

This article was downloaded by:

On: 28 November 2009

Access details: *Access Details: Free Access*

Publisher *Routledge*

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## Asian Journal of Communication

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713684587>

### Audience Research Trends in Mainland China: An Analysis of Three Major Journalism and Mass Communication Journals, 1985-2002

Baohua Zhou

**To cite this Article** Zhou, Baohua 'Audience Research Trends in Mainland China: An Analysis of Three Major Journalism and Mass Communication Journals, 1985-2002', *Asian Journal of Communication*, 16: 2, 119 — 131

**To link to this Article:** DOI: 10.1080/01292980600638595

**URL:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01292980600638595>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

# Audience Research Trends in Mainland China: An Analysis of Three Major Journalism and Mass Communication Journals, 1985–2002

Baohua Zhou

*This paper employed quantitative methods to explore the trends of audience research in Mainland China by analyzing research articles in three major journalism and communication academic journals. The author analyzed research approaches, research methods, medium of focus and theoretical frameworks in these audience research articles from 1985 to 2002. Unlike findings derived from the analyses of mass communication research articles in major international journals, most of the research articles in Mainland China used qualitative methods. Chinese scholars tend to adopt behaviorist and structural approaches towards the study of audience. The number of research articles that dealt with broadcast and print media exceeded any other media, while more and more studies on Internet users are being conducted. Chinese scholars began to develop theories in recent years. The future study will continue based on analysis of other research materials and comparison with audience research articles in leading international journals.*

*Keywords:* Audience Research; China

China, with its economic reform and opening-up policies, has experienced great changes in the past 20 years in many areas, including journalism and mass communication academic research. In 1985, Everett Rogers and his colleagues (Rogers, Zhao, Pan, & Chen, 1985) argued that by western standards, communication research in China in the past would not have been considered scientific research, but political analysis and rhetorical studies. The conceptual change from ‘masses’

---

Correspondence to: Baohua Zhou, Journalism School of Fudan University, 400 Guoding Road, Shanghai 200433, China. Email: zhoubaohua2002@hotmail.com. This study was conducted while the author was a doctoral student at Fudan University. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2004 International Communication Association Convention. The author thanks two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

(*qunzhong*) to 'audience' (Zhang, 2000) and audience surveys that occurred from the early 1980s have not only eroded Mao's 'Party-masses model' of propaganda, but also resulted in reforms in Chinese journalism and communication research areas. The Beijing audience survey conducted by the Beijing Journalists Association in 1982 was considered as the 'first large-scale communication field study in China' by Rogers (et al., 1985). As such, it can be concluded that the beginning of the mass communication research in China was greatly related to audience research in China. In fact, consistent with the trend of mass communication research in the US, communication research on mass media audience, media use, and media effects represents a very active area of communication research in China in the past 20 years. According to Huang and Han (1997), from 1981 to 1996, 22.5% of papers published in *Journalistic University* (*Xinwen Daxue*), 38% of articles in *Journalism* (*Xinwenxue Lun ji*) and 11.5% of papers in *Journalism and Mass Communication* (*Xinwen Yu Chuanbo Yanjiu*)<sup>1</sup> dealt with mass media audience and media effects. Huang and Han (1997) studied all of the research papers on mass communication in three journalism and mass communication journals and gave scholars a general idea about the development of mass communication research in China. However, the current situation and trends of audience research in China were still not fully understood, even though audience research has dominated the communication research area in past years. This paper attempts to achieve a better understanding of the issue, which may also address the concerns and interests of communication scholars outside of China.

Following most of previous systematic content analyses of mass communication research (such as Kamhawi & Weaver, 2003; Potter, Cooper, & Dupagne, 1993), this paper used academic journals as the source of data on the state and trends of audience research in China. As with journals in many other countries, academic journal articles in China are also the main channel for scholars and students to report current research. Though the books, book chapters and conference papers are excluded, many researchers argue that journal articles are a barometer of research trends and reflect the evolution of communication research (Kamhawi & Weaver, 2003).

