Researching Radio Audiences in an Emerging Pluralistic Media Environment: A Case for the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) Method

Margaret I. Amoakohene*

Abstract

The central thesis of this article is that the focus group discussion method of the qualitative research methodology has huge and largely unexploited potentials for use as a tool for audience research in a new democracy with a newly liberated media environment. It argues that the use of the method by Paul Lazarsfeld, Robert Merton and their colleagues at the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University to gauge audience responses and reactions to propaganda and radio broadcasts set the pace for its use in audience research. Through extensive use in, and adaptations to, different research environments, focus groups have demonstrated an ability to function as fully-fledged methods of data collection. The article examines literature on the history, development, and use of focus groups in many fields of study including media and communication to show that the method has advantages for audience research in a competitive media market. Through this perspective, and with reference to a number of studies carried out by the author in Ghana using this method, it recognises focus group research as an appropriate method for researching media, especially radio, audiences and recommends it to media owners.

Key terms: Focus groups, audience research, radio, pluralistic media environment

Résumé

La thèse centrale défendue par cet article est que la méthode d'enquêtes qualitatives participant de la méthodologie de recherche qualitative comporte d'énormes avantages et potentiels, et peut être employée comme un outil de recherche d'audience dans une nouvelle démocratie dotée d'un environnement

---

* Margaret I. Amoakohene is a Lecturer, School of Communication Studies, University of Ghana and Doctoral Candidate, Centre for Mass Communication Research, University of Leicester, UK.

de médias nouvellement libérés. Il affirme que l'usage de cette méthode dans la recherche d'audience a été initié par Paul Lazarsfeld, Robert Merton et leurs collègues du Bureau de la recherche sociale appliquée, à l'Université de Columbia, qui cherchaient à mesurer les réactions de l'audience face à la propagande et aux émissions radio. Du fait de leur adaptation à divers environnements de recherche, ces enquêtes qualitatives se sont révélées être de véritables méthodes de collecte de données. Cet article examine la littérature relative à l'histoire, au développement et à l'emploi des enquêtes qualitatives dans divers domaines d'étude, incluant les médias et la communication, et vise à montrer que cette méthode comporte de nombreux avantages en matière de recherche d'audience, dans un contexte de marché médiatique très concurrentiel. Sur la base de cette perspective et d'un certain nombre d'études menées par l'auteur au Ghana, relativement à cette méthode, cet article conclut en affirmant que la recherche à travers les enquêtes qualitatives est une méthode fort bien adaptée à la recherche d'audiences médias, particulièrement d'audiences radio, et qu'elle est à recommander aux propriétaires de médias.

Mots clés : enquêtes qualitatives, recherche d'audience, radio, environnement médiatique pluraliste

Introduction

Media pluralism, actualised in Ghana in the mid-1990s, has expanded the country's informational environment in ways hitherto unimaginable in its media history. Though broadcasting commenced in 1935 with the inauguration of radio (followed by television in 1965), it operated as a state monopoly until 1992 when Ghana's fourth republican constitution provided for a liberalised media environment. This changed the country's media landscape by introducing private and commercial radio (and later television). Despite initial hiccups with *Radio Eye*, the first private attempt at radio, the establishment of *Joy FM* in 1995 broke state monopoly of the electronic media (Koomson, 1995). Similarly, the maiden telecast of *TV3* programmes on October 1, 1997 broke Ghana Television's 32-year old monopoly (Ansu-Kyeremeh & Karikari 1998). The number of FM radio stations licensed to operate in Ghana today, according to a National Communications Authority (NCA) documentation, stands at about 200 with representation in all regions and many districts. Programming and transmission of these radio stations reflect both the multiplicity of languages spoken in the country and the varied interests of audiences.

Though stemming from different reasons and with different degrees of intensity, changes that have taken place in the Ghanaian media environment are akin to those observed elsewhere in more developed

democracies. Whereas new media, particularly the Internet, have been accredited with such changes in the west (Newbold *et al.* 2001), changes in Ghana (and indeed much of Africa) are largely due to the birth of independent broadcasting with a multiplicity and diversity of traditional/ old media outlets, particularly radio (Karikari 1994). In both cases, however, traditional vertical modes of communication operated on the principle of 'one-to-many' appear to have given way to a horizontal communication environment within which communication is essentially from 'many-to-many' (Newbold *et al.* 2001: 376–422). Through audience interactive programmes that incorporate text, fax, email and phone-in segments, and other discussion programme formats sometimes with studio audiences, hitherto vertical communication structures have yielded to audience inputs to expand along more horizontal lines.

