

## ABSTRACT

Title of thesis: AN EXPLORATION OF THE GENERIC  
PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC RELATIONS  
EXCELLENCE IN AUSTRALIA, ITALY,  
MAURITIUS, AND UGANDA

Eric Matthew Grammer, Master of Arts, 2005

Thesis directed by: Professor Larissa A. Grunig  
Department of Communication

A topic of much recent debate among the public relations discipline is the lack of research on how public relations should be practiced internationally. A mixed-mode survey utilizing e-mail, surface mail, and online questionnaires, this study examines the Excellence Theory in public relations in four culturally, geographically, and economically diverse countries. Data collected from 285 participants in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda suggests the Global Excellence Theory of generic principles and specific applications is applicable worldwide. Specifically, this study illustrates the importance of public relations' involvement in organizational strategic management through two-way, research-based contributions. Results from this cross-national survey also provide further support for the theoretical dimensions of public relations models and has theoretical implications on the use of the Internet as a research tool for public relations scholars and professionals.



AN EXPLORATION OF THE GENERIC PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC RELATIONS  
EXCELLENCE IN AUSTRALIA, ITALY, MAURITIUS, AND UGANDA.

By

Eric Matthew Grammer

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
2005

Advisory Committee:

Professor Larissa A. Grunig, Chair  
Professor Linda Aldoory  
Professor James E. Grunig

© Copyright by  
Eric Matthew Grammer  
2005

## Dedication

To the world's greatest mom, Gwen Grammer. It has been over well over 11 years since you passed away, but not a day goes by when we don't think about you. Thank you for getting me to where I am today.

## Acknowledgements

Thanks to Dr. Lauri Grunig, for being seeing me through to the end of this project. She demonstrated unimaginable levels of patience mixed in with an unwavering belief that this research would come to fruition. Lauri, you were all of this, in addition to being a trusted advisor, staunch advocate, and a world-class editor. This thesis surely would not have been possible without your tremendous level of support.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to my thesis committee members, Dr. Jim Grunig and Dr. Linda Aldoory. Both made significant contributions in molding this finished product as well as to my graduate education. Jim's contributions to public relations are legendary and he served as a great example as to what a researcher should strive to be. In addition to serving as a great mentor, Linda taught my first graduate-level public relations seminar and truly made me feel that I could make contributions, however small, to the profession's body of knowledge.

Of course, I would also like to thank my wife, Jot, whose love and support helped guide this ship in. As an added surprise bonus, she proved to be an expert in Microsoft Word, especially tables. Thanks for the help honey.

I would also like to thank my dad, Elmer, for helping me keep my eye on the prize. Whenever I called him thousands of miles away in California, his first question was always, "How is your thesis coming along?"

I would also like to thank Yunna Rhee who served as a great graduate student role model. Yunna and I shared many similar research interests and this thesis project was largely based on her work in South Korea. I would also be remiss if I did not

mention Jeong Nam Kim, who was extremely helpful in refreshing some of my knowledge of several statistical analyses, specifically expectation-maximization (EM) method of treating nonresponse.

## Table of Contents

Dedication .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iii
Table of Contents .....	v
List of Tables .....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Purpose of the Study .....	6
Chapter 2: Conceptualization.....	9
The Excellence Study .....	10
Value of Excellent Public Relations .....	13
Public Relations' Role in Strategic Management .....	19
Model of Strategic Public Relations .....	20
Dimensions of Public Relations.....	22
International Public Relations.....	27
Universal vs. Ethnocentric/Global Theory of Excellence.....	30
Involvement of Public Relations in Strategic Management .....	34
Empowerment of Public Relations in the Dominant Coalition or a Direct Reporting Relationship to Senior Management.....	35
Two-way Symmetrical Model of Public Relations.....	35
Public Relations as a Management Function Separate From Other Functions.....	37
Knowledge Potential for Managerial Role and Symmetrical Public Relations .....	38
Organizational Context for Excellence .....	39
Chapter 3: Methodology .....	42
Survey Research.....	42
Electronic Surveys .....	43
Limitations of Survey Research.....	47
Population .....	48
Pretest.....	49
Translation .....	50
Instrument .....	51
Data Collection .....	58
Data Analysis .....	60
Statistical Procedures .....	60
Ethical Considerations .....	62
Chapter 4: Results .....	64
Description of Population .....	64
Involvement of Public Relations in Strategic Management .....	70
Descriptive Statistics.....	70
Empowerment of Public Relations in the Dominant Coalition or a Direct Reporting Relationship to Senior Management.....	80
Descriptive Statistics.....	82
Dimensions of Public Relations Models//Two-way Symmetrical	



Model of Public Relations .....	85
Reliability Test.....	86
Descriptive Statistics.....	91
Public Relations as a Management Function Separate From Other	
Functions.....	102
Reliability Test.....	102
Descriptive Statistics.....	102
Knowledge Potential for Managerial Role and Symmetrical	
Public Relations .....	114
Reliability Test.....	114
Descriptive Statistics.....	114
Organizational Context for Excellence .....	126
Isolating the Excellence Variables.....	127
Factor Analysis .....	130
Canonical Correlation .....	133
Reliability Test.....	135
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations .....	143
Characteristics of Public Relations Practice in Australia, Italy,	
Mauritius, and Uganda.....	143
Characteristics of Excellence in Australia, Italy, Mauritius,	
and Italy .....	146
Theoretical Implications .....	147
Global Theory of Public Relations Excellence .....	147
The Importance of Public Relations in Strategic Management .....	149
Theoretical Dimensions of Public Relations Behavior .....	150
The Relationship Between Public Relations and Marketing .....	151
Presence of Activism Around the Globe .....	152
The Use of the Internet as a Research Tool .....	153
Practical Implications.....	154
Premium on Knowledge for Research-based Contributions to	
Strategic Management .....	154
International Public Relations Programs .....	157
The Use of the Internet as a Research Tool .....	157
Limitations .....	158
Suggestions for Future Research .....	160
Examining the Specific Applications of the Generic Principles	
of Excellence.....	160
Theoretical Dimensions of Public Relations Behavior .....	161
Coping With Activism in Rapidly Changing Countries .....	161
Increasing Online Survey Response Rates .....	161
Conclusion .....	162
Appendices.....	163
Bibliography .....	190

## List of Tables

Table 1: Description of Aggregate Population .....	66
Table 2: Demographic Comparison Among Countries .....	68
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Involvement in Strategic Management .....	72
Table 4: ANOVA on Involvement in Strategic Management With Country .....	74
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Strategic Management in Excellence Study.....	81
Table 6: Description of Relationship With Top Management for Aggregate .....	83
Table 7: Reliability Test for Dimensions of Communication Indices .....	87
Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Communication Indices .....	92
Table 9: ANOVA on Dimensions of Communication Indices With Country .....	98
Table 10: Reliability Test for Public Relations as a Separate Function .....	103
Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for Public Relations as a Separate Function .....	105
Table 12: ANOVA on Public Relations as a Separate Function with Country .....	108
Table 13: Reliability Test for Knowledge Potential Indices.....	115
Table 14: Descriptive Statistics for Knowledge Potential Indices.....	118
Table 15: ANOVA on Knowledge Potential Indices With Country.....	122
Table 16: Description of Aggregate Population .....	128
Table 17: Description by Individual Countries.....	129
Table 18: Factor Analysis to Produce a Single Scale of Excellence .....	132
Table 19: Canonical Correlation of Value With Other Variables.....	134
Table 20: Reliability Test for Excellence Indices.....	136
Table 21: Demographic Information for Level of Excellence.....	138
Table 22: ANOVA on Excellence Scores With Demographic Variables.....	140

## Chapter 1: Introduction

Social, political, economic, and environmental issues and advances in communication technology, such as the Internet, are creating a world of increasingly interdependent nations. This has increased the amount of cross-cultural interaction between organizations and stakeholders once separated by political borders, cultural barriers, and geographical circumstances. Such interaction can produce increased awareness and understanding, or it can create misunderstandings, distrust, nationalism, hostility, and conflict (Wakefield, 1997). Parallel to work by public relations scholars focusing on global practice (Botan, 1992; Culbertson & Chen, 1996; L. Grunig, 1992), management scholar Kanter (1995) pointed out that global organizations have a need “to build relationships that reduce tensions” across cultures (p. 80).

Although there is consensus that public relations is critical in creating dialogue-based relationships on the global level (L. Grunig, J. Grunig, & Dozier, 2002; Taylor, 2000a; Wakefield 1997), a clear model of how excellent public relations should be practiced internationally is lacking. Scholars have theorized that organizations either use a localized design, globalized (centralized) design, or a mix of both to communicate with stakeholders in various countries (Anderson, 1989; Botan, 1992; Dilenschneider, 1992; Grammer, 2000; Mahler, 1996; Molleda, 2000; Wakefield, 2000a).

Vercic, L. Grunig, and J. Grunig (1996) and Wakefield (1997) have proposed a global public relations theory based on the theory of excellence in public relations

identified by the International Association of Business Communicators' (IABC) Excellence study (J. Grunig, 1992). In 1985, a group of six scholars began a multi-year study to uncover the factors comprising effective practice of public relations. This project, the largest in the history of public relations at that time, was funded by a \$400,000 grant from the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC) Research Foundation. It was named the "Excellence study" because the characteristics of the most effective public relations programs are those that describe what the group called the attributes of excellent public relations departments (J. Grunig, 1992). The study's data were collected from a set of three questionnaires given to the senior public relations person, the CEO, and an average of 14 employees in 326 organizations in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. The study identified 14 characteristics that comprised the "excellence factor."

As mentioned above, these researchers then extended the findings into a global theory proposing the excellence characteristics as "generic" principles and identifying six "specific" variables to be considered in individual countries (Vercic et. al., 1996). These generic principles of excellence will be the major theoretical concept framing this study, complimented by the comparative approach to public relations research which focuses on the similarities and differences of how the profession is practiced in different nations. (Culbertson, 1996). The generic principles are as follows:

1. Involvement of public relations in strategic management;
2. Empowerment of public relations in the dominant coalition or a direct reporting relationship to senior management;

3. Integrated public relations function;
4. Public relations as a management function separate from other functions;
5. Public relations unit headed by a manager rather than a technician;
6. Two-way symmetrical model of public relations;
7. A symmetrical system of internal communication;
8. Knowledge potential for managerial role and symmetrical public relations;
9. Diversity embodied in all roles;
10. Organizational context for excellence. (J. Grunig, 1992)

Although these principles are generic to public relations excellence worldwide, this does not mean they should be applied in the same manner across the globe. A practitioner must consider six specific variables in determining the application of the generic principles. These variables are: 1) societal culture, 2) the political system, 3) the economic system, 4) the extent and nature of activism, 5) the level of development, and 6) the media system. J. Grunig (in press) said studying each of these variables for a specific country is an aspect of the strategic management of public relations in which practitioners must understand the environment in which an organization works.

Researchers are beginning to investigate differences in the ways public relations practitioners have applied the generic principles in different nations (L. Grunig, J. Grunig, & Vercic, 1998; Rhee, 1999; Wakefield, 2000a). However, investigating how the application of these principles varies between nations is beyond the scope of this project. The purpose of this study is to explore practice in several countries, to compare it with public relations theories (specifically the Excellence

Theory), and then to determine how it is practiced in theoretical terms. This will help answer the call for further evidence supporting the belief the generic principles of public relations excellence are normative and positive among practitioners in other cultures yet to be studied (J. Grunig, in press, p. 35; L. Grunig et al., 2002). Rather than investigating practice that crosses borders, I will be testing the possibility of a universal theory that can be applied across cultures by multinational organizations. Adler (1983) believed that studies testing theory across more than two cultures at a time can offer important information and conclusions about universal possibilities. Thus, although the generic principles of excellence will be the major theoretical concept framing this study, they will be complimented by the comparative approach to public relations research (Culbertson, 1996).

Culbertson (1996) made the distinction between comparative and international research of worldwide public relations. He found this necessary since many studies focusing on domestic public relations practice outside of the United States are often labeled “international,” when in reality they are research on domestic practice in individual non-Anglo countries (L. Grunig et al., 1998). My research project will take a comparative approach since it will only examine similarities and differences between domestic public relations practice in Australia, Italy, Uganda and Mauritius in comparison with results from the original Excellence study, rather than investigating practice in an international or cross-cultural context. This is not to say this study will not contribute to the knowledge of international practice. Often comparative research lays the foundation for the development of international theory and research. This is probably why such projects are often falsely labeled as

international research. This study is comparative research hoping to build a bridge to international theory.

This project departs from previous studies in that it examines practice and models of public relations in *several countries* using the same instrument during the same time period. Wakefield (1997) conducted a Delphi study of 21 experts in public relations in 18 countries. However, it is a stretch to say that each individual was representative of the practice in each country. Taking this into consideration, this study's population will feature more practitioners from each individual country than did Wakefield. Another example of research describing and comparing practice in several countries was a metanalysis comparing studies of the Excellence Theory in India, Greece, and Taiwan with results from the original Excellence study (J. Grunig, L. Grunig, Sriramesh, Huang, & Lyra, 1995). Since this was a metanalysis, different methods of data collection were used in different countries by different researchers.

This thesis will examine practice in Australia, Italy, Uganda and Mauritius using the same instrument. To be economically and chronologically feasible, I limited the scope of the study to surveying practitioners who are members of professional public relations associations in the featured countries. I also limited the number of generic principles I investigated in order to design a questionnaire that would not take too much of the participants' valuable time. The six principles of excellence examined were involvement of public relations in strategic management, empowerment of public relations in the dominant coalition or a direct reporting relationship to senior management, public relations as a management function separate from other functions, models of public relations, the knowledge potential for

the managerial role and for symmetrical public relations, and the organizational context for excellence. The reasoning behind the selection of these principles is provided in the ensuing chapter.

### Purpose of the Study

Since this endeavor is unique in that it surveys numerous practitioners in several countries using the same instrument, it will expand the limited knowledge concerning the state of practice of public relations in countries outside of the United States and Western Europe. Expanding the body of knowledge in this area will be the primary purpose leading this research. The results of this study will be critical to those implementing domestic campaigns and departments in the countries studied because if the generic principles are found to exist and be valued in these countries, then these principles can be integrated into their work.

Similarly, this study is critical for those planning and implementing campaigns and public relations functions that cross borders. In his landmark book, Public Relations: What Research Tells Us (which provided a conceptual map of the body of knowledge of public relations) Pavlik (1987) stated that international practice is one of the fastest growing areas in the field of public relations, as well as the least understood. Although more is presently known about the topic, Pavlik's statement still holds much validity. The importance of research concerning international practice is magnified further when considering that most organizations are affected by publics throughout the world or by competition or collaboration with organizations in other countries (J. Grunig, 2001a).



