

Analysis of Core Discourse and Discourse Framework on Public Opinion of US-Proposed Human Rights Issues in Xinjiang from the Perspective of Cognitive Communication

Zhenqiang Zhao

School of Applied Foreign Languages, Zhejiang Yuexiu University, Shaoxing, China

Email: zzq0416@163.com

How to cite this paper: Zhao, Z. Q. (2023). Analysis of Core Discourse and Discourse Framework on Public Opinion of US-Proposed Human Rights Issues in Xinjiang from the Perspective of Cognitive Communication. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 11, 101-111.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2023.112008>

Received: January 16, 2023

Accepted: February 10, 2023

Published: February 13, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

With the rise of China in all fields, US with ideological bias has waged a public opinion war against China and seized the international public opinion field through a series of means, trying to win the support from homeland and international community, then to curb China's development and undermine China's international image. In order to understand its internal mechanism, it is necessary to analyze the construction mechanism of public opinion discourse from the two dimensions which are core discourse and discourse framework, and meanwhile extract China's core discourse based on the discourse framework recognized by the international community, aiming to effectively counter the American discourse hegemony, contribute more discourse framework to the international community, and promote the fair distribution of international discourse power. By taking the public opinion on Xinjiang's human rights issues released by international mainstream medium dominated by US as an example, this paper will study the intervention process of core discourse and discourse framework, and analyze discourse construction logic where concepts hidden behind the discourse provide value support.

Keywords

Core Discourse, Discourse Framework, Cognitive Communication, Human Rights Issues, Public Opinion

1. Introduction

The game between China and US has a long history and has been further complicated in recent years. Throughout the history of Sino-US relation over 40

years, its development process is divided into four stages, namely, the steady development period from 1979 to 2008, the continuous decline period from 2009 to 2016, the accelerated deterioration period from 2017 to 2020, and the strategic stalemate period since 2021 (Hu & Wang, 2022). During Obama's administration from 2009 to 2016, the two governments rationally maintained the situation of "competing in peace", and negotiated with each other on major issues such as the South China Sea dispute and network security, trying to avoid the escalation of confrontation. During Trump's administration from 2017 to 2020, American attitude and policy towards China changed significantly, by increasing its intervention in China's domestic governance, continuously and violently interfering in China's internal affairs on Taiwan, Hong Kong, Xinjiang, Tibet and other issues, and politically manipulating the traceability, prevention and control of the COVID-19, which led to further deterioration of Sino-US relation. Since Biden's administration from 2021, despite adhering to the professional and steady ruling style of the Nationalist Party, US has closely linked the domestic governance issues of both countries with its policies towards China, such as jointly interfering with its allies in China's internal affairs on Taiwan, Hong Kong, Xinjiang and other areas, and politicizing the issue of the COVID-19 traceability, which led to the lack of political mutual trust between the two countries.

The issue of human rights related to Xinjiang has become one of the main means for US to exert pressure on China's strategy, seriously disrupting the international environment of China's economic and trade development, cultural exchanges and other aspects, and maliciously destroying China's international image and discourse rights. Relying on the cultural hegemony and media empire established in the world after the Cold War, US seized the international public opinion field through a series of means, repeatedly hyped the human rights issue in Xinjiang, and tried to mask the truth of the event in the public opinion environment dominated by US and the West, so that the accusation of human rights issues in Xinjiang became politically correct. In fact, it was an excuse for sanctions against Xinjiang, with the political, economic and other factors hidden behind it. In the era of cognitive competition, US uses a variety of international media platforms to set human rights issues related to Xinjiang, subsidize think tanks, non-governmental organizations, human rights organizations and other authoritative institutions to speak for them, secretly promote the formation of public opinion by various We-media communication subjects, guide international audiences to launch social movements, to achieve its sinister political purpose. Because US occupies the international discourse power, this kind of public opinion constructed from the above manipulation is still widely spread and trusted even though it cannot stand the test of facts. In order to effectively deal with the relevant untrue reports, the mainstream media such as Global Times, China Daily, etc., timely respond to it by reporting the truth to the world on the so-called human rights issues in Xinjiang in omnimedia and multi-modality. In order to change the passive situation of China in the international public opinion field, break the internal mechanism of constructing US' public

opinion discourse concerning Xinjiang, it is imminent and necessary to construct the Chinese counterattack discourse, which has important theoretical significance and practical value for improving China's international discourse power.