As the number of radio stations increase, there has emerged competition among station executives aimed at capturing sizable portions of the audience/market in order to secure the needed publicity and advertising revenue to finance programmes and operations. Competition has dictated and accelerated change in Ghanaian radio by providing audiences with choice not only of stations but also of programmes. In response, radio stations must study their audiences to understand how interactions with them could affect programme content and programme scheduling. They must explore and investigate (not assume) audience needs and interests, likes and dislikes, as well as their expectations so as to tailor programming and programme content to audience requirements. This might be one way of heeding Halloran's (1998) caution that the media should not be seen as isolated institutions but as one of a set of social institutions which interacts with other institutions within the wider social system. Audience research offers useful ways through which interactions between the media and other social institutions are studied.

Audience researchers have traditionally used the survey, the individual in-depth interview, and to some extent, the focus group method to investigate interactions between audiences and the media (Vandebosch 2000; Downing 2003) and to collect information about station, programme and/ or content preferences of audiences. Although useful as a method for audience research, surveys fail to move beyond individuality and superficiality and thereby fail to provide in-depth analyses of audience needs. They fail to capture the subtle nuances of audience tastes and tend to deemphasise the collective, discursive nature of their interaction with media programme content. Qualitative research appears more appropriate for such studies especially in the African context because of its natural environment of social group bonding, which often dictates the kind of

responses given to stimuli (Obeng-Quaidoo 1985; Bourgault 1995). In most cases, the preferred qualitative approach is the individual in-depth interview usually used to discover motives, rationale and motivations for participation or non-participation in specific media activities (Vandebosch 2000).

The individual in-depth interview, however, has the tendency to yield individualistic data without being able to capture the discursive nature of real-life situations where media audiences actually discuss media content with relations, friends and acquaintances (Liebes & Katz 1995). Data gathered using this approach tend to be 'an aggregation of interviews' (MacDougall & Fudge 2001: 118) containing individual responses to the media whereas such responses are more meaningful if they are collectively generated or groupthink. The interactivity of a group concept in focus groups appears suited both to the communal life system into which the African is socialised and to the collective discussion that characterises audience reactions and responses to media messages. Though not as extensively used as the survey or the in-depth interview in previous audience research, the focus group discussion method does contain possibilities capable of overcoming a lot of the constraints identified in both the survey and the interview (Lunt & Livingstone 1996; Hansen *et al.* 1998). Researchers contend that the group interaction in focus group discussions can yield more and richer information than individual interviews even when the same participants are used (MacDougall & Fudge 2001; Asbury 1995).

The essence of this paper is to advance arguments in support of the use of focus groups in audience studies as a method with the capability to provide detailed research results for decision-making in media/communication, public relations and market related research. Through a discussion of the tenets, history, development, uses and strengths of focus groups, the paper contends that the method has the potential to provide the required in-depth information to make content, programming, product, service delivery and audience decisions. It highlights the usefulness of focus groups for studying group dynamics and enabling researchers examine the experiential and subjective aspects of phenomena thereby illuminating the social and cultural contexts that inform these experiences (Frith, 2000). It uses experiences and lessons from conducting focus groups in Ghana (though mainly in areas other than the media) to argue that radio stations would benefit from using focus groups. The method will enable them do more than gather information on audience experiences and preferences including total amounts of listening time, and amounts of time devoted to listening to their preferred programmes (Vandebosch, 2000).

They would also benefit from an understanding of audience motivations for, and the importance they ascribe to such media activities. This will help to examine and understand levels of audience gratification with specific media activities and to assess and collect opinions on programming and content to improve production and patronage.

Central tenets of the focus group discussion method
Focus group discussions are variously referred to as 'focus group interviews', 'group interviews', 'group depth interviews', 'group discussions', 'focused interviews', or 'focus groups' (Merton 1987; Frith 2000). They are focused discussions involving a small number of participants talking about topics of special importance to the investigation under the direction of a moderator or facilitator. The focus group literature provides abundant information and useful 'advice on process issues such as designing interview guides and structuring and moderating groups' (Kidd & Parshall 2000: 295). For instance, they are said to be typically composed of between six and 12 members, plus a moderator, and that a popular size for focus groups is eight people because groups below six or above 10 or 12 are usually difficult to manage (Bernard 1995). According to Broom and Dozier (1990: 147), '. . . the moderator guides the group discussion to elicit qualitative data on knowledge, opinions and behaviour of participants regarding the focus topic.'