This study will also be useful to educators for if these principles are generic, then education in public relations could be standardized worldwide. The findings will also provide scholars investigating international practice a better understanding of the state of practice worldwide and whether there are universal principles evident in excellent public relations practice. This in turn will provide a stronger foundation from which to extend theory concerning practice that crosses national borders.

The secondary purpose of this study is to introduce and test a methodology that has been rarely used in public relations research – a mixed-mode survey involving physical mail and Web-based questionnaires. The use of a Web-based questionnaire is the most significant aspect of this methodology. The Internet is a relatively new medium that has greatly shaped the way individuals, with access to it, see the world. Even more remarkable is the short span of time in which this shift has occurred. Most communication research concerning the Internet has focused on its use as a medium. In public relations research, there has been a focus on how it is used as a tool by practitioners (Bunz, 1998; Pavlik & Dozier, 1996; Wright, 1998) and activist groups (Elliot, 1997; Kaiser, 1995).

Recently, more attention has been devoted to the use of the Internet as a research tool – specifically in survey research ranging across a range of social science disciplines (Clark & Harrison, 2000; Couper, 2000; Dillman, 2001; Wimmer & Dominick, 2000). Use of the Internet as a research tool is still in its infancy. This study will contribute to the body of knowledge concerning how the Internet can be used in research projects investigating public relations. More specifically, it will shed some light on the use of the Internet for survey research among academics seeking to

build basic theory and professionals who can apply this technique in researching publics – the foundation of the two-way symmetrical model of public relations practice.

Although I have discussed the theoretical and applied implications this project may have, I have not yet explained my personal interest in the subject. I am particularly interested in this study because I am a partner in an intercultural marriage and have learned the importance and challenges of communication between cultures. I think it is vital to continue to investigate how the discipline of public relations can meet these challenges. Additionally, as a graduate student in a department composed of several public relations scholars born overseas, I view public relations as a global profession, rather than one in which the differences in practice between countries outweigh the similarities. I think researchers must begin to look at research problems from the perspective of global citizens, and this study is a step in that direction.

As for the use of the Internet in this study, I have witnessed this medium appear and explode in less than a decade. I have also worked in a Washington, DC-based Internet communications firm, experiencing how the Internet has evolved from a public relations tactic to a strategy that is leveling the playing field between powerful organizations and the publics they affect. I hope this thesis contributes to the body of knowledge of public relations practice worldwide and the use of the Internet as a survey tool for public relations research.

## Chapter 2: Conceptualization

This thesis explored the practice of public relations in several countries and whether the generic principles of excellence are applicable to a diverse assortment of countries outside of the United States. The Excellence Theory briefly discussed in the previous chapter formed the foundation of the theoretical framework for this study. In the mid-1980's, a group of scholars identified the pressing need for a comprehensive set of theories to explain the value of public relations to organizations. With funding provided by a \$400,000 grant from the IABC Foundation (now the IABC Research Foundation), this group of scholars embarked on a multi-year study mapping out the body of knowledge in public relations theory. This led to the formation and testing of a theory describing characteristics of public relations and communication departments likely to increase an organization's effectiveness. This theory was later named the "Excellence Theory" because the characteristics of the most effective public relations programs are those the IABC team called the attributes of excellent public relations departments (J. Grunig, 1992).

In this chapter I review the Excellence Theory with particular emphasis on several key concepts central to this study: strategic management of public relations, public relations models, and the value of public relations excellence. I also discuss the extension of the Excellence Theory into a global theory proposing the excellence characteristics as "generic" principles of excellent practice and identifying six "specific" variables to be considered in individual countries (Vercic et al., 1996).

Most of the theoretical literature on public relations has been produced within the last two decades. However, most of these theories, including the Excellence Theory, have originated in the United States, consequently leading to knowledge and theory focusing on U.S. practice. There is a scarcity of theoretical work concerning public relations in countries outside of the United States and dealing with practice that crosses borders. In this chapter I also explore theory concerning international practice of public relations and what is known about practice in countries outside of the United States. Because the major assumption of this study is that the characteristics of public relations excellence are generic, this chapter explore literature discussing whether public relations practice should be culture-specific or culture-free, as well as literature pertaining to these characteristics in settings outside of the United States.

#### The Excellence Study

As described above, J. E. Grunig (1992) and a team of researchers began a multi-year study in 1985 to uncover the qualities that make public relations excellent and allow public relations to contribute to organizational effectiveness. This project involved several phases. The researchers first conducted a comprehensive literature review, gathering relevant theories spanning several disciplines that they believed provided a theoretical framework for a model of excellent public relations (J. Grunig, 1992). The resulting Excellence Theory suggested that organizations are effective when they can identify and accomplish goals important to their self-interests as well as the interests of publics who have the ability to influence the missions and goals of the organization or are affected by the organization.

The Excellence study's second phase was conducted in 1990-1991 with an extensive survey of 327 organizations in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Four hundred seven senior communication managers (some organizations had more than one public relations department), 292 CEOs or other executive managers, and 4,631 employees (an average of 14 per organization) completed separate questionnaires that measured different critical success factors for public relations. The organizations included corporations, government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and trade and professional associations.

This survey tested the Excellence Theory to determine its validity in organizational settings. The third phase consisted of follow-up case studies of 25 organizations with highest and lowest scores on a scale of excellence produced by the initial survey (Dozier, L. Grunig, & J. Grunig, 1995).

This combination of survey and qualitative research methodologies revealed 14 principles of public relations excellence, later to be consolidated into ten principles of public relations excellence: 1) Involvement of public relations in strategic management; 2) Empowerment of public relations in the dominant coalition or a direct reporting relationship to senior management; 3) Integrated public relations function; 4) Public relations is a management function separate from other functions; 5) Public relations unit headed by a manager rather than a technician; 6) Two-way symmetrical model of public relations; 7) A symmetrical system of internal communication; 8) Knowledge potential for managerial role and symmetrical public relations; 9) Diversity embodied in all roles; and 10) Organizational context for excellence.

Examining the status of all ten generic principles of excellence was beyond the scope of this study. Rather this study focused on the three principles most closely related to strategic management of public relations such as involvement of public relations in strategic management, empowerment of public relations in the dominant coalition or a direct reporting relationship to senior management, and models of public relations – since these comprise the backbone of the Excellence Theory (Rhee, 1999). L. Grunig et al. (2002) reported that the most consistent patterns of correlations between value of and support for public relations by the dominant coalition were with variables measuring the extent to which public relations is involved in strategic management.

This study also investigated three other principles – the knowledge potential for the managerial role and for symmetrical public relations, the organizational context for excellence, and whether the public relations function is separate from other functions, specifically marketing – because research in countries where public relations has weaker foundations have found these three principles as the most necessary conditions for public relations excellence (Ali, 1995; Rhee, 1999; Scholz, 1998). Aside from this, I also delimited the scope of inquiry to these six principles because it was not feasible for me to follow the complete protocol of the original Excellence study in which questionnaires were not only given to high-level communication professionals, but also to the CEOs and employees at the communicators' organizations. Although most of the excellence principles can be measured by the questionnaires given to the top communicators, the separate questionnaires distributed to these latter two groups also measured principles such as

diversity embodied in all roles, aspects of organizational context for excellence (the communicator questionnaire measured level of activism which is a major aspect of this context), and a symmetrical system of internal communication.

Also, this study was not able to look at specific organizations and interview all of the top managers of departments that hold some public relations responsibilities so I could not measure the principle of an integrated public relations function. Finally, although the population of this survey consists of senior communicators, many of whom are the top communication managers at their organizations, many are not the top communicators so I could not measure the principle of whether the public relations unit was headed by a manager rather than a technician. In addition to measuring whether these principles of excellence exist in practice, I also investigated whether these principles, if found to be practiced, also contributed the same value to organizations in the countries studied as to those in the countries in the Excellence study.

#### Value of Excellent Public Relations

As explained above, the goal of the Excellence study was to answer the questions of what qualities make public relations excellent and allow public relations to contribute to organizational effectiveness. In other words, what makes public relations valuable to organizations and what are the common characteristics of public relations departments that are valued by organizations. The questions concerning the value of public relations are complex ones that the profession has struggled with for the last thirty years.

Part of this complexity stems from the many ways communication can be valued. As L. Grunig et al. (2002) explained, the value of communication can be measured at five levels:

- 1) Individual level – This is the level of the individual message or publication such as an annual report or press release;
- 2) Program level – Individual communication programs such as media relations, community relations, or customer relations are effective when they affect the cognitions, attitudes, and behaviors of publics. The program level has been the traditional focus of evaluative research on communication. However, effective communication programs may not necessarily contribute to organizational effectiveness and many operate independently of the organization's mission and goals;
- 3) Functional level – The communication function of an organization can be evaluated by comparing the structure and processes of the department that manages the function with the best practices of the function in other organizations or with theoretical principles. Public relations departments that are valued at the functional level are more likely to develop valued programs (at the program level) than functions that do not meet the theoretical criteria;
- 4) Organizational level – To show that public relations has value to an organization, it must be shown that effective communication programs and functions contribute to organizational effectiveness;
- 5) Societal level – Aside from the impact on their own bottom line, organizations also affect other organizations, individuals, and publics. Organizations cannot be



effective unless they also have a positive impact on other entities. Public relations has value when it contributes to the social responsibility of an organization. (pp. 91-92)

The Excellence study focused on effectiveness at the organizational level and functional level because the researchers believed the public relations function must meet certain theoretical criteria in order to contribute value at the organizational level. However, before they could research what makes public relations effective at the organization level, the team had to determine exactly what organizational effectiveness is. As previously outlined this determination was made in the initial phase of the project after focusing on four perspectives on organizational effectiveness from the disciplines of organizational sociology and business management – systems, competing values, strategic constituencies, and goal attainment – in order to come up with one comprehensive definition of organizational effectiveness.

The Excellence study team defined organizational effectiveness “as the balance of organizational goals with the expectations of strategic constituencies; strategic constituencies that can either constrain or strengthen the organization’s ability to meet its goals” (L. Grunig et al., 2002, p. 96). In turn, public relations contributes to organizational effectiveness when it develops long-term relationships with strategic constituencies in order to help reconcile the goals of the organization with the expectations of these constituencies.

Thus the value of public relations is in relationships. However, L. Grunig et al. (2002) pointed out it is impossible to measure the exact monetary values of relationships created through the public relations function because:

- 1) Relationships and their result, reputation, provide a context for behavior by key constituencies; but they are not the only determining factor behind behaviors. Other factors such as competition and the economic environment also affect such behaviors, thus affecting organizational performance;
  - 2) Relationships can save an organization money by preventing costly issues, crises, regulation, boycotts, and litigation. However, it is impossible to measure the cost of something that *did not happen*, or to know whether such events that did not happen *would have occurred* in the absence of excellent public relations.
  - 3) The return on relationships is delayed because organizations spend money on relationships for years to prevent events or behaviors such as costly issues, crises, regulation, boycotts, and litigation that *might* happen soon or many years down the road.
  - 4) The return on relationships is lumpy. Good relationships with some constituencies such as consumers may produce a continuing stream of revenue, but for the most part the return comes all at once, such as when crises, strikes, boycotts, regulation, litigation, or bad publicity are avoided or mitigated. Similarly, relationships with potential donors must be cultivated for years before a donor makes a major gift.
- (p. 97).

Because of these factors, the researchers turned to the technique of compensating variation, which provides a method of transforming nonmonetary

values into monetary values. This method involves asking participants how much they would be willing to pay to have something. Once nonmonetary values undergo this conversion, various nonmonetary effects can be compared to monetary effects, as well as to each other (Ehling, 1992). In the Excellence study this nonmonetary value is the benefit of strong relationships to organizations and society.

In the case of the Excellence study, the researchers asked both the senior public relations executives and the CEOs to answer two questions based on the method of compensating variation. They first asked the top communicator and CEO to provide a nonmonetary value (employing a fractionation scale) for public relations in comparison with a typical department in the same organization. A fractionation scale asks participants to report how much of a particular characteristic they, or their organization, possess (Dozier et al., 1995, p. 245). If the individual or organization possesses an average amount of all characteristics studied a score of 100 is reported. A score of 50 means that characteristic is half of the average of all characteristics and a score of 200 indicates twice the average.

In this case, the top communicator and CEO assigned a value on the fractionation scale in which each were told that 100 would be the value of a typical department. Then the top communicator and the CEO were asked to assign a cost-benefit ratio to public relations: the return for each dollar invested in public relations. The communication executive was also asked to predict how he or she thought members of the dominant coalition would respond to these same two questions (L. Grunig et al., 2002).

The results of the Excellence study showed that communication is a highly valued function in the typical organization, with CEOs and top communicators reporting that public relations returns more than it costs to implement. On average respondents reported a 186% return on investment (ROI), meaning that for every dollar spent on public relations, the organization gets back \$1.86 in value. Even executives in organizations with the least-excellent communication programs reported an average 140% ROI. Survey respondents with excellent public relations departments reported an even higher ROI of 225%. Although only 5% of the study's sample of CEOs said that communication returns less than it costs, 40% said it returned twice the cost.

As probably to be expected, heads of public relations departments rated the ROI even higher than the CEOs, with a mean of 189%. As an indicator of the organizational support for public relations and the validity of this measure for the value of the communication function, the values assigned by the top communicators were much more closely aligned with those of the CEOs than the top communicators thought. In organizations with excellent public relations, the CEOs reported an ROI of 225% and the public relations executives reported a 228% ROI. In this category the top communicators' prediction for the CEO response was a 150% ROI. In organizations ranking average in public relations effectiveness CEOs still reported an ROI of 189%, closely resembling the reported ROI of the top communicator, 198%. Again the top communicator underestimated the value placed on communication by the CEO with an estimated 132% ROI by the dominant coalition. This pattern was repeated for organizations with the

least-effective public relations, with CEOs reporting a 140% ROI and top communicators citing an ROI of 159% and an estimate for the dominant coalition of 131%. The data also showed a strong, consistent, and statistically significant difference between the excellence of public relations and the value and rate of return assigned to it.

The Excellence study also included nonmonetary measures of value for public relations. One of these items was the level of support for public relations within the organization's dominant coalition as estimated by the top communicator or CEO. This item also displayed a strong correlation between the excellence of the public relations function and value (support of the dominant coalition). This study will employ some of the compensating variation measures, as well as the nonmonetary measure mentioned above, from the original Excellence study to determine if the principles of excellence found in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom also contribute to organizational effectiveness in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda if the principles are found to be practiced in these countries.