Though the concept 'mass communication' was introduced to China in the late 1950s, scientific communication research was not conducted until the beginning of 1980s. As Huang and Han (1997) pointed out, before 1985, most articles published in Chinese mass communication journals focused on the introduction and input of western communication theory and methods. As such, Chinese scholars only began to publish their own research articles after that. So this paper analyzes three major mass communication journals from 1985 to 2002.

### **Systematic Content Analysis of Audience Research**

Though no special quantitative analysis focused on audience research, previous systematic content analyses of mass communication research focused on some topics, including methods, theoretical frameworks, medium, and funding, etc. (Kamhawi &

Weaver, 2003; Potter et al., 1993). From these studies, we can conclude that method, theoretical framework, and medium are three useful variables to explore the trend of mass communication research, and they can also be used in systematic content analysis of audience research in China. Communication scholars and students would be interested to know in Chinese audience research which methods are used most or least often, which kind of mediums are most or least dealt with, and which theoretical frameworks are more used compared with others.

Quantitative versus qualitative methods is a hot topic in studying the research trends in the field of mass communication. For a long time, quantitative methods dominated in major international mass communication journals and researchers called for more studies using qualitative methods and more studies combining qualitative and quantitative methods (Potter et al., 1993; Weaver, 1993). For medium, print media had been the focus of many research studies (Riffe & Freitag, 1997), and someone asked whether things would change with television's becoming the medium with highest exposure and the Internet's fast development (Kamhawi & Weaver, 2003). Kamhawi and Weaver's recent study found that the traditional broadcast and print media, especially television and newspapers, dominated in 10 major mass communication journals from 1980 to 1999 and there were more articles dealing with broadcast media than articles on print media. With the development of mass communication research, theoretical development becomes the most difficult problem that every scholar has to consider. In Kamhawi and Weaver's research, only 39% of all journal articles referred to a theory and the theories most frequently mentioned were ones related to the uses and effects of media. This implied that theories about audience research played important roles in mass communication research.

Besides the common topics that are always used in content analyses of mass communication research, special topics related to audience research should be considered. For that matter, research approach can be considered as an important variable. Researchers can study audience from different perspectives and follow different research traditions. Jensen and Rosengren (1990) argued that there were five traditions in search of audience: effects research, uses and gratifications (U&G) research, literacy criticism, cultural studies, and reception analysis. McQuail combined the five into two (behavioral and cultural) approaches and added one (structural approach, which is widely used by media industries, such as Neilson's rating research and Arbitron). McQuail (1994, p. 295) critiqued, 'They [Jensen & Rosengren, 1990] place little emphasis on one of the main purpose and tradition of audience research, which is simply that of counting and classifying audiences for better media-organizational control. This should certainly count as a research tradition, although it has been practiced largely within the walls of media organizations and has low visibility in theoretical discussions'. Therefore, McQuail (1994) has included the traditions suggested by Jensen and Rosengren (1990) in his three traditions. So McQuail's three traditions will be applied to this research.

## Research Questions

Based on the preceding literature review, this paper tries to answer the following questions:

1. Which approaches have been more or less employed in studying audience in three major journalism and mass communication journals in China?
2. Which methods have been more or less used in Chinese audience research?
3. Which kind of medium has been more or less dealt with in Chinese audience research?
4. Which theoretical frameworks have been used and developed in Chinese audience research, and how?

## Method

### *Sample*

In China, with the development of mass communication research, more and more academic journals began to publish research articles in this area. Until now, all Chinese journals do not focus solely on mass communication, choosing to include both journalism and mass communication. There are over 100 journalism and mass communication journals in China, but most of them still publish more articles on journalism, including studies on journalists, reporting, editing, and news system, etc. Since this study focuses on audience research, it would choose academic journals that publish more mass communication research articles as the sources of data. The Chinese Association of Communication (CAC), the only professional society on communication in China, which was founded in the summer of 2002, has not published its official publication until now. At present, those journals published by major educational and research institutions tend to give more attention to communication research articles. These journals include: *Journalistic University* (published by the Journalism School, Fudan University in Shanghai), *Journalism and Communication* (published by the Institute of Journalism and Communication, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing), *Modern Communication (Xiandai Chuanbo)*, published by the Communication University of China, the former Beijing Broadcast Institute), and *International Press (Guoji Xinwenjie)*, published by the School of Journalism, People University of China in Beijing). Among these four major academic journals, *International Press* focuses on research abroad and publishes fewer articles on Chinese communication research. And the first three journals are actually the most widely read and highest esteemed in the mass communication field in China. So this study chose *Journalistic University*, *Journalism and Communication*, and *Modern Communication* as data sources.