Like all qualitative research, focus groups are based on the critical perspective—the belief that social reality is derived and formed from people's interaction with their environment. Priest (1996: 4) puts focus groups in the category of interpretive methods because they 'make use of (rather than try to eliminate entirely) the thoughts, feelings, and reactions of the researcher.' Focus groups are 'based on the assumption that people are an important source of information about themselves and the issues that affect their lives and that they can articulate their thoughts and feelings' (Winslow *et al.* 2002: 566). They 'rely on the dynamic of the group interactions to stimulate the thinking and thus the verbal contributions of the participants, and to provide the researcher with rich, detailed perspectives that could not be obtained through other methodological strategies' (Asbury 1995: 415).

In focus group discussions, 'a small group of people engage in collective discussion of a topic pre-selected by the researcher. The aim of the group discussion is to gain insight into the personal experiences, beliefs, attitudes and feelings that underlie behaviour' (Frith 2000: 276). Researchers, therefore, constantly probe participants through open-ended discussions that the focus group environment creates. This aims at obtaining a

wealth of information and gaining deep understanding of respondents' motives and motivations for given actions. The richness of information generated through focus groups in terms of both quantity and quality of information and understanding would otherwise be lost through other less interactive methods of data collection.

Although earlier prescriptions of how to conduct focus groups advocated for participants previously unknown to each other (Merton 1987; Bernard 1995; Lunt & Livingstone 1996), many contemporary studies that utilise the FGD technique have used pre-existing groups. These are considered more natural and germane to the interactional dynamics of the group (Kitzinger 1994; Lunt & Livingstone 1996). Examples include Philo's (1996) media and mental distress study, Kitzinger's (1993) understanding AIDS study, and Liebes and Katz' (1995) cross-cultural *Dallas* study. These considerations, perhaps, explain Barbour's (1999: S19) definition of the focus group as 'either a naturally occurring or researcher selected group convened for the purpose of discussing a specific research topic.' What this means is that focus group discussions can take place either among groups assembled by researchers in synch with their research needs or among already existing groups depending on the purposes of the research and its objectives.

Decisions with regard to the number of groups required for a given study are made based on its specific requirements. The literature shows wide variations in numbers of groups used in different studies conducted to research various issues. This author has used groups ranging from eight to 21 in various focus group studies conducted in Ghana with participants per group of between six and ten people. The key is to be able to determine the level at which saturation is reached and beyond which no new ideas emerge. In spite of wide variations in the sizes and numbers of groups per research, however, a group size of between six and eight participants and a number of eight to ten groups for a study could yield useful data to produce valid and reliable findings. Ultimately, however, the total number of group sessions for a given study would depend on the number of variables to be considered and resources available for the research. In order to aid comparisons, more than one group session should be conducted in various locations and with different samples of the population reflecting different group characteristics.

While some studies cover a few geographical areas, others span an entire country or a substantial part of it. A study by Knodel *et al*. (1984), for instance, covered the whole of Thailand while one by Nkwi (1992) covered both the Francophone and Anglophone parts of Cameroon. Conversely, in two recent studies this author conducted in Ghana using focus

groups, one study covered four out of the ten regions of the country, while the other focused on four districts of the same region. These variations in geographical areas covered in focus group research are usually based on the objectives of the study. In all cases using focus groups, selection of participants is done very carefully, often spreading recruitment over a wider geographical area and spelling out detailed criteria for selection to meet all required variables, attributes or dimensions under study.

History, development and use of focus groups

'Focus group methods evolved out of research methods designed by Paul Lazarsfeld, Robert Merton, and colleagues at the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University to gauge audience responses to propaganda and radio broadcasts during World War II' (Kidd & Parshall 2000: 295). It is significant that the focus group method was first developed and used in media audience and communication research principally to guide interpretation of data to radio audience research at the University of Columbia and to research on film audiences (Kidd & Parshall 2000; Stycos 1981; Obeng-Quaidoo 1987). Hansen *et al.* (1998), on their part, indicate that Merton's work with Patricia Kendall (Merton & Kendall 1946) and that with Kendall and Fiske (Merton, Fiske & Kendall 1956: 258) 'are reckoned to mark the birth of the method for the study of media audiences and communication processes.' Since 1922, the United States has used focus groups for communications research, propaganda analysis, public opinion research, and research in broadcasting and marketing (Obeng-Quaidoo 1987; Merton 1987; Kidd & Parshall 2000).