#### Public Relations' Role in Strategic Management

J. Grunig and Hunt (1984) defined public relations as "the management of communication between an organization and its publics" (p. 6). They pointed out that organizations use long-term strategic management to develop a mission and set of goals that are appropriate for the opportunities and dangers in their environment. The Excellence study theorized that communication programs that enhance organizational effectiveness "fit...squarely into the strategic management that pervades modern management theories" (J. Grunig & Repper, 1992, p. 118). J. Grunig (2001a)

reasoned that excellent public relations departments are involved in this process by recognizing and cultivating relationships with the strategic publics that affect their mission or goals. When public relations develops these relationships, it saves the organization money by reducing the costs of litigation, regulation, legislation, pressure campaigns, or boycotts that result from bad relationships with publics – publics that become activist groups when relationships are bad (Dozier et al., 1995). Cultivating relationships with donors, consumers, shareholders, and legislators also can help an organization make money (J. Grunig, 1996).

When public relations is an integral component of the organization's strategic management function, public relations departments are likely to manage the communication function strategically (J. Grunig & L. Grunig, 1998). This dual role of public relations in strategic management – in both the organization's strategic management and in the strategic management of public relations – is outlined in the model of strategic public relations conceptualized by J. Grunig and Repper (1992).

#### Model of Strategic Public Relations.

J. Grunig and Repper (1992) stated that public relations must be managed strategically before it contributes to organizational effectiveness. These researchers developed a seven-part model of strategic public relations, providing practitioners with a matrix from which to plan strategic public relations programs. The first three components of the model are stages describing the evolution of publics and issues: stakeholder stage, public stage, and issue stage.

The situational theory of publics (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984) provides an effective theoretical framework for practitioners to take the initial step of identifying

publics. This theory consists of two dependent variables – active and passive communication behavior – and three independent variables – problem recognition, constrain recognition, and level of involvement. Publics are more likely to be active when comprised of those who perceive that what an organization does involves them (level of involvement), that the consequences of what an organization does is a problem (problem recognition), and that they are not constrained from doing something about the problem (constraint recognition).

If none of these conditions applies to a group of people, they comprise a nonpublic of no concern to the organization. However, if an organization has consequences on people or people have consequences on the organization, there is a likelihood that that people will perceive an involvement and recognize a problem. Once such consequences exist, publics form. The first three stages of the model of strategic public relations portray the three steps in the evolution of publics.

1. Stakeholder Stage: refers to people who are affected by decisions of an organization or who make decisions affecting an organization.
2. Public Stage: refers to stakeholders who recognize the consequences of the organization as a problem and organize to do something about them.
3. Issue Stage: publics organize and create issues out of problems that have not been resolved.

Steps 4 through 7 of the model of strategic public relations provide a blueprint for practitioners to plan communication programs with stakeholders and publics in the three stages described above: developing objectives, planning programs, implementing programs, and evaluating the effectiveness of programs. A public

relations department's ability to employ this model of strategic public relations is often based on the model of public relations it practices.

### Dimensions of Public Relations

J. Grunig and Hunt (1984) used the term “model” to refer to a “simplified representation of reality” (p. 27). They suggested that four models of public relations exist: the press agency, public information, two-way asymmetrical, and two-way symmetrical models.<sup>1</sup> Dozier et al. (1995) said these models explain “the values and a pattern of behavior (practices) that communication departments use to deal with publics” (p. 40). These four models are composed of two-dimensional combinations of one-way vs. two-way communication and asymmetrical vs. symmetrical communication.

The earliest model of public relations practices described by J. Grunig and Hunt (1984) is the press agency model, which reflects the P.T. Barnum approach of stressing media coverage at any cost. Predominant in the late nineteenth century, practitioners of this model displayed a reckless disregard for facts by creating publicity stunts of all kinds to generate publicity, whether good or bad.

The second model – the public information model – was an innovation of the 1900s and is characterized by a perceived need to keep publics informed as well as to generate favorable publicity for the organization. J. Grunig (1992) labeled this model a “journalist-in-residence” approach in which accurate information concerning the organization is disseminated, but unfavorable information is not volunteered (p. 403). This label originates from the reaction of large corporations to hire their own

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Grunig and L. Grunig (1992) reviewed the research on the models of public relations, including the history of the models and the extent of, and organizational roots for, their use.



journalists to respond to attacks by muckraking journalists by explaining confusing and misunderstood facts to the public.

Both of these models employ one-way, source-to-receiver communication with information flowing from the organization through media channels to publics. However some public relations eventually started using research providing feedback from publics to management, making communication between organizations and publics two way.

The two-way asymmetrical model of public relations began emerging during World War I. It introduced increased audience research including segmentation and the active seeking of public feedback. However, this two-way communication was used asymmetrically with the intent to use such feedback to persuade or manipulate publics into compliance with the organization's objectives.

The two-way asymmetrical model of public relations employs two-way communication to create an imbalanced relationship between an organization and its publics. In contrast, the two way symmetrical model of public relations adjusts the relationships between an organization and its publics through negotiation and compromise to create mutually beneficial outcomes involving give and take from publics and dominant coalitions.

Excellent public relations departments model more of their communication programs on the two-way symmetrical model than on the other three models, although they often combine the elements of the two-way asymmetrical model with

the two-way symmetrical model in a mixed-motive model.<sup>2</sup> The main difference between the two-way symmetrical model and the others is that in addition to changing the behavior of the publics, it also changes the behavior of the organization. This is not to say that persuasion is not involved in the symmetrical model. The symmetrical model balances the organization's self-interests with the interests of strategic publics and involves a fusion of advocacy and collaboration. Spicer (1997) referred to this balance as "collaborative advocacy." L. Grunig et al. (2002) said that mixed motives and collaborative advocacy can both be equated to symmetry. All three terms mean that an organization's top communicators "must listen as well as argue. This does not mean that symmetrical practitioners should not argue or attempt to persuade. Rather they must consistently remind ... management that they may not be right and ... may be better off if it listens to others" (p. 317).

Scholars have attempted to apply the models of public relations practice in such areas as India (Sriramesh, 1992), Taiwan (Huang, 1990), Greece (Lyra, 1991), South Korea (Kim & Hon, 1998), Brazil (Penteado, 1996), Slovenia (Vercic, L. Grunig, & J. Grunig, 1996) and mainland China (Chen, 1996). In a meta-analysis of three studies, J. Grunig, L. Grunig, Sriramesh, Huang, and Lyra (1995) found all four models of public relations are practiced outside of the United States. These researchers also suggested that symmetrical public relations may be a universal concept that makes an organization more effective over the long term, although specific manifestations may differ from culture to culture.

---

<sup>2</sup> Murphy (1991) suggested a "mixed motives" approach in which asymmetrical methods are used to establish the best position for an organization in the win-win zone created by symmetrical communication.

The four models of public relations have probably been the most studied aspect of the Excellence Theory. These models, especially the two-way symmetrical model, have also been the most controversial and the most debated component of the Excellence Theory (Cancel, Mitrook, & Cameron, 1999; Cheney & Christensen, 2001; Leitch & Neilson, 2001; Yarbrough, Cameron, Sallot, & McWilliams, 1998). Critics have falsely viewed the two-way symmetrical model as advocating pure cooperation, in which the organization tries to accommodate the interests of publics. Rather, in this model the organization tries to fulfill its own interests while simultaneously trying to help a public satisfy its interests (J. Grunig, 2001b; L. Grunig et al., 2002).

Results from the Excellence study suggest that direction of communication should be measured separately from symmetry and asymmetry. Three of the four indicators of the two-way asymmetrical model measured the extent to which organizations used asymmetrical forms of research in their public relations practice. These research-based variables were the most reliable of the four indicators. The first set of variables is symmetry and asymmetry, or the extent to which collaboration and advocacy describe public relations strategy or behavior. The second set of variables includes the extent to which public relations is one-way or two-way.

Rhee (1999) also found that although one-way and two-way variables fell into a single continuum, symmetrical and asymmetrical practices did not. This again supports the thinking that symmetrical and asymmetrical practices are not mutually exclusive and that collaboration and advocacy work in tandem (collaborative

advocacy) in excellent public relations (J. Grunig, 1992; J. Grunig, 2001b; L. Grunig et al., 2002).

In response to this criticism and these results, the Excellence study team has suggested the need to develop a more comprehensive theory that goes beyond the typology represented by the four models. L. Grunig et al. (2002) said “Typologies are a useful way to begin the development of a theory, but for science and scholarship to progress we need to move beyond typologies to conceptualize and measure the theoretical dimensions that underlie a typology” (p. 348).

Excellent public relations can be described better in terms of underlying dimensions than in terms of the four discrete models themselves. Excellent public relations is research based (two-way), symmetrical (although organizations constantly struggle between symmetry and asymmetry when they make decisions), and based on either mediated or interpersonal communication (depending on the situation and public). Although it was not measured as a component of the public relations models in the Excellence study, ethics is described as the fourth dimension with excellent public relations viewing ethics as a process of communication rather than an outcome. Thus excellence public relations is more ethical than less excellent practice. (J. Grunig, 2001b; L. Grunig et al., 2002).

One of the most important aspects of this new theoretical framework is the distinction of symmetry and asymmetry from direction of communication. In this framework the first dimension is symmetry and asymmetry, or the extent to which collaboration and advocacy describe public relations strategy or behavior. The second dimension includes the extent to which public relations is one-way or two-way.

These four dimensions of public relations have begun to be examined (Huang, 1997; Rhee, 1999; Sha, 1999). Huang developed measures of these four dimensions in her examination of the relationships between public relations practitioners in the executive branch of the Taiwanese government and elected members of the legislative branch and their staff. She found that symmetrical and ethical communication were the dimensions most strongly correlated with the relationship indicators of control mutuality and trust.

Sha (1999) examined these dimensions in a study of an activist group in Taiwan. She found that this group displayed different levels of the dimensions when communicating with different publics.

In a replication of the Excellence study in Korea replacing the original measures of the four models with measure of the four dimensions, Rhee (1999) found that excellent public relations was asymmetrical and symmetrical, two-way, ethical, and mediated and interpersonal.

### International Public Relations

Although an alternative view would suggest the principles of excellence to be ethnocentric products of Anglo researchers and participants, additional research (Vercic et al., 1996; Wakefield 1997) has suggested that these principles are applicable in other countries worldwide and for public relations departments dealing with diverse stakeholders across the globe. To determine the validity of applying this theory globally, it is imperative to review what is known about international public relations and public relations in non-Anglo nations.

In his classic bibliographic essay on public relations research, Pavlik (1987)

reserved less than a page to a review of then-extant research in international public relations, only citing four studies. This may be explained by the fact that a body of knowledge concerning U.S. domestic practice has only been significantly developed within the last decade (J. Grunig, 1989, p. 22). Although there has been much more written on this subject in the past five years much of it has involved descriptive research or case studies of practice in individual countries. L. Grunig et al. (2002) identified theory in international public relations as one of four crucial gaps in the body of knowledge of public relations.

The impetus for theory building in this area becomes apparent when one realizes most public relations is international public relations. Most organizations, whether small or large, are affected by stakeholders throughout the world or by competition or collaboration with organizations in other countries (L. Grunig et al., 2002; Heath, 2001; Taylor, 2001). If an organization has a Web site, it is practicing international public relations with messages readily available to just about any corner of the globe.

Another reason why building theory on this topic is so important is because the need for public relations to operate in an international context is an exciting opportunity for astute professionals to demonstrate their value by serving an organization during a time of transition and uncertainty (Taylor, 2001). However, this challenge is not without risks. Foster (1999) pointed out that the international sector is the most difficult aspect of public relations to manage because of its complexity, and unpredictability and that such practice generates more risk than most domestic-based

public relations. To fill this gap in the profession's body of knowledge, it is important to review the state of international public relations research.

Culbertson (1996) divided research surveying public relations worldwide into two broad categories – international public relations and comparative public relations. He defined international public relations as “the practice of public relations in an international or cross-cultural context” (p. 2). Culbertson described comparative public relations research as research comparing similarities and differences between public relations practice in one or more countries with that in other venues.

Sriramesh and White (1992) explained that public relations has been primarily regarded as a U.S. practice with minimal input from “Anglo” countries such as the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada. Thus, when public relations research is reported from non-Anglo countries, this research is often labeled “international,” when in reality it is research on domestic practice in a non-Anglo country (L. Grunig, J. Grunig, & Vercic, 1998).

The root of such inappropriate labels may be the fact that examination of intranational practice around the world is crucial to forming international public relations theory. The purpose of comparative research is to identify universal problems professionals in all nations face, as well as to search for generic principles that apply to the practice of public relations worldwide.

In this study I used comparative research to contribute to the body of knowledge in international public relations. This study investigated whether the generic principles of public relations effectiveness are applicable in nations outside of the Anglo countries profiled in the Excellence study. In order to broaden the body of

knowledge regarding campaigns and public relations functions that deal with stakeholders and publics in more than one country, research is needed to investigate the generic principles and universal problems of public relations as well as specific applications needed to deal with problems particular to individual countries. Although the state of research on international practice is immature, one issue in this area that has received substantial attention is whether multinational organizations and campaigns should be decentralized.

#### Universal vs. Ethnocentric/Global Theory of Excellence

There has been much debate concerning whether public relations can be practiced in similar ways in different countries (Botan, 1992; Illman, 1980; Ovaite, 1988; Wakefield, 2001). Central to this debate is whether multinational organizations should centralize or localize their public relations practices and operations. G. Anderson (1989) labeled the centralized model as “global public relations” and the localized structure as “international public relations”:

- 1) Global public relations emphasizes the concept that programs can and should be created at a central headquarters and then, with only minor adaptations, be carried out in all local markets.
- 2) International [localized] public relations emphasizes the placement of resources and decision-making authority in the local markets, where native communicators best understand the needs of their local audiences. (p. 413)

Supporters of the localized model argue that public relations in a specific country should be performed by locals with firsthand knowledge of the customs, traditions, and laws in their countries (Angell, 1990; Dilenshnieder, 1992; Reed



1999). Other scholars have criticized multinational organizations concentrating on ethnocentric assumptions about public relations because they reflect home-country norms and audiences and limit effectiveness and understanding of other cultures (Banks, 1995; Botan, 1992; Gonzalez, 1989; Kinzar & Bohn, 1985; Maddox, 1993; Nessman, 1995; Vasquez & Taylor, 1994). Aside from ethnocentric assumptions, slow reaction time is another weakness of globalized practice (Dunn, Cahill, & Boddewyn, 1979; Kinzar & Bohn, 1985). If practitioners at the local level do not have the autonomy to deal with a sudden crisis, there is a delay in contacting the individuals in the organization's home country as well as in explaining the circumstances behind such a volatile situation, before a response can be formulated. It is not difficult to imagine the harmful effects such a delayed response can have in the face of an event like this.

