchers in Nigerian universities into forcing complex psychosocial phenomena into quantification and aggregation in contexts that do not require measurement, intensity and/or frequency calculation. Okeke & Ume describe such epistemological blinker as “deskilling of students” (p. 331) and as a practice that encourages “saturation syndrome” (p. 332). In their belief that saturation syndrome makes research results to sound monotonous, Okeke & Ume wonder whether Nigerian universities can afford to continue with the production of researchers who are knowledgeable only in one research paradigm. Okeke & Ume’s worries are akin to those of Jensen who remarks that:

Many scholars and institutions have come to question the explanatory power of conventional empirical approaches within social sciences. There appears to be an emerging consensus that a great many central research issues cannot be adequately examined through the kinds of questions that are posed by hypothetico-deductive methods and addressed with quantifiable answers

(1991, p.2).

To demonstrate that Nigerian universities and their research imperators turn deaf ears to Okeke & Ume and Jensen worries, I refer to (Avwokeni, 2003) – a textbook of 447 pages that is widely used to teach social and management sciences research method in Nigerian universities. There is no mention of the qualitative research in a textbook of such size and popularity; thus typifying what happens in the teaching and learning of social sciences/communication research method courses in Nigerian universities. The bias towards only the quantitative research method in Nigeria is more destructive in the field of (mass) communication where a despicable myth holds that quantitative content analysis which prizes only “manifest contents” above sub meanings of communication (McQuail, 2010, p. 360) is the gold standard for conducting communication research (Branston & Stafford 2007, p. 27). Insight to prove that such belief is not only erroneous but betrays ignorance of the subtleties that make communication studies fascinating could be found in Branston & Stafford (2007, pp. 28-29). According to Branston & Stafford, it might be easy, in one context, to identify and count acts of violence in news footage, rap music or in a computer game. But such move, they contend, begs the question of what constitutes violent act in some other contexts, in some other historical moments and with some other audiences in different interpretive contexts. Furthermore, Branston & Stafford discuss a possibility of mistaking a high interview frequency by the media with one party in a conflict as a favor by the media against the less-interviewed party. In their view, running away with such a mistaken impression without factoring in the “mode of address, the nature of questions asked, and the tenor of

voice of the interviewer” (p. 26) during the frequent interview sessions will amount to overlooking realities that are fundamental to communication.

In another analysis, Meyers (2009, p.39) further explains the poverty of the orthodox method of content analysis by *citing* examples with questions like “did you watch the football last night?” Myers explains that any answer to the question, either yes or no, will be invalid if it fails to factor in the contextual variables. The lack of validity, Myers points out, would stem from the fact that the word *football* means a different thing to people in different places and at different times. Myers’ explanation hinges on the fact that the word football means a different thing to a resident of Manchester in England where football means a “different thing to what it means to a resident of Chicago in the United States.” Subtleties like the ones above justify observations like:

In a post-modern media and computer culture, fresh critical strategies are needed to read cultural texts, to interpret the conjunctions of sight, sound, words and images, that are producing seductive cultural spaces and experiences... Since media and culture are themselves a type of pedagogy, one needs to create a counter pedagogy to question and *critically* analyse the often distorted forms of knowledge, misinformation, deceptive images and seductive spectacle of media and consumer society.

(Durham & Kellner, 2001, p.29)

In the light of the foregoing, researchers – especially communication researchers – who scoff at the qualitative paradigm do so out of ignorance of many things that needs to be emphasized in communication studies. Among the things to be emphasized is the fact that the meaning of “representation/communication” is never given but is always “constructed, slippery and contestable” (Branston & Stafford, 2007, p. 31). More instructive is the fact that “what is said in a communication/text rests upon unsaid assumptions” in a manner that necessitates the need to deploy qualitative textual analysis in order to “identify what is assumed” (Fairclough, 2006, p.11). Fairclough’s observation might have prompted Toynbee (2006, p. 160) to advocate for qualitative textual analysis-based social research. According to Toynbee, “the world is imperfect” and the texts generated in it “carry the imperfections” in a way that calls for a tradition of “textually based social research paradigm to fix the imperfections.” In a similar vein, Gripsrud (2002, p. 142) supports qualitative *Critical Discourse Analysis* as a social research method by observing that “...speakers, writers and newsmakers are hardly aware of the implications of their words, actions/inactions.” Gripsrud’s observation resonates where McQuail’s (2010, p. 361) insists that “concealed latent meanings of texts/communication are the most significant and cannot be read from numerical data.”