Despite this early history, the functional utility of focus groups became noticeable only from the 1960s. Since the 1980s, the method has become increasingly popular not only in market research but also in research in both the social and health sciences with 'an unabated stream of publications' (Kidd & Parshall 2000: 293). During its journey of over half a century, focus groups have experienced several modifications, adaptations and streamlining (Lunt & Livingstone 1996) to pass the litmus test of a bona fide research method in the social sciences. 'In recent years, focus group methods have become increasingly popular as either an adjunctive or primary data collection approach in the social and health sciences and in evaluation research' (Kidd & Parshall 2000: 293). This popularity has been attributed to the rise in 'reception studies' as distinct from the traditional 'effects studies' in media research (Hansen *et al.* 1998). Lunt and Livingstone (1996), and Hansen *et al.* (1998) see the rekindled

interest in focus groups as both a rejection of the quantitative methodology and a move towards the qualitative. The latter provides 'insightful findings and ecologically valid, interpretative techniques' (Lunt and Livingstone 1996: 79) not only in media and communication research but also in other areas of social science research.

> For examining the dynamics of what experiential knowledge and frames of interpretation audiences bring to bear in their use of media content, what role media use has in the everyday life of audiences, or how audiences use the media as a resource in their everyday lives, it is necessary to turn to more qualitative methods, which allow us to observe in a more 'natural' setting than that of the survey or the laboratory experiment how audiences relate to media (both as technologies and as content) (Hansen *et al.* 1998: 257).

There is extensive use of focus groups in the social sciences, widely used in both basic and applied research (Bernard 1995) in most areas including media studies. Social scientists have for many decades used it to collect qualitative data for several purposes (Folch-Lyon & Trost 1981; Morgan & Spanish 1984; Stycos 1981). These include generating constructs, developing models, generating data for the development of products, and for evaluating new programmes and products (Winslow *et al.* 2002). Winslow *et al.* (2002: 566) report that throughout the 1990s focus groups were used to 'gather in-depth views and opinions of homogeneous groups of people for social science research,' including its use in shaping political campaigns in the western world. In the field of social communications, focus groups have had a long history of usage as tools for both media and market research for purposes of marketing (Calder 1977; Folch-Lyon & Trost 1981), business studies (Blackburn & Stokes 2000; Buttner 2001) and advertising (Wang 1997).

   Since Merton's (1946 & 1956) works with his colleagues marking the beginning of focus groups in communication research to study media audiences and communication processes (Bernard 1995; Lunt & Livingstone, 1996; Hansen *et al.* 1998), there have been many other examples. Morley (1980) conducted 29 focus groups in his study of the audience for the news and current affairs programme *Nationwide*. Corner, Richardson, and Fenton (1990) used focus groups to explore respondents' reactions to messages on nuclear power while Schlesinger *et al.* (1992) used it to study perceptions and reactions of women viewing violence on television. To study audience understanding of AIDS, Kitzinger (1993) conducted 52 focus groups while Philo (1996) used the method to study media and mental distress. Liebes and Katz (1995), on their part, conducted 66 focus groups to explore different patterns of audience

involvement with the American soap *Dallas* among different cultural groups.

The literature also shows extensive use of focus groups in health research (Frith 2000; MacDougall & Fudge 2001). Its use in the area of health includes primary health care, attitudes, practices and utilization patterns (Borkan *et al*. 2000), family-planning and contraceptive use (Folch-Lyon 1981), sexuality, reproductive and sexual health knowledge and sexual behaviour (Frith 2000; Robinson 1999); lesbianism and violence (Corteen 2002); sexuality, STDs and HIV/AIDS (Benkert 2002; Frith & Kitzinger 2001); dyslexia (Dale & Taylor 2001); stress (McCallum *et al*. 2002; Majumdar & Ladak 1998); and violence against women (Poorman 2002).