2. Literature Review

The issue of human rights has always been an important part in shaping China's international image. In May 2021, when presiding over the collective study of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee, Xi Jinping, the chairman of China, emphasized that China should enhance and strengthen the international communication capacity, and should comprehensively elaborate the view of development, civilization, security, human rights, ecology, international order and global governance on the basis of more than 5000 years of Chinese civilization. However, US classifies China as "the Other", a common term in western post-colonial theory, constructs the western discourse system for the western audience to recognize China based on the discourse framework of its values, and shapes the image of China between the real and the imaginary with political tendencies of its political class (Zhou, 2011). Through processing discourse, communication subjects construct reality with the help of news, and then hype human rights issues to smear the image of China, misleading the people of US and other countries to form wrong cognition. This kind of cognition becomes the intermediary between the media discourse and social reality, and completes the construction of the national image by the media (Vandijk, 2008). Therefore, the game between China and US focuses on discourse construction. Different from "language", "discourse" has not only the static attributes of syntactic structure and logical order, but also the dynamic attributes of power relations and the game between interest groups (Yao, 2014). The social structure, power relations and ideological elements hidden behind the discourse are everywhere in domestic and foreign news reports and daily life, and inconspicuously change reception subjects' cognition. Michel Foucault believes that language and society are closely linked, and is committed to analyzing the sociality of discourse formation, trying to reveal the power relationship behind discourse, and constructing a series of social practice activities representing power with the help of language symbols (Foucault, 2012). Post-structuralism introduces Foucault's thoughts into political studies, trying to understand the influence of power, knowledge and identity on international relations from the perspective of relationship between discourse and text (Sun, 2009). Under the political manipulation, media content output will be labeled with power. In the process of information dissemination, communication subjects formulate discourse rules, construct discourse framework, condense core discourse, outputs ideology, and affect the cognition of reception subjects. Therefore, discourse, as a constituent element of news text, not only carries the meaning of news topics, but also becomes a tool for exporting power attributes and ideology.

National interests determine the significance of power distribution in the international community, and the specific content of national interests is constructed by concepts of the national people (Wendt, 2014). Power produces social meaning through discourse and forms a driving force at the material level, while concepts at ideological level is the deepest driving force, with discourse constituting the connecting medium between powers and concepts. Based on this, a large number of American and Western scholars conduct researches on how political discourse is integrated into the power operation mechanism, and explore the role of national interests in the construction of international discourse from a multidimensional perspective. Due to the national strategic interests, US sets up the human rights issue in Xinjiang to occupy the highest point of public opinion with the advantage of its global media empire and discourse power, and achieved the attempt to mislead reception subjects of other countries by slandering and blackening the human rights issue in Xinjiang. The relevant domestic research results in China mainly focus on the analysis of typical cases, and make a detailed analysis of the so-called “Forced Labor” and other topics that smear China proposed by US and the West, and put forward a variety of coping strategies, but less analysis of the discourse construction mechanism and construction logic behind the public opinion bias. Through production, processing and dissemination of information, US has an obvious trend of constructing a framework of stigmatization discourse, attempting to form a negative perception of China by the international community. In view of this, this paper, from the perspective of cognitive communication, introduces the framework theory to sort out the core discourse and discourse framework of US’ stigmatizing human rights in Xinjiang, expounds the logical relevance of discourse construction, and extracts the core discourse of China based on the internationally recognized discourse framework to promote the fair distribution of international discourse rights.