CONCLUSION

Much of what is discussed in preceding paragraphs aims at creating in Nigeria, the awareness that social and communication research practices should not be confined to only one research paradigm – the quantitative paradigm. Many reasons have been adduced including the fact that contemporary trends in social research aim at “co-creation of knowledge and not discovering it” (Torrance, 2013, p. 373). Co-creation of knowledge premises the fact that researching “involves a complex politics of representation” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013, p. 43, Loh, 2013). Donmoyer (1996), the editor of an influential journal – *Educational Researcher* -

sharpens the point by observing that “gatekeepers cannot normally widen the gates they monitor; they simply decide which sorts of people can walk through them; if I decide to publish non-traditional manuscripts, there will be less space for traditional scholarly work” (p. 20).

In the light of the foregoing, researchers in Nigeria need to pay attention to Denzin & Lincoln (2013) who observe that what researchers who work with either statistics or words do is to conduct research in line with how people represent their experiences. Given this fact, Denzin & Lincoln report that what a socially-situated researcher needs to do is to create practices that are conducive to the subject matter of inquiry. And since the meaning of most communication stretches from the denotative to the connotative to even the mythical, McQuail’s take on semiotics points to the direction that communication researchers need to follow. According to McQuail (2010, pp. 348-349), semiotics is a resource for opening up layers of meaning that lie beneath the surface of texts. Semiotics, according to McQuail is also useful in qualitative research – especially in a design that seeks to uncover the latent ideological bias of media contents. Wherever majority of communication researchers continue to simulation ignorance or disdain for these compelling facts, their liberal colleagues have a daunting task of convincing to do.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Amadi, F. (2011). Broadening mass communication research for enhanced media practice. *Global media journal, African edition*, 5(1). <http://www.globalmedia.journals.ac.za/pub/artide/view/58/92>.
- [2]. Anderson, R., & Ross, V. (2002). *Questions of communication*. Boston & New York: Bedford/St. Martins.
- [3]. Anssi, p., & Ruusuvuori, J. (2013). Analysing talk and text. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Ed), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (4th ed.), (pp.278-307). Los Angeles/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications INC.
- [4]. Avwokeni, A. (2003). *Practical research methodology*. Port Harcourt: Unicampus Tutorial Services.
- [5]. Babbie, E. (2005). *The basics of social research*. Belmont, CA Thomson Wadsworth.
- [6]. Beck, A., et al. (2004). *Communication studies: The essential resource*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [7]. Birch, D. (1989). *Language, literature and critical practice: ways of analyzing text*. London: Routledge.
- [8]. Branston, Gill & Stafford, Ray (2007). *The media student’s book*. London & New York: Routledge.
- [9]. Dance, F., & Larson, C. (1976). *The functions of Human communication: a theoretical approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- [10]. Denzin, N. K. (2013). The elephant in the living room, or extending the conversation about the politics of evidence. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and*

- interpreting qualitative materials* (4th ed.) (517-546). Los Angeles/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications INC.
- [11]. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2013). Introduction: The discipline and practices of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (4th ed.), (pp.1-54). Los Angeles/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications INC.
- [12]. Donmoyer, R. (1996). Educational research in an era of paradigm proliferation: what's a journal editor to do? *Educational Researcher*, 25(2), 19-25.
- [13]. Durham, M. G., & Kellner, D. M. (2001). Adventures in media and cultural studies: Introducing the key works. In M. G. Durham & D. M. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and cultural studies key works* (pp.1-29). Malden Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers INC.
- [14]. Fairclough N. (2006). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- [15]. Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative inquiry*. 12(2), pp.219-245. Accessed April 2013 from <http://www.flyvbjerg.plan.aau.dk/publications2006/0604FIVEMISPUB>
- [16]. Gitlin, T. (1978). Media sociology: The dominant paradigm. *Theory and society*, 6, 205- 253.
- [17]. Gobo, G. (2005). The renaissance of qualitative methods. *Forum qualitative social research FQS* 6(3). Art 42 Retrieved May 28th 2007. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/>
- [18]. Gouldner, A. (1976). *The dialectics of ideology and technology*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- [19]. Gripsrud, J. (2002). *Understanding media culture*. London: Arnold.
- [20]. Henwood, K.L. (1996). Qualitative inquiry: perspectives, methods and psychology. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for Psychology and Social Sciences* (pp. 25-42). Garsington Road, Oxford, Uk: BPS Blackwell.
- [21]. Hirschheim, R. (1992). Information systems epistemology: an historical perspective. In R. Galliers (Ed.), *Information systems research: issues, methods and practical guides* (pp 28-60). Oxford: Blackwell Scientific.
- [22]. Jankowski, N., & Wester, F. (1991). The qualitative tradition in social Science inquiry contributions to mass communication research. In K. Jensen and N. Jankowski (Eds.), *A handbook of qualitative Mythologies for mass communication research* (pp. 44-75). London: Rutledge.
- [23]. Jensen, K. (1991). Introduction: the qualitative turn. In K.B. Jensen and N.W. Jankowski, (Eds.), *A handbook of qualitative methodologies for mass communication research* (pp.1-13). New York: Rutledge.
- [24]. Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2013). Focus groups: Contingent articulations of pedagogy, politics and inquiry. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting*