Focus group research in Ghana: Experiences and lessons
Over the last couple of decades, focus groups have been used in Ghana to research various topics ranging from market concerns including social marketing and health to media and communication issues for both academic purposes and for industry. Although the use of the method in Ghana does not compare with its use elsewhere, various organisations including those in manufacturing, commerce, media, non-governmental and social services have used focus groups to research and to interact with their audiences. They have used the method to establish how and what specific messages of products and services communicate to audiences and consumers, and to gauge public reception and perception of those messages. Though the majority of these studies are health-related, there are many others that are in the domain of media and market research. These studies have proved extremely useful in that sponsors/organisations have been able to assess the effectiveness of their communications in order to map out ways of adapting to audience/client needs. Recommendations from the studies have equally been useful providing sponsors ways of strategising for the future in order to take advantage of prevailing conditions and to have an edge over competition.

In the area of health and related research, which appears to dominate the focus group literature in Ghana, there have been a number of sponsored studies whose reports are privately held. Published works in this area, however, include one by DeRose *et al.* (2002) who used focus groups to examine fertility, reproduction and power relations among young Ghanaian men and women. Asenso-Okyere *et al.* (1998) investigated the impact of cost-sharing policies introduced in Ghana in 1985 by the Government of the PNDC on people's health care seeking behaviour using

focus group discussions of cohorts of the Ghanaian population. Studying the period between 1985 and 1992, the authors combined focus groups with in-depth interviews conducted with health workers and selected opinion leaders in three districts of Ghana to obtain a broader perspective of any such impact. Obeng-Quaidoo (1987) reports of twelve focus groups conducted in four cities in Ghana to find out people's perceptions of family planning and their contraceptive use.

In the specific area of communication research, the dearth of published works using focus groups in Ghana shows in the fact that only one recently published article was found for the present study. Kwansah-Aidoo (2002) conducted 12 focus groups and 120 in-depth interviews to investigate Ghanaian media coverage of the environment and how that affected educated urban dwellers' awareness of environmental issues. In spite of this shortcoming, there are numerous unpublished reports of studies that have used the focus group research method mainly in the field of market research to examine communication strategies. The author of this article has over the last 15 years undertaken many commissioned studies for industry using focus groups. Many of these studies have aimed to develop, pre-test and post-test large numbers of advertising concepts and messages while others have sought to research product concepts and their acceptability to intended targets. Some other studies have focused on product images; consumer/public perceptions of and reactions to various products/services and their communications; as well as audience reactions to and evaluation of specific radio and television programmes to enable their fine-tuning.

In a recent study to assess participants' responses to the messages of a service provider, we conducted seventeen focus groups composed of between eight and ten participants each in four out of Ghana's ten regions each of which had peculiar realities and difficulties vis-à-vis the provision of that particular service and its communication patterns. Recommendations from this study resulted in the translation of communication content or messages into all major languages of the catchment areas. Other studies conducted for some other service delivery organisations resulted in the use of pictures and symbols in communication to offset problems of illiteracy (and in one case, hearing impairment), which was endemic in those areas studied. In a radio-specific study to assess audience reactions to and evaluations of some programme series of a local-language community radio station, we conducted 21 focus groups in four districts of a region in Ghana which constituted the coverage area of the station. In this particular case, a major recommendation resulted in a

significant change in programme content: adapting the language of transmission to suit everyday usage rather than the formal 'dictionary-based' language, which tended to be misunderstood by the youth, and poorly understood by many others. The findings of another focus group research engineered the streamlining of a radio station's programming to be in sync with audience expectations thus resulting in programme-time changes.

Despite the fact that recommendations from some of these studies have been both insightful and useful to patrons and audiences or targets, most of the studies have been sponsored and paid for by business, commercial concerns and organisations in the health sector. Consequently, as Downing (2003: 633) observed, their findings are 'strictly reserved for contracted firms' and are thus unavailable to the public. These organisations dictate the design and budget of the studies as well as control the publication of research findings.