3. The Core Discourse of US-Proposed Human Rights Issues in Xinjiang

From the perspective of the operation mechanism of discourse, discourse is based on social practice of production, processing and dissemination of social concepts rooted in ideology. The understanding of discourse needs to deconstruct from the outside to the inside, by clarifying its core connotation and discourse to refine the central concepts and themes, which has the characteristics of symbolization and serves a practical purpose. In other words, the core discourse is the cognitive representation of power and the construction of discourse content. To refine the core discourse of US’ public opinion concerning Xinjiang, it is requested to summarize its core claim from the proposed topic and view. In recent years, US has launched a new round of public opinion war concerning Xinjiang with political purposes and ideological bias. Besides using the ready-made routine in public opinion, US hyped the human rights issue, which greatly

misled the international reception subjects. Focusing on China's policy of governing Xinjiang, US stigmatized Xinjiang's human rights issue, by fabricating false evidence on so-called human rights reports, and sensationalizing the existence of so-called "Forced Labor", "Forced Sterilization", "Human Rights Violations", "Genocide" in Xinjiang, so as to use these core discourse to gradually build up the psychological space among international reception subjects, thus form wrong perception on China's policy of governing Xinjiang, which great disrupt the stability of China's western boundary, and finally realize the conspiracy to curb China's rise.

First, US's anti-China think tanks, human rights institutions, non-governmental departments and others have carried out many activities to stigmatize human rights in Xinjiang by forging evidence, fabricating reports, spreading rumors. The National Democracy Foundation of US is keen on hyping human rights issues in Xinjiang, concocting the so-called "Genocide" and other topics, and long-term funding for separatist organizations in Xinjiang. In 2019, the Foundation bribed witnesses, forged evidence, stigmatized the existence of human rights problems in Xinjiang, and fabricated negative topics that were detrimental to China's image in the international public opinion field. In 2020, US began to hype the so-called "Forced Labor" fallacy. The specific operation path was first to make US think tanks propose the issue, and then the human rights institutions, industry associations and other departments play it up. After that, the members of the two houses of US Congress, ministers, secretaries of state, spokesmen of the State Council and other political figures appeared to support, and finally the government issued the human rights-related sanctions bill. The whole set of operations is run by the international mainstream media dominated by US and its western allies. The fallacies such as "Forced Labor" and "Terrible Abuse" are repeatedly mentioned in reports, speeches and popular programs to suppress China's rise.

Second, US misled relevant UN organizations and agencies with false evidence in an attempt to make false statements about human rights public opinion concerning Xinjiang. Since 2019, the United States and its allies criticized China's policy of governing Xinjiang, accused Xinjiang of frequent anti-human rights incidents without cause, drafted a bill concerning Xinjiang, and tried to exert pressure on member countries in NATO to interfere in China's internal affairs. However, the international community was not lack of sober awareness. Most countries were very aware of its so-called political attempt, and believed that the draft concerning Xinjiang was bound to be ended in failure. US and its allies planned the so-called "The United Nations Human Rights Assessment Report on Xinjiang" to accuse China of "violating human rights" in the international public opinion field by supplying fabricated facts and false witnesses. In 2022, US frequently published false statements and data related to Xinjiang, which misled the United Nations Human Rights Commissioner to issue the so-called report, by claiming that there was "Forced Labor" in Xinjiang, and appealed to the international community to resist Xinjiang cotton and defend the rights and

freedoms of Xinjiang minority groups. US and Western anti-China politicians and forces with ideological bias frequently fabricate Xinjiang-related lies and false information in various social media, with a purpose to maliciously slander and smear China, and attempt to split China and curb China's rise.

4. The Discourse Framework of US-Proposed Human Rights Issues in Xinjiang

Core discourse always carries certain value cognition and needs to be attached to a set of underlying value-dependent interpretation system (Tang & Shi, 2022), which is the discourse framework. The term "framework" belongs to the concept of cognitive psychology and is a process in which people's value are constantly shaped and jointly constructed in social interaction. In order to maintain its dominant position and vested interests, the state or interest group has constructed a discourse framework that shapes people's thinking inertia through the media for a long time, so that reception subjects can form the reasoning and judgment of events unconsciously, and recognize the discourse according to this framework. Therefore, discourse framework is the cohesion of values hidden in the deep level of discourse, and a universal discourse encoding and decoding mechanism among reception subjects. Based on the framework, discourse is produced and processed by the communication subjects and used to explain and demonstrate public events. The discourse framework is attached to values, which are the essence of ideology. Ideology is crucial in the process of constructing and activating the discourse framework, and forms the value support of the discourse framework. Speaking of US's ideology, American economist Arnold Kling put forward three discourse frameworks from the perspective of moral concepts: "Oppression-Oppressed" discourse framework, "Civilization-Barbarism" discourse framework and "Freedom-Coercion" discourse framework. The underlying logic of the discourse on US-proposed human rights issues in Xinjiang is to adopt the "Oppression-Oppressed" discourse framework, by smearing the series of China's policies on governing Xinjiang, and fabricating various lies of so-called "Human Rights Violations". This discourse framework originated from the "Progressive Movement" in US at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Its value proposition was to require the government to play a greater role in balancing class differences and bring benefits to the society. Whenever social conflicts appeared, the government's social governing ability was questioned.