Supporters of the global approach maintain that although local staff members have a thorough understanding of local culture and conditions, they may not have the experience and knowledge needed to design and launch programs. This lack of experience and knowledge can leave organizations susceptible in times of disaster and crises (Manu, 1996). In addition to this susceptibility, some scholars point out that maintaining strong, interrelated public relations programs throughout the world is more important than understanding of local culture (G. Anderson, 1989). Sharpe (1992) agreed, stating that professionals recognize the importance of public relations and that its capabilities remain the same worldwide despite variations in environments from region to region.

Multinational corporations based in certain cultures often ignore exploring alternatives and solely rely on one of the two positions (Wakefield, 1997). For instance, European organizations usually favor a localized management structure whereas American organizations often believe their operation either must be completely globalized or must allow for complete local autonomy with no central control (Hampton-Turner & Trompenaars, 1993). Getting caught up in this either/or proposition can lead to serious problems, as mentioned above.

Epley (1992) stated that effective international communication structures combine aspects of both models – “Global public relations is local public relations” (p. 111). He described the strategy as being able to communicate with global reach and local touch. Mahler’s (1996) qualitative study of public relations among German subsidiaries in the United States resulted in similar findings.

Similarly, Vercic et al. (1996) and Wakefield (1997) proposed a middle-ground global theory based on Brinkerhoff and Ingle’s (1989) theory of “structured flexibility” in the management of development organizations. Brinkerhoff and Ingle described five management functions that are generic and stated that how each of these functions are employed differs in each individual setting. Likewise, six specific variables – the economic system, political system, extent of activism, level of development, culture, and media system – must be taken into account when applying the principles of public relations excellence in different countries.

J. Grunig (2001a) said, “This global theory also spells out differences in the way these principles are applied that make them culturally specific rather than ethnocentric – differences that overcome Botan’s reservations about ethnocentric

public relations” (p. 17). Echoing Sriramesh and White (1992), J. Grunig (2001a) called for more evidence to support “that these principles work in other cultures and be open to new concepts and revisions of these concepts proposed by scholars and practitioners in other cultures” (p. 36).

Further research in Slovenia supports the validity of these factors in measuring public relations excellence worldwide (Vercic et al., 1996). Two-way symmetrical public relations, upon which the principles are largely based, has also been uncovered in India, Taiwan, and Greece (J. Grunig, L. Grunig, Sriramesh, Huang, & Lyra, 1995). In addition, Wakefield (1997) conducted a Delphi study with 21 panelists from 18 nations that suggests the principles of excellence are ideal worldwide.

This theory of generic principles does not deny the existence of different forms of practice, but maintains they will be effective only if they share underlying similarities with the generic principles of excellence (Vercic et al., 1996). This global theory remains normative and further research is needed to determine whether this is a positive theory describing effective practice in other cultures. If the principles of excellence are in existence in practice this provides evidence that the global theory is positive and if these principles are also found to contribute to organizational effectiveness this would provide further evidence this theory is also normative. Even if it is found that the principles are not indicative of the current effective practice in the countries studied, this project will shed further light on whether these principles are indeed based upon universal values. This study will attempt to fill this gap in theory and uncover whether the following generic principles exist in other countries.

### Involvement of public relations in strategic management.

Effective organizations usually rely on long-term strategic planning to enable them to develop a mission and set of goals that are appropriate for their environment. Excellent public relations departments are involved in this process by recognizing and cultivating relationships with the strategic publics that affect their mission or goals. When public relations develops these relationships, it saves the organization money by reducing the costs of litigation, regulation, legislation, pressure campaigns, or boycotts that result from bad relationships with publics – publics that become activist groups when relationships are bad. It also helps the organization make money by cultivating relationships with donors, consumers, shareholders, and legislators (L. Grunig et al., 2002). Taylor (2000b) found this same ability to build relationships crucial to achieving success in nation-building. Wakefield (2001) said strategic public relations seems to be valued among practitioners worldwide.

When discussing whether this principle will contribute to effectiveness in diverse settings, one must examine the need for involvement of public relations in strategic management. All organizations try to identify and build relationships with vital publics that form external or internal threats to the organization and its goals. In an international context, these functions such as environmental scanning and building relationships become far more complicated and necessary because of the numerous and complex publics the senior public relations practitioner must communicate with in comparison with a domestic setting (Grammer, 2000). Synnott and McKie (1997) also found that demand for research-based public relations in international settings is increasing. This raises the first research question:

RQ1a: In what ways are participants in this study involved in strategic management?

RQ1b: How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ1c: How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

Empowerment of public relations in the dominant coalition or a direct reporting relationship to senior management.

For the strategic management of public relations to become an integral part of the strategic management of the organization, the public relations unit must be empowered to practice public relations according to professional principles rather than the well-intentioned ideas of senior managers outside of the department. When public relations is empowered the senior public relations person becomes part of, or has ready access to, the group of managers that makes strategic decisions for the organization. Such empowerment or a direct reporting relationship appears to be a necessary, if not a sufficient, condition for public relation's participation in strategic management (L. Grunig et al., 2002).

RQ2a: What kind of reporting relationship do participants in this study have with the dominant coalition of their organization?

RQ2b: How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ2c: How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

Two-way symmetrical model of public relations.

Excellent public relations departments model more of their communication programs on the two-way symmetrical model than on the other three models, although they often combine the elements of the two-way asymmetrical model with the two-way symmetrical model in a mixed-motive model. The main difference between the two-way symmetrical model and the others is that in addition to changing the behavior of the publics, it also changes the behavior of the organization.

Scholars have attempted to apply the models of public relations practice in such areas as India (Sriramesh, 1992), Taiwan (Huang, 1990), Greece (Lyra, 1991), South Korea (Kim & Hon, 1998), Brazil (Pentado, 1996), Slovenia (Vercic, L. Grunig, & J. Grunig, 1996) and mainland China (Chen, 1996). In a meta-analysis of three studies, J. Grunig, L. Grunig, Sriramesh, Huang, and Lyra (1995) found all four models of public relations are practiced outside of the United States. These researchers also suggested that symmetrical public relations may be a universal concept that makes an organization more effective over the long term, although specific manifestations may differ from culture to culture. Other researchers, such as Taylor (2001), still believe more evidence is needed to show that symmetrical communication occurs in other parts of the world.

RQ3a: What dimensions of public relations models are practiced by participants in this study?

RQ3b: How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ3c: How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

Public relations as a management function separate from other functions.

Many organizations splinter the public relations function by making it a supporting tool for other departments such as marketing, human resources, law, or finance. When this occurs and the public relations function is subordinate to other functions, it cannot be managed strategically. J. Grunig (2001a) pointed out that many investigations into domestic practice overseas have reported that public relations is often confused with advertising and marketing, which tends to lead to the dominance of press agency and public information models of practice. Public relations professionals communicate with publics that threaten the organization's autonomy or provide opportunities to enhance that autonomy, whereas marketing creates and seeks out markets that can use or consume its products or services.

If public relations becomes a tool for the marketing function, the organization loses its ability to build relationships with all of its strategic publics and is limited primarily to communication with consumer publics. In a case study of Coca-Cola's operations in Europe, Wakefield (1999) pointed out this can lead to disastrous consequences. To avoid such outcomes, research is needed to examine the public relations function in relation to other organizational functions in domestic practice throughout the world:

RQ4a: What is the relationship between public relations and other, related organizational functions such as marketing among participants in this study?

RQ4b: How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ4c: How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

### Knowledge potential for managerial role and symmetrical public relations.

Excellent public relations departments have top communication managers who have learned a theoretical body of knowledge in public relations. This includes strategic knowledge or the ability to manage the organization's response to issues and develop goals and objectives for the department. In addition, research knowledge is needed to segment publics and to conduct evaluation. The knowledge potential appears to be a prerequisite for excellent public relations, because only practitioners who know how to manage the communication function strategically have the necessary expertise to participate in the strategic management of an organization (L. Grunig et al., 2002). The knowledge potential of practitioners also increases their chance of being accepted by the organization's dominant coalition.

The knowledge of practitioners is one of the most heavily researched topics in comparative international public relations research (Al-Enad, 1992; Beng, 1994; Chen, 1996; Coombs, Holladay, Hasenour, & Signitzer, 1994; Ekachai, 1995; Rhee, 1999; Turk, 1996). The literature on this topic suggests that much like in the Excellence study countries, most practice across the globe is not research based, nor does it feature collaborative advocacy typical of excellent public relations.

Research has suggested that practitioners in countries such as Korea are most likely to practice the craft models of press agency and public information, although they aspire to practice the two-way symmetrical and asymmetrical models (Kim & Hon, 1998). Ekachai (1995) found the dominant role behaviors of Thai practitioners to fit the one-way models of press agency and public information. In a survey of public relations professionals in Singapore, Beng (1994) found that many



organizations have not yet realized the value of strategic public relations. Newsom and Carrell (1994) reported that public relations education in India suffers from a lack of professors with professional experience and exposure to communication theory and behavioral sciences.

However, other studies have uncovered excellent public relations. Chen and Culbertson (1992) found that the Chinese government takes two approaches to public relations: symmetric public relations as well as one-way methods such as propaganda, press agency, and image building. Al-Enad (1992) found that practitioners in Saudi Arabia attempt to serve the public and the organization's interests.

In a survey of practitioners in Romania, Turk (1996) found that although practitioners rely on persuasion to achieve goals, they seek to "develop mutual understanding between the management of an organization and the publics the organization affects" (p. 346). Synnott and McKie (1997) also found that demand for research-based public relations in international settings is increasing.

RQ5a: What public relations knowledge is available in the public relations departments among participants in this study?

RQ5b: How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ5c: How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

#### Organizational context for excellence.

Excellent public relations departments feature participative rather than authoritarian cultures, feature an environment with activist pressure, and have organic organizational structures. Organizations with authoritarian cultures predominately

feature centralized decision-making with an emphasis on authority and tradition (Dozier et al., 1995). In such an environment, departments pursue individual agendas rather working toward a common, unified goal. Because of close supervision employees experience a sense of distrust within the organization. In contrast, organizations with participative cultures share decision-making authority with those affected by decisions. Featuring a sense of teamwork rather than distrust, these organizations feature integrated departments working toward a common goal.

Although the Excellence team found that participative organizational cultures provide a favorable environment for excellent public relations, excellent communication departments and programs also occur in organizations with authoritarian cultures (Dozier et al., 1995, p. 17). Because excellent public relations can exist in organizations with authoritarian cultures and because its measurement relies on questionnaires distributed to employees, this study did not investigate organizational culture. Rather, I investigated the organizational context for excellence by investigating the organization's exposure to activist pressure.

L Grunig et al. (2002) pointed out that activism is good for an organization, pushing organizations to excellent public relations. Activist pressure requires organizations to employ the greater sophistication of research-based, two-way communication more than one-way, mediated communication. Such pressure causes the dominant coalition to recognize the need for two-way and symmetrical expertise in the public relations department. Excellent public relations departments develop programs to communicate actively, and symmetrically, with activists. Organizations that collaborate with activists develop a competitive advantage over organizations

that do not because they behave in a way that is acceptable to publics and, therefore, make fewer decisions that result in negative publicity and regulation, litigation, and opposition. Of the six specific conditions that L. Grunig, et al. (2002) believed affect the local application of generic principles of public relations excellence worldwide, they pointed out that the level of activism receives the least attention. However, they argued activism may be the most important of these six conditions because it provides an important incentive for organizations to practice excellent public relations.

Activism is almost nonexistent in authoritarian countries and thus the organizational context for excellence may not be present. Under such conditions, organizations may feel less pressure to produce excellent public relations (L. Grunig et al., 2001).

However, as Molleda (2000) stated, “A domestic event can become a global trend or a global issues can effect domestic operations” (p. 48). With the advent of global communication technologies, even organizations in authoritarian countries with low levels of activism may face pressure from groups outside of their borders (D. Anderson, 1992; Maddox, 1993; Welge & Hotbrugge, 1998).

RQ6a: Do participants in this study believe they face activism as public relations practitioners?

RQ6b: How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ6c: How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries.

## Chapter 3: Methodology

To examine public relations practice in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda, I used survey research. In this study, Rhee's (1999) adjusted subsets of the IABC team's questionnaire were used in addition to new questions created to measure the relationship between the public relations function and other functions in an organization. In this chapter, the rationale behind choosing this methodology is discussed, as is the process that was undertaken in this project.

### Survey Research

Babbie (1992) defined survey research as “the administration of questionnaires to a sample of respondents selected from the population” (p. 282). Initially this project was designed to employ a mixed-mode survey (Dillman, 2000) via e-mail and surface mail because these methods can cover a wide geographic area for a reasonable cost. After a first wave of pretests using the e-mail survey, I determined it would be better to replace this method with a Web-based survey. I still initially used e-mail to contact participants. This initial e-mail was a cover letter (Appendix A) explaining the purpose of the survey with a link to the Web page that featured the survey.

The surface-mail survey method is often the only way to gather information from people who live in dispersed areas or in other countries (Wimmer & Dominick, 1997, p. 152). Another advantage of the mail survey is that since there is not any interpersonal interaction, some respondents are more likely to answer sensitive questions candidly than they would in other situations such as face-to-face interviews.

This absence of personal contact minimizes interviewer bias. Participants also have a greater sense of privacy than they would in interpersonal interviews, since questionnaires can be completed at home or in the office. These same advantages apply to Web-based surveys. Web-based surveys also feature the benefit of virtually no costs, except for the time it takes to design the survey and to distribute e-mails to potential participants, inviting them to participate in the study.

Dillman (2000) pointed out that using different survey modes may elicit different responses. However, he also said mixed-mode surveys provide an opportunity to compensate for the weaknesses of each method. The likelihood of measurement differences between modes can be overcome by having both surveys reflect each other through “unimode construction,” which is the writing and presenting of questions in such a way that assures respondents are reacting to a common mental stimulus (p. 232). The fact that the two modes I employed are so similar also reduced the risk of measurement differences.

### Electronic Surveys

Dillman (2000) said that the two most significant developments in survey methodology during the twentieth century were the introduction of random sampling in the 1940s and telephone interviewing in the 1970s. He went on to explain that electronic surveys administered through new media such as e-mail and the World Wide Web possess an even greater potential to transform how most major surveys are conducted. It appears as if these media are already having an impact on research involving geographically dispersed and international populations (Coomber, 1997a; Bunz, 1998).