Strengths of focus group research

Hansen *et al*. (1998: 258) proffer two reasons why focus groups are preferable in studying the dynamics of audience-media relationships. First, focus groups are 'more cost-efficient than individual interviews – a wider range of people can be interviewed within the same limitations of time, resources, and research money.' Secondly, 'groups allow the researcher to observe how audiences make sense of media *through conversation* and interaction with each other'. In the opinion of Lunt and Livingstone (1996:93): 'The group acts as a context that challenges, asks for elaboration, and demands examples of claims that people make.' Cutlip *et al*. (1994: 331) believe 'the major strength of focus groups is the open, spontaneous, and detailed discussions they generate, even among people who did not know each other before the session began.' Similarly, Priest (1996:66) sees group interaction as the strongest point of focus groups:

> ... the real advantage of a focus group is that the researcher can gather data on participants' interaction with one another. A richer picture of how information is processed and conclusions are drawn can be constructed in comparison to what can be understood from the narrower data produced in an interview situation. Participants may say things to one another that they would not bring up in a one-on-one conversation, such as arguments they consider persuasive and associations they make in response to others' comments. They may also more easily forget that the researcher is present, so their conversations and reactions more closely approximate normal conditions.

Focus groups have the advantage of cultural appropriateness, which allows them to adapt to peculiar environmental conditions in the context within which research is carried out (Vissandjée *et al*. 2002; Williams, 1999). The method provides a more naturalistic approach to research by using the narratives and oral traditions of different cultures (Russon 1995). It is therefore suited to African cultural, traditional, and environmental circumstances including its informal, open and group bonded nature, strong narrative and oral traditions. The richness of Africa's local languages (including those of Ghana), the continent's communal audience listening and viewing nature with a concomitant richness of audience interaction and discourse evident in participation in radio phone-in programmes make the method particularly preferable. The ability to use local languages in conducting focus groups enables participants to express themselves adequately and researchers to understand and capture participants' beliefs, values, communication and ways of interaction, among others. The rich nuances and subtleties of these languages allow researchers into the deeper meanings of participants' words and expressions sometimes impossible to capture in a second language like English or French.

Focus groups are usually neither constrained by limitations of access, and resource constraints of the participant observation, nor the rather more time-consuming and individualized approach of the one-to-one interview. There are enormous advantages in focus groups' ability to collect data from people within groups that are, in general, difficult to reach. These groups include people who are disadvantaged such as minorities and illiterates, or people who are disenfranchised (Barbour 1999). Esposito (2001: 569) argues that focus groups are an excellent way of identifying the needs of populations that are under-researched and they also 'allow participants a voice in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of interventions.' Frith (2000) outlines three key advantages of the method. Firstly, it is useful for exploratory research into under-researched topics and for speedy policy analysis. Secondly, it enables researchers to learn the language and vocabulary typically used by respondents to talk about phenomena under investigation. Finally, it provides conditions under which people feel comfortable discussing issues including some that are personal and sensitive like sex and sexual experiences about which people would usually be bashful. Fontana and Frey (1994: 36) summed up the advantages of focus groups as 'being inexpensive, data rich, flexible, stimulating to respondents, recall aiding and cumulative and elaborative.'

Conclusion

Focus groups as tools of audience research have the inherent quality and ability of enabling researchers take advantage of group dynamics and interactions to yield rich original data to streamline content and programming. Radio stations in competitive markets (such as Ghana) need to research using methods that transcend the superficiality of the survey (Hansen *et al*. 1998) in order to answer questions relating to the *why* and *how* of audience-media relationships. Focus groups do provide that opportunity. They have the capacity to probe deeper into audience motivations, beliefs, attitudes and behaviour in more natural and realistic settings that match normal human group dynamics (Morley 1980; Folch-Lyon 1981; Frith 2000). Using focus groups in audience research replicates the normal ways through which audiences attend and respond to the media, and discuss media content with others in their immediate environment. The method thus has the potential to deliver to station managers what audiences require with regard to their radio listening experiences.

The extreme popularity of phone-in programmes and the responses they evoke from listeners show the enthusiasm of listeners to get involved as active rather than passive audiences. This provides pointers to a hidden and untapped potential of the focus group to research radio audiences in the booming electronic media market in Ghana. Focus groups demonstrated their ability to research audiences since the days when a 'group of people listened to a recorded radio programme that was supposed to raise public morale prior to America's entry into World War II' (Bernard, 1995: 225). Through experience of their use in Ghana, although relatively minimal, one can vouch for their usefulness in communication-media-audience research. It is time to exploit fully their unique potential to study the interface between audiences and the media, particularly radio, in a liberalised pluralistic electronic media environment such as Ghana.