Taking advantage of American global discourse power and media empire established in the late Cold War, US has continuously publicized "universal" value system globally, and teamed up with its allies to build it into a weapon against the non-ally countries, which resulted in social unrest and public suffering. Especially on the issue of human rights within sovereign countries, US and its allies, under the banner of "human rights are higher than sovereignty", continue to make trouble, and alienate relationship between a government and its people,

which led to very serious humanitarian disasters. The truth is that the “American-style democracy” and “human rights system” promoted by the United States essentially serve its political value system and aim to maintain its hegemonic position in the world rather than human rights itself. There are serious dual standard problems in judging domestic and international “human rights”. Discourse construction cannot be separated from various “social movements”. Usually, media reports will be used to set topics, disseminate their ideas, and share the same or similar values among reception subjects, thus stimulating group behavior under self-consciousness. US-proposed human rights issue in Xinjiang and a series of operations have obviously exceeded simple communication of media, and become the category of “social movement”. US maliciously hypes the human rights issue in Xinjiang by colluding with human rights organizations and overseas separatist forces, manipulating western mainstream media, subsidizing think tanks and non-governmental organizations, funding well-known bloggers, to arouse the emotional factors of “human rights”, “humanity”, “kinship” and other emotional factors among global audiences under the “Oppression-Oppressed” discourse framework. Meanwhile, in the real world, various celebrity speeches, demonstrations and other activities were organized and reported by the media dominated by them, which gradually evolve into a form of “social movement”, and highlight the “legitimacy” of the agenda. Finally, US government officials set the tone for it, and incorporated these activities into the legislation of the anti-China agenda, so as to intervene in the internal affairs of China’s governance of Xinjiang, forming a closed loop of “social movement” with distinctive political color.

5. The Discourse Construction Mechanism of US-Proposed Human Rights Issues in Xinjiang

The connection between the core discourse and the discourse framework is not causal. Only when the discourse framework anchors the proposition, frames the position, and conforms to the core discourse, can they work together. In other words, the core discourse in the international community is the judgment of interests under the power decision, while the discourse framework is the ideological cohesion behind it, both of which respectively constitute the speech representation and underlying logic of the discourse of public opinion (Arnold, 2017). The core discourse, built on the discourse framework, needs to prove its legitimacy through linguistic means to shape the ideological position in line with the discourse framework. From the perspective of concrete practice, in the process of international dissemination of US-proposed human rights issues in Xinjiang, if the international reception subjects lack a direct understanding of China’s policy of governing Xinjiang, whether they accept it depends more on the provision of a legal language framework rather than factual logic. By analyzing the application of legalization strategy in the discourse framework of human rights issues, it is understandable to construct mechanism of core discourse and dis-

course framework. US disassembles logic loopholes and demonstrates the authority and legitimacy of human rights issues by invoking the views of authoritative people or basing on rules or conventions; demonstrates the moral legalization of human rights issues on the concept and methods of China's policy of governing Xinjiang by following its own values or moral principles; demonstrates the standard legalization of human rights issues by resorting to its own norms of conduct; demonstrates the narrative legalization of human rights issues by telling the stories with social significance. The legalization strategy not only demonstrates the core discourse within the discourse framework, but also helps to output its own ideology and guide the judgment of reception subjects. The discourse framework of the public opinion on US-proposed human rights issues in Xinjiang is to reaffirm the core concept logic in the process of legalization construction, and guide the international reception subjects' cognition towards the direction beneficial to US.