Couper and Nichols (1998) stated that the use of electronic surveys began in the early 1980s as an alternative to face-to-face interviews or mailed paper questionnaires. Since the inception of such methods, three formats of electronic surveys have evolved as the most frequently used – disk-by-mail, e-mail surveys, and the Web-based questionnaire on the Internet.

The disk-by-mail format was one of the first attempts at electronic surveying (Couper & Nichols, 1998; Ramos, Sedivi, & Sweet, 1998). This method involves mailing a disk containing the questionnaire to participants who are instructed to open the file on the disk, respond to the questions, and mail the completed questionnaire disk back to the researcher. This method may be innovative, but it is essentially the same as a self-administered surface-mail survey. It is hard to understand the advantages of such an approach over a paper questionnaire distributed by surface mail, especially when one understands that the participants must have access to a computer with the same software, in addition to possessing the knowledge of how to use the software. This format also shares the same disadvantages of surface-mail surveys such as delay or loss of data by sending the disk via the postal service. Understanding the limitations of this approach because of surface mail, researchers began to turn to electronic mail (e-mail).

This second method of electronic surveying is the e-mail survey in which the questionnaire is sent to the participant as part of an e-mail message or as an attached file to an e-mail message (Smee, Brennan, Hoek, & Macpherson, 1998). According to Wimmer and Dominick (2000), this is the most common form of electronic survey methods. The questionnaire is written in ASCII text, the common format among e-

mail systems. The participant essentially edits the original message in answering the questionnaire by typing in characters at given points in the message (e.g., an “X,” or typing in words for an open-ended question). When finished, the participant sends the edited message back as a reply. This method of surveying requires little set-up time and few computer skills beyond those required for sending e-mail, resulting in questionnaires that are fast and easy to administer.

Although this is the most commonly used electronic survey method, it is not without limitations. Since e-mail is limited to a basic text format, it provides for little or no formatting of the questionnaire. This problem of formatting can be overcome by using attached files. However, these files may not be accessible to the recipient of the message because of software incompatibilities. Additionally, some e-mail programs may restrict the length limit of messages, which could prevent a portion of participants from receiving questionnaires. Researchers have gotten around these problems of software compatibility and text formatting by designing Web-based surveys written in hypertext markup language (HTML) and posted on a Web site.

According to Ramos et al. (1998), this third method may have the “most promising future” (p. 405). This method offers the most flexibility in creating simple to sophisticated questionnaire formats (Young & Ross, 2000) as well as recruiting participants. Web-based questionnaires can integrate Likert-type scale responses, question skip patterns, graphics, animations, and even links to other pages. This method also can significantly reduce the amount of time devoted to data entry. Once posted on the Internet, the Web questionnaire can be downloaded into a compatible

spreadsheet or statistical analysis software. This not only cuts down on time but also the occurrence of data entry errors.

The Web-based questionnaire also allows flexibility in recruiting participants. Incorporating e-mail with the Web-based survey, participants may receive e-mail messages containing the address (URL) of the Web page that contains the survey. This is a sound strategy in situations where a population's e-mail addresses are known, such as organizations or businesses. Researchers can also recruit participants by acquiring e-mail lists and randomly sampling from them. Another means of recruitment is to post a notice of a survey with relevant newsgroups or list servers providing a brief description of the research and a link with the URL to the survey (Coomber, 1997b; Parks & Floyd, 1996). Additionally, if the researcher or organization sponsoring the research project maintains a Web site, it is possible to do a "pop-up" survey (Tierney, 2000; Wimmer & Dominick, 2000). An interval is selected at random (Tierney used 3), and then every third visitor to the Web site sees a banner or window pop-up appear, providing a link to the survey. The primary limitation of the Web-based questionnaire method of electronic surveying is possessing knowledge of HTML and CGI (Common Gateway Interface) scripts.

A potential advantage of e-mail and Web based surveys is the ability to acquire large sample sizes at minimal cost and in a short time because of the automation of data gathering, the minimal cost of fieldwork, and potentially quick response and turn-around times. Since the questionnaire responses are in an electronic format, the returned questionnaires cannot get lost among other papers as is the case with surface-mail surveys. Other specific advantages include reduced publishing costs



and being more environmentally friendly as a result of the reduced amounts of paper needed to conduct a study. Participants also appear to prefer responding to electronic questionnaires to the traditional paper-and-pencil questionnaire (Young, 1998; Young & Ross, in press).

Obviously there are several advantages to electronic surveys, mostly related to time and costs. However, I was also concerned about the quality of the data gathered from such a methodology. Would respondents answer the questions of an electronic survey with the same sincerity and honesty as surface-mail surveys? The answer appears to be “yes.” A handful of studies concerning this issue has been conducted with outcomes indicating no difference between responses to electronic and surface-mail surveys (Booth-Kewley, Edwards, & Rosenfield, 1992; Kiesler & Sproull, 1986; Lautenschlager & Flaherty, 1990; Yoffie, 1998).

#### Limitations of Survey Research

There were several limitations to the methodology employed in this study. Although survey research features several advantages as discussed above, this methodology also has shortcomings. Survey research can seldom deal with the contexts of social life, sacrificing depth and richness of details. It also lacks flexibility. If a significant new variable arises, the researcher is unable to measure it with a standardized questionnaire as he or she would be able to if he or she were depending on observation (Babbie, 1992).

The mixed-mode survey employing Web-based questionnaires is a relatively new method and there is little published information about the problems that may be encountered in conducting a survey via the Web. There is also an issue of

generalizability – problems may occur when researchers draw conclusions about the population from samples reached through the Internet (Clayton & Werking, 1998; Ramos et al., 1998). However, Coomber (1997b) suggested that gathering data with electronic surveys is particularly useful when the researcher is more interested in studying unusual, specific, or deviant groups than a general population. Since the population of this study is a specific group of public relations practitioners including those from countries traditionally underrepresented in public relations research, electronic surveying appears to be a logical choice to compliment surface-mail surveys in order to reduce costs and time and to reach these geographically dispersed populations.

In the academic field of public relations this methodology has been used in only a handful of projects thus far (Bunz, 1998; Elliot, 1997; J. Grunig & Hon, 1999; Wright, 1998). Of these studies, only J. Grunig & Hon (1999) featured a Web-based survey as opposed to an e-mail survey. Thus, this is an important contribution to the body of knowledge of public relations research because it is one of the initial studies using a Web-based survey, let alone a mixed-mode design involving both surface mail and Web-based questionnaires.

### Population

The population examined in this study consisted of public relations practitioners who were members of professional societies for public relations in Australia (Public Relations Institute of Australia), Italy (Public Relations Federation of Italy), Mauritius (Public Relations Association of Mauritius), and Uganda (Public Relations Association of Uganda). Because these populations were limited in size I

conducted a census rather than a sample of each population. I initially planned on contacting all of the public relations associations around the world that were listed on the International Public Relations Association's (IPRA) Web site. To reduce costs, time, and redundancy, I diverged from this initial plan and instead contacted each of the associations that had an e-mail address listed and that were in countries where the Excellence principles had not yet been tested. I contacted each of these associations to seek endorsement of this study as well as a list of e-mail addresses and physical mailing addresses for members.

### Pretest

Before the pretest, I constructed an initial English-language questionnaire using items from Rhee's (1999) questionnaire that were based on the Excellence study questionnaire. I created and added 11 questions measuring whether the public relations function is separate from other functions, specifically marketing. Before translation, a pretest of these English-language questionnaires was conducted using several graduate students studying public relations in the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland as well as several colleagues working in public relations in the United States. Participants were given both hard copies and electronic copies of the questionnaire and asked to identify ambiguous terms and provide any suggestions or comments on the questionnaire that they might think would be helpful.

Initially, I planned to administer an e-mail survey in addition to the surface-mail survey. However, the pretests revealed that it would be better to use a Web-based survey in place of the e-mail survey because the e-mail questionnaire lost its

formatting when participants hit the reply button. With Dillman's (2000) concept of unimode construction in mind, the Web-based questionnaire (Appendix B) was also more similar to the surface-mail questionnaire (Appendix C) than the e-mail questionnaire was. However, e-mail was still initially used as a cover letter to contact potential participants to explain the purpose of the study and provide a link to the Web-based questionnaire.

I also made one minor change to the questions after these initial pretests. This change was to a question measuring the use of environmental scanning. There was concern that public relations professionals, especially those outside the United States, would not understand this term; so I described what it meant in parentheses following the term. The result was a change from "Perform environmental scanning" to "Perform environmental scanning (scanning the organization's environment for publics affected by the organization's behaviors)." Finally, I added more boxes, between questions, reminding participants what each scale item represented.

### Translation

In Australia, Mauritius, and Uganda, where English is the official language, there was no need to translate the questionnaires from English. However, in Italy the questionnaires were translated from English to Italian and then backtranslated into English to identify any ambiguous or inappropriate wording. This process was conducted by two FERPI student member volunteers who had studied public relations as graduate students in the United States and who were also practicing public relations. This translation-backtranslation procedure is the most commonly used technique to translate instruments (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997; Werner &

Campbell, 1970) because the accuracy of the translation can be evaluated by comparing the original and backtranslated versions.

### Instrument

The IABC questionnaire used an open-ended fractionation scale that accounts for the complete lack of a characteristic with the presence of a true zero, and 100 as an “average amount” of any characteristic experienced by a practitioner. The scale is unbounded at the upper end, which allowed participants to write as high a number as they believed best answered the question. In her adjustment of the IABC questionnaires, Rhee (1999) changed the fractionation scale to a five-point Likert-type scale for all items because she believed her study’s participants were more familiar with the latter than the former. I employed the Likert-type scale for a similar reason.

I chose to use Rhee’s (1999) questionnaire because it provided standardized questions from the IABC questionnaire that have been established as valid and reliable (J. Grunig & L. Grunig, 1992) in addition to measuring five of the six generic principles I intended to examine. Additionally, these measures have been found to be applicable to non-Anglo nations such as Slovenia and South Korea. The characteristics of Excellence clustered into a single Excellence factor in these two countries as they had previously in Anglo countries. Thus, this questionnaire should be applicable to the population in this project. Additionally, Rhee’s questionnaire included reconstructed measures of models of public relations based on the concept of dimensions of public relations models that have been more recently embraced (J. Grunig, 2001; L. Grunig, J. Grunig, & Dozier, 2002; Huang, 1997; Sha, 1999).

Involvement of public relations in strategic management was measured by the following items from questions 4 and 5 in the questionnaire (Appendix C):

To what extent does your public relations department contribute to strategic management of your organization? (If your department makes no contribution to strategic planning and decision making, go to Q6.)

1. We contribute to strategic planning.
2. We contribute in responding to major social issues.
3. We contribute in major initiatives (e.g., acquisitions, major new programs, movements into new markets, launches of new products or services).
4. We contribute in routine operations (e.g., development and maintenance of employee communication, community relations, or media relations programs).

Please use the scale below to estimate to what extent your department makes its contribution to strategic planning and decision making through each of the following activities.

5. Regularly conducted and routine research activities.
6. Specific research conducted to answer specific questions.
7. Formal approaches to gathering information for use in decision making other than research.
8. Informal approaches to gathering information.
9. Contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization.
10. Judgement based on experience.
11. Other.

The following items from questions 1, 2, 3, and 6 were used to measure empowerment of public relations in the dominant coalition or a direct reporting relationship to senior management:

This series of questions asks about your relationship, as member of a public relations department, to senior management. Please check one answer for each question unless otherwise specified.

1. Does your public relations department report directly to the most senior manager in your company?

Yes (Go to Q4)    No

2. Does an indirect reporting relationship exist, then, from the public relations department to the most senior manager (for example, in which the department reports directly on some matters but not all)?

Yes (Go to Q4)    No

3. Does the department then report to a senior manager who in turn reports to the most senior manager?

Yes    No

4. Does the department then report to a more junior level of management?

Yes    No

5. Today's organizations are so complex that many of them require more than a single leader to operate effectively. Instead of a single person, then, many organizations are controlled by a group of powerful people -- often called the "dominant coalition." In your organization, who is represented in the power elite? (Please Check **ALL** that apply)

- a. The chief executive officer.....
- b. The chief financial officer.....
- c. The chief operating officer.....
- d. The head of public relations, public affairs, or communication .....
- e. Other (Specify):\_\_\_\_\_

The characteristic of knowledge potential for the managerial role and symmetrical public relations were measured through several indices in question 10 measuring knowledge of two-way symmetrical public relations, knowledge of two-way asymmetrical public relations, knowledge of press agency, knowledge of the public information model, and knowledge of the managerial and technician roles.

The models of public relations, or rather the underlying dimensions of these models such as direction of communication, purpose of communication, mode of communication and ethics of communication were examined in indices listed in question 9.

The organizational context for excellence, specifically the presence of activism was measured with items in questions 15 and 16:

1. Has your organization experienced pressure from activist groups?  
Think of the most recent case or a typical case when your organization was pressured by an activist group and answer the following questions.
2. How successful do you think that activist group was in achieving its goals in its dealings with your organization?
3. How successful do you think the organization's response to the group was?



In the conceptualization chapter of this thesis, I outlined the importance of the public relations function being a separate function from the marketing and other functions. Many investigations into domestic public relations outside the United States have found public relations to be often confused with advertising and marketing. Because of this, I thought it crucial to investigate. The original Excellence study measured this by asking participants whether there were separate units for marketing and public affairs (public relations), and if so which received a larger budget and greater support from the dominant coalition. I used these items and developed several others in the hopes of creating an index to measure this characteristic and its relationship to public relations Excellence. The items developed to measure this relationship were based on the latest research on the subject from public relations and integrated marketing communication scholars (Caywood, 1997; Ehling, White, & J. Grunig, 1992; J. Grunig & L. Grunig, 1998; Harris, 1998; Varey, 1998).

The Excellence characteristic of the public relations function being a separate function from the marketing and other functions was measured by the following items in questions 11, 12, 13, and 14:

Using the following scale, please choose a number that indicates how much you agree or disagree that the statement describes the way public relations is practiced in your organization. YOUR RESPONSE SHOULD SHOW HOW PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTUALLY IS PRACTICED, NOT THE WAY YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE PRACTICED.

1. We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and or product awareness.
2. Product publicity is a primary goal.
3. We support marketing campaigns.
4. We identify consumer needs.
5. We participate in sales promotion as a central task.
6. Does your organization have two separate units, one for marketing-related public relations and another for public affairs (public policy)?
7. Which unit has the larger budget?

This series of questions measures your department's relationship with marketing.