For each journal, every issue was selected since our study focused on audience research other than mass communication research. Thus there are a total of 218 issues analyzed in this study (see Appendix A). Only research articles were analyzed, which

means that book reviews, essays, commentaries and 'research-in-brief' articles were excluded. For each issue, every article of mass communication research was read to decide whether it was an article on audience, including focusing on readers, listeners, television audience and Internet users, etc. Articles that focused on communicator, media, message, and media policy, etc. were not analyzed, even if they mentioned the concept of 'audience' somewhere in the articles. Only articles that focused on audience were analyzed. A total of 179 research articles studying audience published in the three journals between January 1985 and December 2002 were included in this analysis.

### *Coding Instrument*

Variables coded for each article include the *approach* of research (structural analysis, behaviorist analysis, and cultural analysis), the general *method* of research (quantitative, qualitative, or a mix of both), the *data-gathering* procedure (survey, experiment, etc.), the *theory* behind the study (if any), and the *medium* the study was dealing with (print, broadcast, Internet, or media in general).

The structural research referred to those describing the audience in terms of its composition and its relation to the social structure of the population as a whole. The audience could be measured in terms not only of demographics but also of content preferences, opinions and responses to programs. The behaviorist analysis referred to those seeking to establish the effects of media messages on individual behavior, opinions, attitudes and values. The cultural analysis referred to those articles focusing on perceptions of meaning of text and understanding meaning in social and cultural context.

If the method by which the results were determined involved numerical or counting procedures and statistics were used to report data, the article was classified as quantitative (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000, p. 103). Quantitative research in audience research included mostly surveys and experiments. Qualitative research included focus groups, direct observations, in-depth interviews, and case studies, as well as legal, policy, and historical research in order to increase the depth of understanding to research subjects (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000, p. 102). If more than one data-gathering procedure was used, the method was coded as a mixture of quantitative (if all the methods were quantitative), a mixture of qualitative (if all the methods were qualitative), or a combination of both quantitative and qualitative (if both methods were used).

Most audience research studies dealt with some kind of medium. An article was classified as print media if it dealt exclusively with newspapers or/and magazines. It was coded as broadcast when it dealt with television or/and radio. When print and broadcast were both studied, it was coded as a combination. Studies of the Internet were coded separately. Some studies that did not mention any particular medium were coded as 'media in general'. 'Others' included those dealing with videotext, cinema and videogames, etc.

If one article employed some theoretical framework, it was coded according to the theory itself. When more than one theory was mentioned, the dominant one was coded.

### *Data Collection*

Two researchers did the coding. An intercoder reliability of a sample of 30 articles using Krippendorff's alpha showed 87% agreement.

### *Breakdown of the 28-Year Period*

We divided the 28-year period into five historical units: 1985–1988, 1989–1992, 1993–1996, 1997–2000, and 2001–2002. Such time units were defined by historical markers. For example, following the 1989 crackdown on the student uprising there was a brief hiatus in Chinese media reforms and the development of audience research; in 1992, both returned with a new fervor, when Deng Xiaoping called for accelerated market-oriented reforms. In 1996, 'communication studies' (*Chuanboxue*) was accepted as an independent academic field ('*xueke*') by the Ministry of Education of PRC, which was supposed to accelerate the development of communication research, including audience research since in China, the recognition of the government would support the institutionalization of the academic field. Only two years later, the first two PhD programs of communication research were established at Fudan University in Shanghai and People University of China in Beijing. Year 2000 meant the coming of the new millenary, which brought China into a new period with more internationalization and informationization. The breakdown of 28-year period permitted us to better understand and interpret the trajectory of audience research in China.