On the second hand, in the face of the adverse public opinion, China's ability to construct human rights discourse related to Xinjiang needs to be strengthened. First of all, the research paradigm of humanities related to Xinjiang in China needs to be upgraded urgently. The "human rights issues" concocted by US bypasses the leading paradigm of the issue of "sovereignty ownership" in Xinjiang, which takes the human rights issues in Xinjiang as the starting point, and radiates to the fields of cotton production and marketing, supporting industries, scientific and technological innovation, etc. Therefore, the research on Xinjiang should incorporate the human rights paradigm into the sovereignty research paradigm, and upgrade its research paradigm by relying on multiple disciplines, such as history, ethnology, anthropology, communication, and religion. In terms of specific research content, the research of humanities and sociology related to Xinjiang should integrate multi-disciplinary research to meet the new trend of international cognitive communication of shaping China's image through human rights issues in Xinjiang. Secondly, build a national narrative system of human rights issues related to Xinjiang. The narrative system, based on the practical reality of the China's governance of Xinjiang, present the real life state of Xinjiang people to the international community, share the stories of Xinjiang people's living and working in peace by using the discourse that can be understood by the international reception subjects, and highlight the hypocrisy and emptiness of America discourse system of human rights in Xinjiang. The construction of the narrative system takes the history of Xinjiang as the starting point, and emphasizes that under the leadership of the CPC, it has put an end to the destruction of extraterritorial separatist forces, and gradually formed a new scene of peace, stability and prosperity. The great achievements Xinjiang has made at present not only exemplify that human rights issues are the pride topics for the Xinjiang people, but also help the vast number of countries and regions with social unrest to draw governance experience and wisdom from the successful experience in Xinjiang. China is willing to carry out cooperation and dialo-

gue on human rights with international community on the basis of fully constructing the narrative system of Xinjiang issues.

6. The Construction Path of International Communication of Compelling Xinjiang Stories

The important function of news communication activities is to maintain the core values of a society. Even the American media, which is called “objective”, “neutral” and “balanced”, is still the main carrier of disseminating its core values. Comparatively speaking, the narrative of compelling Xinjiang stories in Chinese mainstream media currently has problems, like “depoliticization” to highlight symbols, “mystification” of Orientalism and “modernization” of developmentalism (Zheng & Xia, 2021). In the international news reports on Xinjiang issues, in addition to abstract economic growth and income figures, reports on the promotion and protection of rights enjoyed by individuals due to the modernization development, and the government’s efforts to protect individual labor rights, development rights and other human rights are rare. Many news reports portray Xinjiang as a “mysterious” region with Orientalism color, and carry out mysterious propaganda on the culture and religion of Xinjiang’s ethnic minorities. This communication method is not conducive to improving the understanding of Xinjiang by domestic and foreign audiences, and it is difficult to form resonance. In the context of modernization, marketization and globalization, the mainstream media is more focused on the economic development of Xinjiang, ignoring the dynamic role jointly played by political subjects and ordinary individuals in the region, which leads to the situation where static developmental discourse inhibits the dynamic narrative of Xinjiang stories. Therefore, if China wants to present the compelling Xinjiang stories well in the international mainstream media and social media, it should maintain and disseminate the mainstream ideology and core values of China’s society, on the basis of the “re-politicization” narrative framework. Its international communication must refer to China’s and Xinjiang’s history, and Socialist system with Chinese characteristics, by presenting vivid and dynamic compelling stories of all Xinjiang people’s participation in institutional construction, social governance and national policy.

Under the situation that Xinjiang issue has become the focus of the current international communication competition between China and US, it is necessary to focus on the following three aspects to present dynamic and compelling Xinjiang stories under the socialist system with Chinese characteristics in an all-round and multi-level way by using the narrative discourse framework of “re-politicization”. First of all, to “demystify” and present compelling stories of ordinary people. As a province of China, Xinjiang, like other provinces, is a part of China’s territory. The people of all ethnic groups living here, like the people in the mainland, are Chinese citizens. They also have work pressure, have to pay off the mortgage, and worry about children’s enrollment and employment. To de-