References

Ansu-Kyeremeh, K., & Karikari, K. (1998) *Media Ghana: Ghanaian media overview, practitioners and institutions*. Legon, Ghana: School of Communication Studies Press.

Asbury, J. (1995) 'Overview of focus group research'. *Qualitative Health Research*, *5*(4), 414–20.

Asenso-Okyere, W.K., Anum, A., Osei-Akoto, I., Adukonu, A. (1998) 'Cost recovery in Ghana: are there any changes in health care seeking behaviour?'. *Health Policy and Planning, 13*(2), 181–188.

Barbour, R. S. (1999) 'The use of focus groups to define patient needs'. *Journal*

of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition, *28*(4), S19–S22.

Benkert, H. (2002) 'Liberating insights from a cross-cultural sexuality study about women'. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*(8), 1197– 1207.

Bernard, H. Russell (1995) *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* 2nd Edition. New Delhi: Altamiria Press.

Blackburn, R., & Stokes, D. (2000) 'Breaking down the barriers: using focus groups to research small and medium enterprises'. *International Small Business Journal*, *19*(1)(73), 44–67.

Borkan, J.M., Morad, M., & Shvarts, S. (2000) 'Universal health care: The views of Negev Bedouin Arabs on health services'. *Health Policy and Planning*, *15*(2), 207–216.

Bourgault, Louise M. (1995) *Mass media in sub-Saharan Africa*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Broom, Glen M. & Dozier, David M. (1990) *Using research in public relations: Applications to program management.* Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Bittner, E.H. (2001) 'Examining female entrepreneurs' management style: an application of a relational frame'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *29*(3), 253–70.

Calder, B.J. (1977) 'Focus groups and the nature of qualitative marketing research'. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *14*, 353–64.

Corner, J., Richardson, K., & Fenton, N. (1990) *Nuclear reactions: Form and response in public issue television.* London: John Libbey.

Corteen, K. (2002) 'Lesbian safety talk: Problematizing definitions and experiences of violence, sexuality and space'. *Sexualities*, *5*(3), 259–80.

Cutlip, Scott M., Center, Allen H., & Broom, Glen M. (1994) *Effective public relations* (7th Edition). Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.

Dale, M., & Taylor, B. (2001) 'How adult learners make sense of their dyslexia'. *Disability and Society*, *16*(7), 997–1008.

DeRose, L.F., Dodoo, F. N. A., & Patil, V. (2002) 'Fertility desires and perceptions of power in reproductive conflict in Ghana'. *Gender and Society*, *16*(1), 53–73.

Downing, J.D.H. (2003) 'Audiences and readers of alternative media: The absent lure of the virtually unknown'. *Media, Culture & Society*, *25*(5), 625–45.

Esposito, Noreen (2001) 'From meaning to meaning: The influence of translation techniques on non-English focus group research'. *Qualitative Health Research*, *11*(4), 568–579.

Folch-Lyon, E. (1981) 'Focus group and survey research on family planning in Mexico'. *Studies in family planning*, *12* (12), 409–432.

Folch-Lyon, E. & John F. Trost (1981) 'Conducting focus group sessions'. *Studies in Family Planning*, *12*(12), 443–49.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1994) 'Interviewing: The art of science'. In N.K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361–376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Frith, Hannah (2000) 'Focusing on sex: Using focus groups in sex research'. *Sexualities*, *3*(3), 275–297.

Frith, H., & Kitzinger, C. (2001) 'Reformulating sexual script theory: Developing a discursive psychology of sexual negotiation'. *Theory and Psychology*, *11*(2), 209–232.

Halloran, J.D. (1998) 'Mass communication research: Asking the right questions'. In Anders Hansen et al., *Mass communication research methods* (pp. 9–34). New York: Palgrave.

Hansen, A., S. Cottle, R. Negrine, & C. Newbold (1998) *Mass communication research methods*. New York: Palgrave.

Karikari, K. (Ed.) (1994). *Independent broadcasting in Ghana: Implications and challenges*. Legon, Ghana: Ghana Universities Press.

Kidd, P. S., & Parshall, M. K. (2000) 'Getting the focus and the group: Enhancing analytical rigor in focus group research'. *Qualitative Health Research*, *10*(3), 293–308.

Kitzinger, J. (1994) 'The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants'. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 16,* 103–121.