## **Findings**

### *Research Approaches*

Table 1 shows the trend of research approaches about audience research in Chinese journals from 1985 to 2002. We can conclude that the behaviorist approach

**Table 1** Research Approaches from 1985 to 2002 (%)

Approach	Structural analysis	Behaviorist analysis	Cultural analysis	Total
1985–1988	27.6	72.4	0	100
1989–1992	29.7	70.3	0	100
1993–1996	30.2	69.8	0	100
1997–2000	28.6	54.3	17.1	100
2001–2002	28.6	57.1	14.3	100
Total	29.1 (52)	64.2 (115)	6.7 (12)	100 (179)

dominated in the past 18 years. From the late 1980s to the early 2000s, the application of behaviorist analysis decreased by 15%. Structural analysis ranked the second. Obviously most audience research articles follow these two traditions in China, which means that audience composition, media use, and media effects have been paid the most attention in this country, which has the largest population in the world.

Compared with these two approaches, cultural analysis, the other important approach that developed in the western countries from the middle 1980s, got the least attention. This approach was not employed by Chinese scholars until the late 1990s. And among those research articles, most were introductions on literacy criticism, cultural studies, and reception analysis, while only two articles focused on case studies of cultural and reception analysis.

Why in China do so many audience studies follow these two approaches, which also can be called 'US style'? This phenomenon is related to the journalism reform in Mainland China. The participants in the early development of communication research in China including those involved in the 1982 Beijing survey declare that US mainstream ideas about the audience are more useful in addressing urgent problems in China's reforms (Zhang, 2000). As mentioned earlier, the conceptual change from 'masses' to 'audience' made audience surveys possible and allowed an increasing number of media organizations and other social institutions to recognize its importance and values. This led to the diffusion of audience surveys into two main approaches—structural and behaviorist approaches. On the other, the European critical school's ideas are too locked away in the 'ivory tower' for Chinese scholars to adapt immediately. So we can see that from 1985 to 1996, all journal articles accessed audience with US traditional structural and behaviorist approaches. 1996 was an important year, when communication research as an academic field earned its independent status in Chinese educational system. The first audience research paper following cultural approach published in main journals in 1997 was at least encouraged by, if not the direct result of, the communication research's status enhancement in 1996. It is also a symbol for diversity in approaches of Chinese audience research since then.

### *Research Methods*

For the past 30 years, the use of quantitative methods were far more common than the use of qualitative methods or the combination of these two methods in research published in major international journals (Kamhawi & Weaver, 2003). On the contrary, Table 2 shows that in major journals in China, the use of qualitative methods far exceeded the use of quantitative methods and the combination of these two methods. There was a great difference concerning research methods between Chinese and international mass communication journals (see Table 3).

Despite the obvious difference between Chinese and international journals, we can find a significant increase for the employment of quantitative methods from 1980s to 1990s in Chinese journals, and a slight increase for qualitative methods use in

**Table 2** Research Methods from 1985 to 2002 (%)

Methodology	Quantitative	Qualitative	Combination of quantitative and qualitative	Total
1985–1988	13.3	80.0	6.7	100
1989–1992	36.8	60.5	2.6	100
1993–1996	26.8	68.3	4.9	100
1997–2000	17.1	77.1	5.7	100
2001–2002	28.6	71.4	0	100
Total	25.1 (45)	70.9 (127)	3.9 (7)	100 (179)

international journals in the same period. It seems that both Chinese scholars and western scholars (most are scholars residing in the US) have recognized their weakness in method use. In China, because of the academic tradition of interpretivism and fund shortages, more scholars tend to use qualitative methods, especially in-depth interview, historical and policy analysis. In the US, studies employing quantitative methods are more likely to have received funding than those not using such methods (Kamhawi & Weaver, 2003). As Tables 2 and 3 have shown an increase of about 15% for quantitative methods in China, we optimistically believe more studies will employ quantitative methods.