mystify Xinjiang's ethnic minorities is an important step to enhance international dissemination of Xinjiang stories. Among international communication contents, the communication power of individual stories is far greater than that of displaying figures and achievements, which is also easier to arouse resonance among international audiences. Secondly, to go beyond "one-sided modernization" and present stories of human rights well. The central government's long-term investment in Xinjiang's social economy and its efforts on Xinjiang's modernized development are precisely the basis on protecting rights of Xinjiang people. The changes in Xinjiang over past 70 years can be described as earth-shaking. In this great historical process, the changes in the lives of ordinary people are the most moving stories. Under the current situation that western human rights discourse still occupies a leading position in the world, the international dissemination of compelling Xinjiang stories, especially those of presenting Xinjiang's economic and social development, should go beyond the traditional economic achievements and the framework of modern development, and put ethnic issues under the framework of "human rights" to construct human rights discourse. Finally, to adhere to the political basis of socialism with Chinese characteristics, and integrate the shared history between Xinjiang people and the CPC into the narrative of Xinjiang stories. For the first time in history, the CPC has carried out land reform and democratic reform in Xinjiang, completely ending ethnic oppression and exploitation in this land, giving all the Xinjiang people various rights, and building Xinjiang with ethnic equality, unity and harmony. It is also the CPC which has brought the spring breeze of reform and opening up to the western region in China, bringing new development of society, economy and life to the whole Xinjiang, and improving the relatively backward situation of Xinjiang. It is the first time that the CPC has put forward and implemented the "Silk Road Economic Belt" initiative, which once again brought opportunities to Xinjiang, located in the western part of the country and the hinterland of the mainland, to regain its historical prosperity. Therefore, the "re-politicization" narrative discourse in the international dissemination of compelling Xinjiang stories cannot be separated from a powerful political foundation, which is the governance experience of the CPC in implementing the socialist system, practicing regional national autonomy and building a solid Chinese national community in Xinjiang for 70 years.

7. Conclusion

From the perspective of cognitive communication, the core of the game between China and US on human rights issues in Xinjiang is the game of values. In the process of issues dissemination via international mainstream media, the values made by discourse production and knowledge processing need the public opinion to intervene in a specific way. This paper decodes the process of values' intervention through the core discourse and discourse framework, and analyzes the discourse construction logic and internal mechanism of the public opinion

on US-proposed human rights issues in Xinjiang, which is based on the discourse framework of “oppression-oppressed” launched by the “social progress movement” in American history. The discourse framework forms an coupling and interaction with the core discourse by anchoring propositions and framing positions, and reflects the values behind the discourse framework through the construction mechanism of legitimization, triggering empathy among the international reception subjects with emotional factors such as “human nature” and “kinship”, and imperceptibly guiding them to somewhere beneficial to the national interests of US, and finally forming international relations and power distribution conducive to US. After recognizing the function and operating mechanism of the core discourse and discourse framework, it is imminent to upgrade the research paradigm of humanities and social sciences, integrate human rights issues into multiple disciplines for cross-research, and explore the path of international communication. Meanwhile, in the process of international dissemination of Xinjiang stories, its narrative should be based on the core value system of the socialist system with Chinese characteristics, and use “human rights” framework to present the vivid, dynamic, and compelling stories of all Xinjiang people’s participation in institutional construction, social governance and ethnic policies, so that the international community can understand the real Xinjiang and its people.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Arnold, K. (2017). *The Three Languages of Politics: Talking Across the Political Divides*. Cato Institute.
- Foucault, M. (2012). *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage.
- Hu, R., & Wang, J. S. (2022). On Sino-US Relations and Domestic Governance. *Contemporary American Review*, 3, 25-43.
- Sun, J. S. (2009). Language Studies in International Relations Theory: Review and Prospect. *Foreign Affairs Review (Journal of Foreign Affairs College)*, 1, 70-84.
- Tang, J. T., & Shi, J. M. (2022). Core Discourse and Discourse Framework: Discourse Construction of American Public Opinion Concerning China. *Political Studies*, 2, 66-77.
- Vandijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and Context*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wendt, A. (2014). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yao, G. (2014). *Discourse, Power and Practice: A Study of the Underlying Ideology in the Post-Modern Perspective*. Shanghai Sanlian Bookstore.
- Zheng, L., & Xia, Q. (2021). Symbol and Narration: The “Re-Politicization” Study of International Communication of Regional Stories. *Modern Communication (Journal of Communication University of China)*, 7, 56-60.
- Zhou, N. (2011). *Cross-Cultural Research: Using the Image of China as a Method*. Commercial Press.