Kitzinger, J. (1993) 'Understanding AIDS: Researching audience perceptions of acquired immune deficiency syndrome'. In Glasgow University Media Group (J. Eldridge, Ed.), *Getting the message: News, truth and power* (pp. 271–304). London: Routledge.

Knodel, J, Havanon, N., & Pramualrana, A. (1984). 'Fertility transition in Thailand: A qualitative analysis'. *Population and Development Review*, *10*, 297–315.

Koomson, A.B. (Ed.) (1995) *Prospects for Private Broadcasting in Ghana*. Accra: Gold-Type Press Ltd.

Kwansah-Aidoo, K. (2002) 'The beauty of 'short' stories: Noting the significance of anecdotal analysis in African communication research'. In Anthony V. Stavros (Ed), *Advances in communications and media research*, Vol. 1. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Liebes, T., & Katz, E. (1995) 'Patterns of involvement in television fiction: A comparative analysis'. In O. Boyd-Barrett & C. Newbold (Eds.), *Approaches to media: A reader*. London: Arnold, pp. 531–535.

Lunt, P. and Livingstone, S. (1996). 'Rethinking the focus group in media and communications research'. *Journal of communication*, *46*(2), 79–98.

MacDougall, C. & Fudge, E. (2001). 'Planning and recruiting the sample for focus groups and in-depth interviews'. *Qualitative Health Research*, *11*(1), 117–26.

Majumdar, B., & Ladak, S. (1998). 'Management of family and workplace stress experienced by women of colour from various cultural backgrounds'. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, *89*(1), 48–52.

McCallum, D.M., Arnold, S.E., & Bolland, J.M. (2002). 'Low-income African-American women talk about stress'. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, *11*(3), 249–263.

Merton, R.K. (1987). 'The focused interview and focus groups: Continuities and discontinuities'. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51, 550–566.

Merton, R.K., Fiske, M., & Kendall, P.L. (1956). *The focused interview: a manual of problems and procedures.* Glencoe Illinois: The Free Press.

Merton, R.K., & Kendall, P. L. (1946). 'The focused interview'. *American Journal of Sociology*, *51*, 541–557.

Morgan, D.L., & Spanish, M. T. (1984). 'Focus groups: A new tool for qualitative research'. *Qualitative Sociology*, *7*, 253–270.

Morley, Dave (1980). *The nationwide audience*. London: British Film Institute.

Newbold, C., Boyd-Barrett, O., & Van den Bulck, H. (Eds.) (2001). *The media book*. London: Arnold.

Nkwi, P. (1992). 'Population Action Program for the improvement of quality of life in rural communities'. *Report*. Yaoundé: World Bank, African Population Advisory Council.

Obeng-Quaidoo, I. (1985). 'Culture and communication methodologies in Africa: A proposal for change'. *Gazette* 36: 109-120.

Obeng-Quaidoo, I. (1987). 'New development-oriented models of communication research for Africa: The case for focus group research'. *Communicatio Socialis Yearbook* VI: 115–125.

Philo, G. (Ed.) (1996). *Media and mental distress*. London: Longman.

Poorman, P.B. (2002). 'Perceptions of thriving by women who have experienced abuse or status-related oppression'. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *26*(1), 51–62.

Priest, S.H. (1996). *Doing media research: An introduction*. London: SAGE.

Robinson, N. (1999). 'The use of focus group methodology with selected examples from sexual health research'. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *29*(4), 905–913.

Russon, C. (1995) 'The influence of culture on evaluation'. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 7(1), 44–49.

Schlesinger, P., Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R. P., & Weaver, C. (1992) *Women viewing violence*. London: British Film Institute.

Stycos, M.J. (1981) 'A critique of focus group and survey research: The machismo case'. *Studies in Family Planning*, *12*(12), 450–456.

Vandebosch, Heidi (2000) 'Research note: A captive audience? The media use of prisoners'. *European Journal of Communication*, *15*(4), 529–544.

Wang, J. (1997) 'Through the looking glass of foreign ads in China'. *Asian Journal of Communication*, *7*(1), 19–42.

Williams, R.D. (1999) 'Use of focus groups with rural women of lower socio-economic status'. *Applied Nursing Research*, *12*(1), 45–50.

Winslow, Wendy W., Honein, Gladys & Elzubeir, Margaret A. (2002) 'Seeking Emirati women's voices: The use of focus groups with an Arab population'. *Qualitative Health Research 12*(4), 566–575.