While we must point out here that quite a lot of ‘qualitative’ studies in China are simply policy elaborations or journalistic observations or commentaries that contain few or no statistics, the ‘qualitative’ papers reviewed by Kamhawi and Weaver (2003) are theoretically or conceptually grounded research. If we take a look at the specific contents of those audience research papers, we will find that some are simply introductions of western concepts or methods of audience research (such as Lu, 1988), some are criticisms or reviews of ‘audience’ concept or theories (such as Ming,

**Table 3** Research Methods in Chinese and International Journals\* from 1985 to 1999 (%)

Methodology	Quantitative		Qualitative		Combination of quantitative and qualitative	
	Chinese	International	Chinese	International	Chinese	International
1985–1988**	13.3	72.4	80.0	24.7	6.7	2.9
1990–1999†	27.2	70.0	68.4	27.0	4.4	3.0
1980–1999‡	25.1	71.9	70.9	25.6	3.9	2.5

\*The data for international journals are from Kamhawi and Weaver (2003). It should be mentioned their research deals with all of mass communication research articles in 10 major international journals, while our study deals with only audience research in Chinese journals.

\*\*For international journals, the data were collected from 1985 to 1989.

†For Chinese journals, the data were collected from 1989 to 2000.

‡For Chinese journals, the data were collected from 1985 to 2002.

2002), and some are analyses of kinds of topics on audience without theoretical framework or foundation (such as Zhou, 1997). Though these papers are short of theoretical contributions for audience research, they reflect the trajectory and characteristic of audience research in China. As we can see from Table 2, the proportion of 'qualitative' studies is especially high in 1985–1988 (80% in this time unit) as well as 1997–2000 (77% in this time unit). We will not feel surprised if considering 1985–1988 was the first time unit when Chinese audience research took its first step and the introduction of new ideas about audience had a prominent impact on audience survey in this period; 1997–2000, as mentioned above, was the first time unit after communication research was accepted as an independent academic field by official educational system, so scholars had been encouraged to introduce more new knowledge about audience research not only from the US but also from the European countries and other places, which meant much wider academic view.

It can be easily interpreted why the proportion of quantitative research was relatively high during 1993–1996 since China accelerated market-oriented reforms after 1992. People will feel surprised that there were so many quantitative studies during 1989–1992. It was the fact that new terms such as 'communication', 'information' and 'audience' were assaulted by conservatives after the student uprising in 1989 with brands of 'western bourgeois journalism' and a 'source of bourgeois spiritual pollution' for this assumed knowledge system about audience and communication (Zhang, 2000). There are two possible explanations: on the one hand, academic journals held a relatively free space; on the other hand, quantitative papers, most of which were survey papers, were more easily accepted by journals compared with those 'qualitative' papers discussing theoretical problems about audience or communication. The quantitative papers in this period were mainly products of three important research projects including 'Propaganda effects of Beijing Asian Games in 1990', 'Communication and people's modernization' and 'Mass media and children' directed mainly by the Institute of Journalism and Communication, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS). Obviously these projects avoided a head-on collision with official ideological fortresses, so they were safer than audience research projects in the preceding time unit such as 'People's opinion about China's political reform' led by the Public Opinion Research Institution at People University of China.

The most often used method to collect data concerning quantitative methods was survey. Among 45 studies employing quantitative methods, 41 studies conducted surveys to gather data, while only two studies employed experiment. In Kamhawi and Weaver's research (2003), they found that 13.3% of research articles in international journals employed experiment method. This is a gap between Chinese and international journals. Chinese scholars ought to be reminded that experiment is also an important and helpful method to collect data for audience research, especially for audience psychology research.

**Table 4** Audience Research by Medium from 1985 to 2002 (%)

Medium of study	Print	Broadcast	Combination	Internet	Media in general	Others	Total
1985–1988	17.1	37.1	45.7	0	0	0	100
1989–1992	8.8	32.4	52.9	0	5.9	0	100
1993–1996	12.2	17.1	53.7	4.9	12.2	0	100
1997–2000	2.8	48.6	17.1	2.9	28.6	0	100
2001–2002	2.9	17.6	0	20.6	50.0	8.8	100
Total	8.9 (16)	30.2 (54)	34.6 (62)	5.6 (10)	19.0 (34)	1.7 (3)	100 (179)

### Medium

Table 4 shows that the traditional broadcast and print media were most likely to be studied in major journals in China in the past 18 years. It seemed that Chinese scholars liked to study audience in their use of all kinds of media. The combination of print and broadcast media was ranked first.