8. We are in charge of tasks and responsibilities distinct from the marketing department.
9. We share resources with the marketing department.
10. We compete for resources with the marketing department.
11. Does the public relations department report to a manager from the marketing department?
12. Does the marketing department report to a manager from the public relations department?
13. Does the public relations department report to a department other than public relations or marketing, such as human resources?

14. Regardless of whether you have separate units, which function - public affairs or marketing related public relations - receives more support from senior administrators in the dominant coalition?

The latter half of the questionnaire included the following items to collect demographic information about participants and their organizations:

Now please tell us some basic demographic information about you and your organization.

1. What is your sex?
2. What is your age? Year of Birth: 19\_\_
3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
4. What was your major area?
5. What type of organization are you working for?
6. What is the name of your department and your position?
7. Approximately, how many public relations practitioners are in your department?
8. Approximately, how many people are employed by your organization overall?
9. How long have you worked in the field of public relations?
10. Have you previously worked as a journalist?
11. How long have you worked in the field of public relations?
12. If you had advertising experience, how long have you worked in advertising?

## Data Collection

In general, research using mail surveys achieves a response rate between 10% and 40% (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000). Because of the costs and extended timeframe associated with international mailing, I initially decided to send the e-mail questionnaire to all those association members on the mailing lists with e-mail addresses and then send surface-mail questionnaires to those members who did not have an e-mail address. However, many of the mailing lists were vastly different and this required some changes to my methods. For instance, the Public Relations Association of Uganda did not keep track of e-mail addresses because most members did not have e-mail addresses, let alone consistent access to the World Wide Web. Thus I decided to send surface-mail questionnaires to all on the member mailing list and also included return postage because costs were high for participants in Uganda to mail back the questionnaires. This development was unexpected and expended my surface-mail budget. As a result, I then made the decision to only send out e-mail questionnaires to participants with e-mail addresses for the associations in Australia, Italy, and Mauritius, which worked well because these mailing lists included e-mail addresses for most members.

I employed some of the methods recommended by Fox, Crask, and Kim (1989) to increase response rates, such as using stamped outgoing postage and a prenotification e-mail to the e-mail survey. To encourage participation as well as education of the participants, I included a cover letter (Appendix D) explaining the purpose of the study and stating that the respondents would receive a summary of the results upon completion of the study. Additionally, I indicated that the professional

organization of which they were a member had endorsed this project. For the e-mail survey, I sent a prenotice e-mail (Appendix E) two days in advance of sending the e-mail with the link to the Web-based questionnaire.

Initially, I planned to send a follow-up postcard to non-respondents three weeks after disseminating the surface-mail questionnaires. International mailing costs made this prohibitive. However, I was able to send follow-up e-mail reminders (Appendix F) to non-respondents to the Web-based questionnaire with a link to the questionnaire (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). All e-mail and surface-mail contacts were personalized, using individual names and handwritten addresses on envelopes.

In total, 109 surface-mail questionnaires were sent to members of the Public Relations Association of Uganda and 13 were collected (12% response rate). The response for the Italian Public Relations Federation was 141 questionnaires returned from a total of 818 invited to participate in the Web-based questionnaires (17% response rate). As for the Public Relations Institute of Australia, 101 of 827 Web-based questionnaires were collected from members (12% response rate). Finally, 30 of 44 Web-based questionnaires (68% response rate) were gathered from Public Relations Association of Mauritius members. All Web-based questionnaire responses were e-mailed to my e-mail address by CGI script and then stored on the hard drive of my computer and backed up on CD-Roms stored in my home office along with the surface-mail questionnaire responses. In total 1,689 e-mail invitations to the Web-based questionnaire were sent out with 272 questionnaires collected (16% response rate). As described above, the surface-mail questionnaires elicited a 12% response

rate. The response rate for both survey modes was 285 out of 1,798 invitations to participate (16% response rate).

### Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 11.5 for Windows on an IBM computer. I entered data and each questionnaire was assigned a variable name for analysis.

An initial print-out of descriptive statistics for each variable was examined to check for technical errors. When errors were found, the contents of that variable were examined for all participants.

### Statistical Procedures

This study involved examining six characteristics of public relations Excellence. Each characteristic was operationalized involving a total of 134 variables. The data gathered were complex, with varying numbers of respondents for the separate national associations allowing for different analyses and requiring several phases of data treatment.

Descriptive statistics such as mean scores and standard deviations were examined for all six characteristics of public relations Excellence being examined. Mean scores and standard deviations were analyzed for each individual national association and for all association members as an aggregate group. Such statistics were used to compare these characteristics among the associations in this study. The aggregate information was used to get a better picture of public relations practice outside of the countries examined in the original Excellence study and in order to use tests of significance to measure an index of Excellence. For missing data I used the

expectation-maximization (EM) method of treating nonresponse. Research focusing on missing data suggests that EM imputation produces less-biased estimates than list-wise deletion (Graham & Donaldson, 1993), and more accurate estimates than mean substitution (Azen, Van Guilder, & Hill, 1989).

Factor analysis was conducted for items measuring whether the public relations function is separate from the marketing and other functions to test the statistical validity of these items. However, factor analysis was not conducted for items employed from Rhee's (1999) questionnaire because the items had already been established as statistically valid measures. However, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated for all items to test their internal consistency and reliability.

Variables for public relations involvement in strategic management, dimensions of public relations models, and knowledge potential available in the public relations department were collapsed into scales and factor analyzed to construct broader variables for each of these characteristics of Excellence. To compare characteristics of Excellence between the practitioners in the national associations in this study with those from the original Excellence study countries, I used procedures such as factor analysis and canonical correlations to compare the characteristics of public relations Excellence related to the effectiveness (value) of the public relations department. These broader variables were then selected for further factor analysis to isolate a single factor of Excellence that was then used to calculate an overall index of public relations Excellence and Excellence scores for each participant's organization. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated to test the reliability of this index.

I then examined the relationships between the Excellence index and variables that were not included in constructing the Excellence index, such as the degree to which practitioners' organizations faced activism; the outcomes of activism; and demographic information such as level of education, type of organization, sex, years of experience and so forth. Means were compared by cross tabulations, ANOVA, and t-tests.

### Ethical Considerations

I recognized ethical considerations involving issues of harm, consent, deception, privacy, and confidentiality of data (Judd, Smith, & Kidder, 1991; Wimmer & Dominick, 2000). Consistent with other research methods involving human subjects, studies using the Internet should protect the privacy and dignity of the participants. However, this medium is in its infancy as a research setting; and additional care must be taken (Duncan, 1996). One reason for such care is the hazy distinction between private and public on the Internet (Jones, 1994).

Taking this into consideration, I took several measures to help ensure the integrity of the study's participants. First, the proposal for this research was submitted for review and approved by the University of Maryland's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB acts as an advocate for research participants, serving the purpose of informing and protecting participants cooperating in research conducted by those affiliated with the University. A cover letter (Appendix D) was sent with each questionnaire informing the participants of the purpose of the study as well as any possible risks or benefits of the study. Additionally, a letter of informed consent (Appendix G) told participants how long it was likely to take them to complete the



questionnaires attached to the cover letter. The letter of informed consent was also included on the entry page to the Web-based questionnaire (Appendix H). If a potential participant declined to participate, I did not make any attempts to coerce or persuade him or her to participate. Additionally, the identity of all participants was kept confidential and only the sex, age, and work experience of the participants were recorded for data analysis.

## Chapter 4: Results

This chapter analyzes results of the cross-national survey. I first describe the response rates to this mixed mode survey and demographic information of the participants in this study. Next, I examine demographic information for participants as an aggregate group and then examine similarities and differences among members of the Public Relations Federation of Italy (FERPI), Public Relations Association of Mauritius (PRAM), the Public Relations Association of Uganda (PRAU), and the Public Relations Institute of Australia (PRIA).

The focus of this chapter then turns to answering the study's research questions by examining the data. This analysis is done for the aggregate group as well as among countries. The internal consistency and reliability of items used in this survey are discussed. The chapter concludes with a final analysis and summary of the results.

### Description of Population

A total of 285 questionnaires were collected from 1,798 invitations to participate for this study (16% response rate). Of these 285 participants, 141 (49%) practiced in Italy, 101 (35%) practiced in Australia, 30 (11%) practiced in Mauritius, and 13 (5%) were professionals in Uganda. Nearly half of the participants in this study worked for a corporation (27.6%) or public relations agency (26.4%) (see Table 1). Thirty-five participants (13.4%) worked for a non- governmental or non-profit organization; 28 (10.7%) worked for a government agency. Participants also held positions at subsidiaries of multinational corporations (5.7%), advertising agencies

(1.1%), and affiliate offices of multinational public relations agencies (1.1%). Several participants (13.8%) reporting working for some other type of organization.

The study's participants were nearly equally divided between male (48.2%) and female (51.8%) practitioners. On average, the practitioners had 14 years of experience in public relations ( $SD = 9.06$ ) and had served approximately eight years in their current position ( $SD = 7.76$ ). Experience among participants in this study ranged from six months to 40 years. The majority of participants (57.8%) also had experience as journalists. Participants displayed high levels of education with 35.1% reporting having achieved a bachelor's degree, 16.1% having taken some classes beyond the undergraduate level, and 32.3% possessing a master's or doctoral degree.

Participants had a variety of publics their department's programs targeted. Most practitioners (90.2%) reported having a public relations program for media, and 73.7% reported having a program targeting the organization's community. The study's population reported having programs for publics such as activist groups (50.6%), customers (49.8%), and the government (51.9%) about half of the time. Participants also reported having programs for publics such as students (44.4%) and employees (40.4%). Practitioners had the fewest programs for investors (33.1%).

Practitioners displayed different characteristics by country (see Table 2). For example in Australia, nearly two thirds (61.6%) of the participants were female while only 15.4% of practitioners in Uganda were female. In Uganda 61.5% of the participants worked for a government agency compared with only 4.3% and 3.6% of participants from Italy and Mauritius. Approximately two-thirds of practitioners from Italy (64.0%) and Mauritius (57.1%) worked for corporations or public relations firms

Table 1

Description of Aggregate Population

Variable	<u>n</u>	Frequency	Percentage
Type of organization	261		
Corporation		72	27.6
Public relations agency		69	26.4
Non-governmental or non-profit organization		35	13.4
Government agency		28	10.7
Multinational Corporation Subsidiary		15	5.7
Advertising agency		3	1.1
Office/affiliate of multinational public relations firm		3	1.1
Other		36	13.8
Level of education	279		
A professional, master's or doctoral degree		90	32.3
Some graduate or professional school		45	16.1
A bachelor's degree		98	35.1
Some college		23	8.2
A high school diploma		19	6.8
Less than a high school diploma		4	1.4

(table continued)

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	<u>n</u>	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	280		
Female		145	51.8
Male		135	48.2
Journalism experience	263		
Yes		152	57.8
No		111	42.2
Types of publics public relations departments have programs for			
Media	276	249	90.2
Community	266	196	73.7
Government	262	136	51.9
Activist/interest group	253	128	50.6
Customer	265	132	49.8
Students	259	115	44.4
Employees	270	109	40.4
Investors	257	85	33.1
Variable	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Number of years in current job	273	7.67	7.76
Number of years in public relations	265	14.04	9.06

Table 2

Demographic Comparison Among Countries

Variable	Australia	Italy	Mauritius	Uganda
Type of organization				
Corporation	18.1%	33.1%	32.1%	7.7%
Public relations firm	20.1%	30.9%	25.0%	0
Non-governmental or non-profit organization	24.5%	6.5%	10.7%	7.7%
Government agency	22.3%	4.3%	3.6%	61.5%
Multinational corporation subsidiary	2.1%	7.2%	10.7%	0
Advertising agency	0	2.2%	0	7.7%
Office/affiliate of multinational public relations firm	0	1.4%	3.2%	0
Other	12.8%	14.4%	14.3%	15.4%
Level of education				
A professional, master's or doctoral degree	28.0%	30.9%	50.0%	38.5%
Some graduate or professional school	20.0%	14.7%	3.3%	30.8%
A bachelor's degree	45.0%	32.4%	20.0%	23.1%
Investors	31.3%	39.0%	22.2%	9.1%
Some college	4.0%	10.3%	16.7%	0
A high school diploma	3.0%	8.8%	10.0%	7.7%
Less than a high school diploma	0	2.9%	0	0

(table continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Variable	Australia	Italy	Mauritius	Uganda
Sex				
Female	62.6%	47.1%	53.3%	15.4%
Male	37.4%	52.9%	46.7%	84.6%
Journalism experience				
Yes	34.3%	50.0%	30.0%	100.0%
No	65.7%	50.0%	70.0%	0
Number of years in current job	<u>M</u> = 5.17	<u>M</u> = 9.30	<u>M</u> = 7.42	<u>M</u> = 10.44
Number of years in public relations	<u>M</u> = 13.45	<u>M</u> = 14.73	<u>M</u> = 15.02	<u>M</u> = 3.64
Types of publics public relations departments have programs for				
Media	95.0%	83.0%	86.7%	84.6%
Employees	44.9%	43.5%	24.1%	8.3%
Activist/interest group	52.6%	53.0%	28.6%	63.6%
Customer	42.9%	58.6%	32.1%	54.5%
Students	29.9%	49.6%	64.3%	63.6%
Community	81.8%	68.5%	64.3%	83.3%
Government	55.1%	50.4%	42.9%	63.6%

whereas Australian practitioners were equally divided among corporations (18.1%), public relations firms (20.1%), non-profit organizations (24.5%), and government agencies (22.3%).

Although a handful of participants (less than 2%) reported not finishing high school, most displayed high levels of education, with 93% of Australian participants reporting having a bachelor's degree or higher followed by 92.4% of Ugandan participants, 78% of Italian participants, and 73.3% of practitioners from Mauritius. All Ugandan participants reported having served as journalists. Participants from the other three countries reported working as journalists in far fewer numbers. Fifty percent of Italians had such experience, followed by participants from Australia (34.3%) and Mauritius (30%).

Both Italians and Ugandans had spent nearly a decade in their present positions. On average, Australian practitioners had spent nearly half that time ( $M = 5.17$  years) in their current positions. Participants from Mauritius had spent nearly seven and a half years in their present position.

#### Involvement of Public Relations in Strategic Management

RQ1a. In what ways are participants in this study involved in strategic management?

RQ1b. How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ1c. How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

#### Descriptive Statistics

To measure public relations involvement in strategic management,



participants were first asked “To what extent does your public relations department contribute to strategic management of your organization?” If their department made no contribution to strategic planning and decision making they were asked to skip the eleven items used to measure each individual’s public relations department’s involvement in strategic management.