- and interpreting qualitative materials* (4th Ed.) (pp.309-344). Los Angeles/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications INC.
- [25]. Kunczik, M. (1995). *Concepts of journalism north and south*. Bonn: Friedrich Ebert Foundation.
- [26]. Lanigan, R. (1988). *Phenomenology of Communication*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- [27]. 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>
- [28]. Mayhew, L. (1997). *The new publics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- [29]. McQuail, D. (2010). *Mass Communication theory* (6th Ed.) Thousand oaks, California: Sage Publications INC.
- [30]. Myers, M.D. (2009). *Qualitative research in business & management*. London: Sage Publications.
- [31]. Okeke, C., & Ume, T. (2004). Some epistemological issues in the conduct of social and behavioral studies in the faculty of education of Nigeria universities. *The Qualitative Report*, 9 (2), 320-334.
- [32]. O'Shaughnessy, M., & Stadler, J. (2007). *Media and society: an introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [33]. Peredaryenko, M.S., & Krauss, S.E. (2013). Calibrating the human instrument: understanding the interviewing experience of novice qualitative researchers. *The qualitative report*, 18(85), 1-17. Retrieved 2 November 2013 from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR18/peredaryenko85.pdf>
- [34]. Potter, J. (1996). Discourse analysis and constructionist approaches: theoretical background. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for Psychology and Social Sciences* (pp.125-140). Garsington Road, Oxford, UK: BPS Blackwell.
- [35]. Redding, C. (1968). Human communication behaviour in complex organizations: some fallacies revisited. In: F. Dance & C. Larson (Eds.), *Perspectives on communication*. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Speech Communication Centre.
- [36]. (Sambo, (1999). Mass media, democratization and the new world order. In L. U. Uche (Ed.), *Mass communication, democratization and civil society in Africa* (pp.162-172). Lagos: Smagh & company.
- [37]. Smith, J.A. (1996). Evolving issues for qualitative psychology. In K. Jensen and N. Jankowski (Eds), *A handbook of qualitative Mythologies for mass communication research* (pp.189-201). London: Routledge.
- [38]. Stamp, G.H., & Knapp, M.L. (1990). The construction of intent in interpersonal communication. *Quarterly journal of speech*. 76, 282-299.
- [39]. St. Pierre, E. A. (2013). Post qualitative research: The critique and the coming after. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative*

- materials* (4th Ed.) (pp.447-480). Los Angeles/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications INC.
- [40]. Torrance, H. (2013). Qualitative research, science and government: Evidence, criteria, policy and politics. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (4th Ed.) (pp.309-344). Los Angeles/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications INC.
- [41]. Toynbee, J. (2006). The politics of representation. In M. Gillepsie & J. Toynbee (Eds.), *Analyzing media texts* (pp. 157 – 185). England: Open University Press.
- [42]. Uche, L.U. (1999). Communication and democratic empowerment in the development of rural Africa: Corruption and perverted priorities in the development agenda. In L. U. Uche (Ed.), *Mass communication, democratization and civil society in Africa* (pp.11-26). Lagos: Smagh & company.
- [43]. Wainwright, D. (1997). Can sociological research be qualitative, critical and valid? *The qualitative report* 3(2). <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-2/wain.html>
- [44]. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2006) (Eds.). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- [45]. Woolgar, S. (1996). Psychology, qualitative methods and the ideas of science. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for Psychology and Social Sciences* (pp. 11-24). Garsington Road, Oxford, Uk: BPS Blackwell.