For those studies not dealing with combination of traditional media or media in general, most of them dealt with broadcast media, especially television. This finding is consistent with the great influence and power that television wields over Mainland China today. There is a significant decrease in print media audience research and an increase for Internet users research. In 2001 and 2002, the number of studies dealing with Internet exceeded the number of those dealing with broadcast and print media for the very first time. In the age of the Internet, more studies would deal with Internet users or analyze media audience in general, which involves Internet as well as other media.

### Use of Theory

The use of theory was not common. Of the 179 studies, only 22 (12.3%) referred to a theory. Table 5 shows the most often employed theory in Chinese audience research is 'uses and gratifications theory', which focuses on media use and gratifications that audience derive from media. It is consistent with the dominance of structural and behaviorist approaches concerning research topics. The other important theories on media effects were also mentioned in these articles. Most of them employed these

**Table 5** Theories Employed in Chinese Audience Research from 1985 to 2002

Theories mentioned most often (36.4%)	Theories mentioned next most often (45.5%)	Theories mentioned least often (18.1%)
Uses and gratifications (36.4%)	Agenda setting (9.0%)	Media dependency theory (4.5%)
	Cultivation (9.0%)	Spiral of silence (4.5%)
	Knowledge gap (9.0%)	Diffusion of innovation (4.5%)
	Media and modernization (9.0%)	Party-masses theory (4.5%)
	Freedom of expression (9.0%)	

theoretical frameworks to analyze Chinese audience and a few of them tested the explanatory and predictive power of these classical theories in the Chinese context. It seems that Chinese scholars are increasingly paying more attention to theoretical development as most of the studies that tested classical theories in the Chinese context were conducted in the last three years among which Zhang and his colleagues' empirical studies (i.e. Ding & Zhang, 2001; Li & Zhang, 2002) were examples.

## **Conclusion**

This paper tried to seek the trends of audience research in Mainland China in the past 18 years by analyzing three major journalism and communication journals. Four major variables about audience research in China were analyzed: research approaches, research methods, medium of focus and theoretical frameworks employed.

With the input and development of western communication theories and methods in Mainland China in the past 18 years, there were nearly 200 audience research articles published in three major and most widely read Chinese academic journals. They studied audience from three different perspectives, with quantitative and qualitative methods, dealing with different media and by employing several classical theories. Though there existed obvious imbalance among different approaches, methods, media and theories, Chinese scholars began to use these scientific theories and methods to study Chinese audience other than political analysis or rhetorical studies. This is a great advance for Chinese mass communication research considering it did not begin until the early 1980s.

In the past 18 years, Chinese scholars studying audience mostly followed structural and behaviorist traditions. Audience surveys, which used to be seen as a symbol of capitalism, became prevalent in this country. Although qualitative methods are still dominant in this area of study, the percentage of quantitative research had increased from the 1980s to 1990s, especially the survey method. Broadcast and print media were dealt with most often in the past years, while studies on Internet users also increased in recent years. Despite the low percentage of studies that employed theoretical frameworks, Chinese scholars had begun to test and develop western classical theories. These proved that Chinese scholars had been following the steps of the academic world.

Compared with the findings of meta-analysis of mass communication research in international journals, the findings of this study revealed a great gap between Chinese audience research and international research. Chinese academics should study audience with the other approaches, besides those with structural and behaviorist traditions. Literacy criticism, cultural studies, and reception analysis are important approaches to study audience as well, but they are often neglected in Chinese journals. More case studies should be conducted using these approaches.

Quantitative and qualitative methods have their own strength and weakness in studying audience. More quantitative methods should be used in China to analyze audience.

Theory development has been a global problem in the field of mass communication. Chinese scholars could employ western theories to analyze Chinese audience. With China's illustrious history and cultural traditions that deal with many topics related to communication, Chinese scholars should also be encouraged to develop their own theories to explain and predict the media use, media effects, and audience understanding of meaning of texts.