In this study participants were less likely to contribute to strategic management through research activities than they were through less formal activities. For example, when asked to estimate to what extent their department contributed to strategic planning and decision making through regularly conducted and routine research activities on a five-point Likert-type scale, they reported a mean of 3.20 (SD = 1.05) (see Table 3). Similarly, participants displayed a mean of 3.50 (SD = 1.05) when asked to estimate the extent their department contributed to strategic management through specific research conducted to answer specific questions. Mean scores for both of these were the lowest among items measuring strategic management.

On the other hand, items measuring informal approaches such as the contribution in routine operations (M = 4.44, SD = .78), judgement based on experience operations (M = 3.94, SD = .84), and contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization displayed the highest scores among the items. An eleventh item offered participants the opportunity to describe other ways in which they contribute to strategic management in hopes of uncovering trends for future research.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Involvement in Strategic Management for Aggregate Group

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
To what extent does your public relations department contribute to strategic management of your organization?			
We contribute to strategic planning	285	4.01	0.92
We contribute in responding to major social issues	285	3.92	0.93
We contribute in major initiatives	285	4.02	1.00
We contribute in routine operations	285	4.44	0.78
Please use the scale below to estimate to what extent your department makes its contribution to strategic planning and decision making through each of the following activities.			
Regularly conducted and routine research activities	285	3.20	1.05
Specific research conducted to answer specific questions	285	3.50	1.05
Formal approaches to gathering information for use in decision making other than research	285	3.53	0.94
Informal approaches to gathering information	285	3.64	1.05
Contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization	285	3.93	0.90
Judgement based on experience	285	3.94	0.81

Note. All measured by five-point Likert type scale :1=Strongly disagree,

2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Strongly agree.

Although no new trends emerged, two participants described lobbying and cultivating relationships with organizations and two others described stakeholder analysis and specific market research.

Among the four countries studied, practitioners in Uganda reported the highest involvement in strategic management, followed by Australia. Italy and Mauritius displayed very similar scores with each other (see Table 4). Although not significant at the .05 level, results suggest there is a significant difference between practitioners from the four groups in the index measuring involvement in strategic management. ( $F = 2.33$ ,  $p = .072$ ).

Uganda reported the highest means for contributions to strategic planning ( $\underline{M} = 4.54$ ), as well as contributions in response to major social issues ( $\underline{M} = 4.62$ ) and in routine operations ( $\underline{M} = 4.92$ ). Australian practitioners ranked slightly above their peers from Italy and Mauritius in these three categories.

Although these groups did not display any significant difference for research-based activities, Australian practitioners reported higher scores on informal contributions to strategic planning such as judgement based on experience ( $\underline{M} = 4.11$ ) and informal approaches to gathering information ( $\underline{M} = 3.88$ ). In a bit of a role reversal, Ugandan professionals reported the lowest score on these informal activities.

This study's finding that practitioners in these four countries are more likely to contribute to strategic management through informal practices of information gathering than using a formal approach was similar to results in the Excellence study. Although the Excellence study used an open-end fractionation scale, these data were later converted into means using square-root transformation (L. Grunig et al., 2002).

Table 4

ANOVA on Involvement in Strategic Management With Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
Index measuring involvement in strategic management			
Australia	101	3.91	0.65
Italy	141	3.75	0.52
Mauritius	13	3.71	0.47
Uganda	30	3.98	0.36
Total	285	3.81	0.57
$F=2.33$ ( $p=.074$ )			
We contribute to strategic planning			
Australia	101	4.07	1.02
Italy	141	3.96	0.82
Mauritius	13	3.80	0.97
Uganda	30	4.54	0.51
Total	285	4.01	0.92
$F=2.22$ ( $p=.086$ )			

(table continued)

Table 4 (table continued)

ANOVA on Involvement in Strategic Management with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
We contribute in responding to major social issues			
Australia	101	4.15	1.02
Italy	141	3.70	0.82
Mauritius	13	3.86	0.97
Uganda	30	4.62	0.51
Total	285	3.92	0.93
$F=7.58$ ( $p=.000$ )			
We contribute in major initiatives			
Australia	101	4.08	1.12
Italy	141	4.00	0.90
Mauritius	13	3.74	1.14
Uganda	30	4.40	0.64
Total	285	4.02	1.00
$F=1.55$ ( $p=.201$ )			

(table continued)

Table 4 (table continued)

ANOVA on Involvement in Strategic Management with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
We contribute in routine operations			
Australia	101	4.51	0.85
Italy	141	4.39	0.68
Mauritius	13	4.26	0.97
Uganda	30	4.92	0.28
Total	285	4.44	0.78
$F=2.68$ ( $p=.047$ )			
Regularly conducted and routine research activities			
Australia	101	3.32	1.16
Italy	141	3.09	0.96
Mauritius	13	3.25	1.04
Uganda	30	3.38	1.12
Total	285	3.20	1.05
$F=1.13$ ( $p=.336$ )			

(table continued)

Table 4 (table continued)

ANOVA on Involvement in Strategic Management with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
Specific research conducted to answer specific questions			
Australia	101	3.51	1.16
Italy	141	3.49	0.99
Mauritius	13	3.47	0.93
Uganda	30	3.54	1.27
Total	285	3.50	1.05
$F=0.02$ ( $p=.996$ )			
Formal approaches to gathering information for use in decision making other than research			
Australia	101	4.51	0.85
Italy	141	4.39	0.68
Mauritius	13	4.26	0.97
Uganda	30	4.92	0.28
Total	285	4.44	0.78
$F=0.20$ ( $p=.894$ )			

(table continued)

Table 4 (table continued)

ANOVA on Involvement in Strategic Management with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
Informal approaches to gathering information			
Australia	101	3.88	1.02
Italy	141	3.58	0.82
Mauritius	13	3.34	0.97
Uganda	30	3.21	0.51
Total	285	3.64	0.86
$\underline{F}=4.35$ ( $p=.001$ )			
Contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization			
Australia	101	3.95	0.91
Italy	141	3.92	0.93
Mauritius	13	3.96	0.81
Uganda	30	3.85	0.69
Total	285	3.93	0.90
$\underline{F}=0.07$ ( $p=.976$ )			

(table continued)



Table 4 (table continued)

ANOVA on Involvement in Strategic Management with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Judgement based on experience			
Australia	101	4.11	0.75
Italy	141	3.86	0.85
Mauritius	13	3.93	0.58
Uganda	30	3.62	1.04
Total	285	3.94	0.81
$F=4.35$ ( $p=.001$ )			

Note. All measured by five-point Likert type scale: 1=Strongly disagree,

2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Strongly agree.

Public relations heads participating in the Excellence study reported higher mean scores for the informal contributions to strategic management, such as judgement based on experience ( $\underline{M} = 11.60$ ,  $\underline{N} = 319$ ), contribution in routine operations ( $\underline{M} = 12.83$ ,  $\underline{N} = 376$ ), and contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization ( $\underline{M} = 11.62$ ,  $\underline{N} = 334$ ) than they did for research-based items such as regularly conducted research ( $\underline{M} = 7.68$ ,  $\underline{N} = 329$ ) or research conducted to answer a specific question ( $\underline{M} = 8.89$ ,  $\underline{N} = 331$ ). These results from the study are outlined in Table 5. Rhee (1999, pp. 103-104) also found practitioners less likely to make more formal, research-based contributions than informal ones to the strategic management of the organization.

This study's data in which Australian and Ugandan practitioners demonstrate larger contributions to organizational strategic management than those in Italy and Mauritius suggest that this principle of public relations excellence is generic and just as likely to occur in a country similar to those in Excellence study as one that is vastly different. It is encouraging that professionals in this study are making contributions to strategic management through informal approaches. However, results also suggest that in general worldwide, public relations professionals are not performing the full range of research activities most beneficial to the strategic planning of their organizations.

#### Empowerment of Public Relations in the Dominant Coalition or a Direct Reporting

##### Relationship to Senior Management

RQ2a. What kind of reporting relationship do participants in this study have with the senior management of their organization?

RQ2b. How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Involvement in Strategic Management in Excellence Study

<u>Variables</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>
Contribution to organizational functions		
Strategic planning	375	10.09
Responding to major social issues	377	11.68
We contribute in major initiatives	376	11.20
We contribute in routine operations	376	12.83
Contribution to strategic planning and decision making		
Regularly conducted and routine research activities	329	7.68
Specific research conducted to answer specific questions	331	8.89
Formal approaches to gathering information for use in decision making other than research	331	8.64
Informal approaches to gathering information	333	11.28
Contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization	334	11.62
Judgement based on experience	319	11.60

Note. The means reported here are the square-root transformation of data collected during the Excellence study using an open-end fractation scale.

RQ2c. How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

### Descriptive Statistics

L Grunig et al. (2002) pointed out that in order for public relations to be involved in strategic management it must be represented among the organization's dominant coalition. To measure public relations reporting relationship to these top-level decision makers, participants were initially asked the question, "Does your public relations department report directly to the most senior manager in your company?" Participants' public relations departments reported directly to the most senior manager 85.5% of the time ( $N = 282$ ) (see Table 6). If participants did not report directly to the most senior manager, they were asked to answer the following questions: 1) Does an indirect reporting relationship exist, then, from the public relations department to the most senior manager?; 2) Does the department then report to a senior manager who in turn reports to the most senior manager?; and 3) Does the department then report to a more junior level of management?

Among these participants 35 (71.4%,  $N = 49$ ) had an indirect reporting relationship with the CEO, 14 (70%,  $N = 20$ ) reported to a senior manager who in turn reports to the CEO, and four (36.4%,  $N = 11$ ) reported to a more junior level of management. Participants were also asked if the head of their public relations department was a member of the dominant coalition. Participants reported their department head was a member of the dominant coalition 38.2% of the time ( $N = 285$ ).

Table 6

Description of Relationship With Top Management for Aggregate Population

Variable	<u>n</u>	Frequency	Percentage
Public relations department reports directly to the most senior manager in your company	281	241	85.5
The head of the public relations department is a member of the dominant coalition	285	109	38.2

Description of Relationship With Top Management by Country

Variable	Australia	Italy	Mauritius	Uganda
Public relations department reports directly to the most senior manager in your company	71.7	92.9	93.3	92.3
The head of the public relations department is a member of the dominant coalition	36.6	38.3	43.3	38.5

Description of Relationship With Top Management in Excellence Study

Variable	<u>n</u>	Frequency	Percentage
Public relations department reports directly to the most senior manager in your company	183	101	55
The head of the public relations department is a member of the dominant coalition	174	82	47
An indirect reporting relationship exists from the public relations department to the most senior manager	49	35	71
There is no direct or indirect reporting relationship to the most senior manager, but the department reports to a senior manager who reports to the most senior manager	20	14	70
There is no direct or indirect reporting relationship to the most senior manager, but the department reports to a more junior level of management	11	4	36

When examining the reporting relationship among individual countries, a high number of participants in Italy (92.9%,  $\underline{N} = 140$ ), Mauritius (93.3%,  $\underline{N} = 30$ ), and Uganda (92.3%,  $\underline{N} = 13$ ) reported a direct reporting relationship with their organization's senior manager. A lower percentage of participants (71.7%,  $\underline{N} = 99$ ) from Australia reported such a relationship. Australian practitioners also showed the lowest level of public relations department heads who were members of the dominant coalition (36.6%,  $\underline{N} = 101$ ), followed by Italy (38.3%,  $\underline{N} = 141$ ) and Uganda (38.5%,  $\underline{N} = 13$ ). Public relations departments in Mauritius were the most well represented within the dominant coalition with 43% ( $\underline{N} = 30$ ) of the participants reporting such inclusion.

Public relations professionals in this study described a reporting relationship with their organizations' top management in greater frequency than in the Excellence study. Although participants reported directly to the top management nearly 90% of the time, 55% of public relations heads in the Excellence study reported such a relationship. This dichotomy also was present in those describing an indirect reporting relationship with the organization's top decision makers. Among those who did not have a direct reporting relationship in the Excellence study, only 29% described an indirect reporting relationship to their most senior manager. When a direct reporting relationship was absent among participants in this study, 71% reported an indirect one.

Interestingly, although participants in this study described a reporting relationship to the organization's top manager a greater percent of the time, fewer were included in the organization's dominant coalition (38%) than in the Excellence

study (47%). It appears that most of the participants in the Excellence study who reported to their CEO also were members of the dominant coalition.

However, in this study many more participants reported to the CEO than were included in the dominant coalition. Although this suggests that practitioners in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda have a reporting relationship with the dominant coalition more often than professionals in the Excellence study, they are not so involved in their organizations' decision making. However, this should not adversely affect the participants' organizations. As L. Grunig et al. (2002, p. 142) pointed out, the Excellence theory places emphasis on the empowerment in the dominant coalition not because this allows public relations to dictate organizational decisions, but because it allows the organization to benefit from the expertise of the public relations function – something that can be conveyed through a reporting relationship with the CEO.

#### Dimensions of Communication/Two-way Symmetrical Model of Public Relations

RQ3a. What dimensions of public relations models are practiced by members of these national public relations associations?

RQ3b. How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ3c. How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

Although it is crucial for public relations to be empowered in order to bring the problems of stakeholder publics into decision making, it is of even more importance for the public relations function to practice in a way allowing it to identify and communicate with publics. This study featured several items measuring the

dimensions of public relations models practiced by participants in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda.

### Reliability Test

I calculated Cronbach's alpha coefficients in order to test the internal consistency of the measures of the dimensions of communication (see Table 7). Most resulting measures were above or right at a reliability of .70 which is generally desired to indicate adequate construct reliability (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). Cronbach's alphas for symmetrical purpose of communication, asymmetrical purpose of communication, direction of communication, interpersonal communication, mediated communication, and ethical communication were .73, .53, .83, .69, .77, and .77 respectively. Although the score for the concept of asymmetrical purpose of communication was lower than .70, the reliability is similar those J. Grunig and L. Grunig (1992) reported for the earlier construct of public relations models: an average of .62 for press agency index, .53 for the public information index, .57 for the two-way asymmetrical index, and .59 for the two-way symmetrical index for seven studies.