Though this is a descriptive content analysis of audience research in China, we try to use additional materials to interpret some interesting phenomena in the development process of Chinese audience research. It is clear that the historical trajectory of the rise and fall in the currency of different approaches, methods and theories also traces the context change of China's socio-political environment and the development of the academic field. The input of 'audience' concept and related audience surveys quickly earned their market and position since they conform with the trend of China's reform and open policy. The acceptance of 'communication research' by the official educational system in 1996 pushed audience research scholars to seek more diversified approaches and theories. The articulation between 'audience research' as an academic discourse and China's socio-political environment, as well as the articulation between 'audience research' and China's media practices, is a very interesting research topic for the future.

As mentioned earlier, books, book chapters and conference papers were not included in this study. We would like to continue this study by using these materials about audience research in China. Furthermore, most of the comparisons between Chinese and international journals did not deal with the exact same topic since there were nearly no special studies on audience research in major international journals. We hope future research will fill this kind of gap.

## Note

- [1] *Journalistic University* is a Shanghai-based major mass communication academic journal in China; *Journalism* and *Journalism and Mass Communication* are two major mass communication academic journals published in Beijing.

## References

- Ding, W., & Zhang, G. (2001). Testing the 'knowledge gap' hypothesis on Internet. *Modern Communication*, 6, 11–16 (in Chinese).
- Huang, D., & Han, G. (1997). 1981–1996: The past and present situations of communication studies in China. *Journalistic University*, 3, 20–26 (in Chinese).
- Jensen, K. B., & Rosengren, K. E. (1990). Five traditions in search of the audience. *European Journal of Communication*, 5, 207–238.
- Kamhawi, R., & Weaver, D. (2003). Mass communication research trends from 1980 to 1999. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 80, 7–27.
- Li, B., & Zhang, G. (2002). An empirical study on the relationship among audience agenda, media agenda and social reality. *Modern Communication*, 4, 45–47 (in Chinese).

- Lu, W. (1988). The main methods and approaches of US audience survey. *Journalistic University*, 2, 63–64 (in Chinese).
- McQuail, D. (1994). *Mass communication theory: An introduction*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ming, M. (2002). An interpretive paradigm: Hall's model. *Journalism & Mass Communication*, 2, 23–30 (in Chinese).
- Potter, W. J., Cooper, R., & Dupagne, M. (1993). The three paradigms of mass media research in mainstream communication journals. *Communication Theory*, 3(3), 17–335.
- Riffe, D., & Freitag, A. (1997). A content analysis of content analyses: Twenty-five years of Journalism Quarterly. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 74, 873–882.
- Rogers, E. M., Zhao, X., Pan, Z., & Chen, M. (1985). The Beijing audience study. *Communication Research*, 12(2), 179–208.
- Weaver, D. (1993). Communication research in the 1990s: New directions and new agendas. In P. Gaunt (Ed.), *Beyond agendas: New directions in communication research* (pp. 199–220). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2000). *Mass media research: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Zhang, Y. (2000). From masses to audience: Changing media ideologies and practices in reform China. *Journalism Studies*, 1(4), 617–635.
- Zhou, H. (1997). Some issues on mass media consumption. *Modern Communication*, 2, 35–39 (in Chinese).

## Appendix A: Analyzed Issues of Major Journalism and Communication Journals in China

Year/journal	<i>Journalistic University</i>	<i>Journalism &amp; Communication</i>	<i>Modern Communication</i>
1985	1–3	1–3	1–4
1986	1–2	1–6	1–4
1987	1	None in this year	1–4
1988	1–4*	1–6	1–4
1989	1–4	1–2	1–4
1990	1–4	1–4	1–4
1991	1–4	1–3	1–4
1992	1–4	1–4	1–6‡
1993	1–4	1–2**	None in this year
1994	1–4	1–4†	1, 3, 4, 6 (Issues 2 and 5 were missing)
1995	1–4	1–4	1–6
1996	1–4	1–4	1–6
1997	1–4	1–4	1–6
1998	1–4	1–4	1–6
1999	1–4	1–4	1–6
2000	1–4	1–4	1–6
2001	1–4	1–4	1–6
2002	1–4	1–4	1–6

\**Journalistic University* began to publish quarterly from 1988.

\*\**Journalism & Communication* was named as 'Journalism Study' and 'Journalism Research Sources' from 1985 to 1993.

†*Journalism & Communication* began to publish quarterly from 1994.

‡*Modern Communication* began to publish bimonthly from 1992.