I initially tried to develop a continuum of asymmetrical communication and symmetrical communication for the dimension of purpose of communication. However, when these two concepts were treated as a continuum, reliability for the purpose of communication was significantly lower (Cronbach's alpha = .34) as opposed to the reliabilities (symmetrical purpose of communication: .73 and asymmetrical purpose of communication: .53) for these concepts as separate measures. Similar to Rhee's (1999) results, this indicated that the two concepts ar



Table 7

Reliability Test for Dimensions of Communication Indices

Index	<u>Item- total corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
<i>Symmetric purpose of communication</i>			
We not only try to change the attitudes and behaviors of members of the public, but also try to change our attitudes and behaviors	0.48	0.24	0.70
Before making final decisions or adopting policies, we seek the opinions of those groups or individuals that will be affected by the decision or policy	0.55	0.32	0.65
We believe public relations should provide mediation for the organization – to help management and publics negotiate conflict	0.54	0.31	0.66
We consider the opinions of members of the public and try to change our behaviors and policies	0.52	0.27	0.67
Cronbach's Alpha = .73			
<i>Asymmetric purpose of communication</i>			
We conduct programs or projects to persuade publics to agree with the organization's point of view	0.30	0.16	0.51
In conducting public relations, we try to provide only information that will help the public to see the organization more favorably	0.26	0.12	0.57
We conduct programs or projects to persuade publics to behave as the organization wants them to behave	0.50	0.25	0.15
Cronbach's Alpha = .53			

(table continued)

Table 7 (continued)

Reliability Test for Dimensions of Communication Indices

Index	<u>Item- total corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
<i>Direction of communication</i> (Two-way)			
We listen to the opinions of publics	0.63	0.49	0.80
Before carrying out public relations or communication activities, we first conduct research to understand how the public feels about certain issues	0.52	0.44	0.81
After conducting public relations or communication activities, we conduct evaluations of these activities	0.63	0.56	0.79
Public relations programs in this organization involve two-way communication between the organization and publics	0.68	0.54	0.79
<i>(One-way)</i>			
We speak more than we listen in public relations	0.43	0.32	0.82
Public relations programs in this organization involve one-way communication - from the organization to publics	0.69	0.56	0.79
Information flows out from this organization but not into it	0.64	0.51	0.79
Most public relations programs in this organization are designed to disseminate information to the publics	0.21	0.08	0.84
Cronbach's Alpha = .83			

(table continued)

Table 7 (continued)

Reliability Test for Dimensions of Communication Indices

Index	<u>Item- total corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
<i>Mediated communication</i>			
We distribute news releases	0.40	0.25	0.76
We use advertisements	0.41	0.32	0.76
We distribute flyers, pamphlets, magazines, or other printed materials that present the company	0.54	0.46	0.74
We stage events, tours, open houses	0.56	0.33	0.73
We use mass media, such as television, radio, broadcasts, newspapers or magazines	0.62	0.46	0.72
We hold news conferences	0.43	0.42	0.76
We offer information and news briefings	0.54	0.42	0.74
We give speeches	0.33	0.16	0.77
Cronbach's Alpha = .77			
<i>Interpersonal communication</i>			
We communicate in person with the public	0.52	0.51	0.63
We use face-to-face communication	0.56	0.61	0.62
We make informal contact with the public	0.52	0.53	0.63
We hold banquets	0.39	0.32	0.66
We offer party favors or memorabilia	0.31	0.49	0.68
We offer valuable gifts	0.27	0.46	0.69
We contact government offices in person	0.17	0.28	0.71
We attend meetings	0.40	0.40	0.66
Cronbach's Alpha = .69			

(table continued)

Table 7 (continued)

Reliability Test for Dimensions of Communication Indices

Index	<u>Item- total corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
<i>Ethical dimension of communication (Ethical)</i>			
We take into account the effects of the public relations activities or communication activities on the public	0.47	0.43	0.74
The information we provide is factual	0.49	0.39	0.74
We consider the interests of the public as much as organizational interests	0.53	0.50	0.73
We explain our motivations or why we do things to the public	0.53	0.42	0.73
<i>(Unethical)</i>			
In our public relations, we believe that favorable information should be disseminated but unfavorable information should be kept from the public	0.45	0.50	0.75
When doing programs or projects, we avoid disclosing negative information about our organization/company	0.47	0.50	0.74
We believe the role of public relations is to promote the interests of the organization even if the organization's decisions have negative effects on the publics	0.41	0.20	0.75
We try to avoid dialogue with the public when the organization makes unpopular decisions	0.42	0.19	0.75
Cronbach's Alpha = .77			

independent from each other to some degree and this continuum was separated into two scales. I treated mediated and interpersonal communication as two separate concepts rather than a continuum, because both methods of communication can be used in conjunction or separately.

### Descriptive Statistics

Among the dimensions of communication, participants reported the highest scores for mediated communication ( $\underline{M} = 4.04$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .64$ ), followed by scores for symmetrical purpose of communication ( $\underline{M} = 3.60$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .72$ ), ethical-unethical dimension of communication ( $\underline{M} = 3.57$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .65$ ), and the continuum for the dimension measuring direction of communication ( $\underline{M} = 3.55$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .62$ ). Participants had lower scores for asymmetrical purpose of communication ( $\underline{M} = 3.37$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .79$ ) and interpersonal dimension of communication ( $\underline{M} = 3.38$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .61$ ). Table 8 outlines these scores as well as means and standard deviations for each item.

Participants in this study showed a proclivity for seeking input from publics. For instance, of the 38 items used to measure the dimension of public relations models, the third highest average score ( $\underline{M} = 4.21$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .87$ ) was for the item, “Before carrying out public relations or communication activities, we first conduct research to understand how the public feels about certain issues.” The mean response for the item, “We listen to the opinions of publics,” was 3.99 ( $\underline{SD} = .86$ ). The item, “Public relations programs in this organization involve two-way communication between the organization and publics,” elicited a mean response of 3.80 ( $\underline{SD} = .98$ ).

Among items measuring the dimension of purpose of communication, participants reported the highest means for the following three items: 1) “We believe

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Communication Indices

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
<i>Direction of communication</i>	285	3.55	0.62
<i>(Two-way)</i>			
We listen to the opinions of publics	285	3.99	0.86
Before carrying out public relations or communication activities, we first conduct research to understand how the public feels about certain issues	285	4.21	0.87
After conducting public relations or communication activities, we conduct evaluations of these activities	285	3.60	1.00
Public relations programs in this organization involve two-way communication between the organization and publics	285	3.80	0.98
<i>(One-way)</i>			
We speak more than we listen in public relations	285	3.18	1.18
Public relations programs in this organization involve one-way communication - from the organization to publics	285	2.93	1.17
Information flows out from this organization but not into it	285	3.22	1.19
Most public relations programs in this organization are designed to disseminate information to the publics	285	3.46	1.14

(table continued)

Table 8 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Communication Indices

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
<i>Symmetrical purpose of communication</i>	285	3.60	0.72
We not only try to change the attitudes and behaviors of members of the public, but also try to change our attitudes and behaviors	285	3.43	1.05
Before making final decisions or adopting policies, we seek the opinions of those groups or individuals that will be affected by the decision or policy	285	3.71	0.91
We believe public relations should provide mediation for the organization - to help management and publics negotiate conflict	285	3.81	0.95
We consider the opinions of members of the public and try to change our behaviors and policies	285	3.50	0.90
<i>Asymmetrical purpose of communication</i>	285	3.37	0.79
We conduct programs or projects to persuade publics to agree with the organization's point of view	285	3.71	1.06
In conducting public relations, we try to provide only information that will help the public to see the organization more favorably	285	3.18	1.07
We conduct programs or projects to persuade publics to behave as the organization wants them to behave	285	3.25	1.11

(table continued)

Table 8 (continued)  
Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Communication Indices

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
<i>Mediated communication</i>	285	4.04	0.64
We distribute news releases	285	4.35	0.87
We use advertisements	285	3.61	1.21
We distribute flyers, pamphlets, magazines, or other printed materials that present the company	285	4.05	1.02
We stage events, tours, open houses	285	4.08	1.00
We use mass media, such as television, radio, broadcasts, newspapers or magazines	285	4.23	0.98
We hold news conferences	285	3.95	1.12
We offer information and news briefings	285	4.08	0.93
We give speeches	285	3.91	1.03
<i>Interpersonal communication</i>	285	3.38	0.61
We communicate in person with the public	285	3.99	0.97
We use face-to-face communication	285	3.86	1.03
We make informal contact with the public	285	3.65	1.02
We hold banquets	285	2.93	1.31
We offer party favors or memorabilia	285	2.65	1.28
We offer valuable gifts	285	1.92	1.04
We contact government offices in person	285	3.89	1.06
We attend meetings	285	4.19	0.81

(table continued)



Table 8 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Communication Indices

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
<i>Ethical dimension of communication</i> ( <i>Ethical communication</i> )	285	3.57	0.65
We take into account the effects of the public relations activities or communication activities on the public	285	3.99	0.86
The information we provide is factual	285	4.21	0.87
We consider the interests of the public as much as organizational interests	285	3.59	1.00
We explain our motivations or why we do things to the public	285	3.82	0.98
<i>Unethical communication</i>			
In our public relations, we believe that favorable information should be disseminated but unfavorable information should be kept from the public	285	3.18	1.18
When doing programs or projects, we avoid disclosing negative information about our organization/company	285	2.93	1.17
We believe the role of public relations is to promote the interests of the organization even if the organization's decisions have negative effects on the publics	285	3.23	1.19
We try to avoid dialogue with the public when the organization makes unpopular decisions	285	3.46	1.14

Note. All measured by five-point Likert type scale: 1=Strongly disagree,

2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Strongly agree.

public relations should provide mediation for the organization – to help management and publics negotiate conflict ( $\underline{M} = 3.81$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .95$ ); 2) “Before making final decisions or adopting policies, we seek the opinions of those groups or individuals that will be affected by the decision or policy” ( $\underline{M} = 3.71$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .91$ ); and 3) “We conduct programs or projects to persuade publics to agree with the organization’s point of view” ( $\underline{M} = 3.71$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.06$ ). The first two items measured symmetry and the latter asymmetry, indicating that participants practiced a strategic mix of collaboration and advocacy.

Practitioners in this study also exhibited characteristics of ethical communication. Specifically, they reported high scores for providing factual information ( $\underline{M} = 4.21$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .87$ ) and taking into account the effects of public relations activities on the public ( $\underline{M} = 3.99$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .86$ ). For items measuring unethical communication (on all items 1 represented the most unethical practice), three out of four had means above three.

When examining means for individual variables of the index for the dimension of mediated communication, it becomes obvious that media relations is a central focus for many participants. Five of six variables in this index with mean scores above four measure items related to attracting publicity: 1) “We distribute news releases” ( $\underline{M} = 4.35$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .87$ ); 2) “We use mass media, such as television, radio, broadcasts, newspapers or magazines” ( $\underline{M} = 4.23$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .98$ ); 3) “We offer information and news briefings” ( $\underline{M} = 4.08$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .93$ ); 4) “We stage events, tours, open houses” ( $\underline{M} = 4.08$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.00$ ); and 5) “We distribute flyers, pamphlets, magazines, or other printed materials that present the company” ( $\underline{M} = 4.05$ ,  $\underline{SD} =$

1.02). This preoccupation with the press agency model was also reported in the Excellence study and a replication in Slovenia (L. Grunig et al., 1998).

When examining the dimensions of communication by individual country these four groups showed significant differences on two dimensions: asymmetrical purpose of communication ( $F = 8.03, p < .001$ ) and ethical dimension of communication ( $F = 3.53, p < .05$ ) (see Table 9). Participants from Uganda displayed higher scores for the index measuring the asymmetrical purpose of communication ( $M = 4.33, SD = .79$ ) than did professionals from the other three groups, which appeared to clump together with means ranging from 3.27 for Italy to 3.41 for Australia. Practitioners from Australia reported the highest levels of ethical communication ( $M = 3.68, SD = .67$ ), followed by participants from Uganda ( $M = 3.57, SD = .78$ ), Italy ( $M = 3.52, SD = .60$ ), and Mauritius ( $M = 3.26, SD = .67$ ).

Although it was not significant at the  $p < .05$ , there did appear to be a difference in the symmetrical purpose of communication between countries with a significance of  $p = .119$ . Ugandan professionals displayed higher scores ( $M = 4.02, SD = .75$ ) on this scale than did participants in Italy ( $M = 3.64, SD = .68$ ), Australia ( $M = 3.55, SD = .72$ ), and Mauritius ( $M = 3.52, SD = .78$ ).

I was unable to compare findings in this study concerning the dimensions of communication with the Excellence study since the IABC team initially examined the models of public relations practice: press agency, public information, two-way asymmetrical, and two-way symmetrical. Later the Excellence team suggested isolating four underlying dimensions of communication. (J. Grunig, 2001b; Huang, 1997). Rhee (1999) reported finding higher reliability scores when using separate

Table 9

ANOVA on Dimensions of Communication Indices With Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Direction of communication			
Australia	101	3.36	0.74
Italy	141	3.46	0.65
Mauritius	13	3.44	0.75
Uganda	30	3.64	0.66
Total	285	3.43	0.70
$F=0.80$ ( $p=.496$ )			
Ethical communication			
Australia	101	3.68	0.67
Italy	141	3.52	0.60
Mauritius	13	3.26	0.67
Uganda	30	3.57	0.78
Total	285	3.55	0.65
$F=3.53$ ( $p=.015$ )			

(table continued)

Table 9 (continued)

ANOVA on Dimensions of Communication Indices With Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Symmetrical purpose of communication			
Australia	101	3.55	0.72
Italy	141	3.64	0.68
Mauritius	13	3.52	0.78
Uganda	30	4.02	0.75
Total	285	3.61	0.71
$F=1.97$ ( $p=.119$ )			
Asymmetrical purpose of communication			
Australia	101	3.41	0.81
Italy	141	3.27	0.72
Mauritius	13	3.36	0.68
Uganda	30	4.33	0.79
Total	285	3.38	0.78
$F=8.03$ ( $p=.000$ )			

(table continued)

Table 9 (continued)

ANOVA on Dimensions of Communication Indices With Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
Mediated communication			
Australia	101	4.04	0.69
Italy	141	4.00	0.59
Mauritius	13	4.03	0.56
Uganda	30	4.33	0.53
Total	285	4.03	0.62
$\underline{F}=1.13$ ( $p=.318$ )			
Interpersonal communication			
Australia	101	3.38	0.63
Italy	141	3.35	0.61
Mauritius	13	3.50	0.59
Uganda	30	3.58	0.53
Total	285	3.39	0.61
$\underline{F}=1.04$ ( $p=.376$ )			

Note. All measured by five-point Likert type scale: 1=Strongly disagree,

2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Strongly agree.

scales for each direction of these four scales than when using a continuum scale for each dimension of communication. In this study I also found that the concepts of mediated and interpersonal communication as well as the purpose communication dimensions were independent of each other and could not be analyzed as one continuum. However, I did find that the dimensions of ethical-unethical communication and direction of communication were reliable when used as continuum scales. This was one of the initial studies examining these dimensions and suggests that although there is validity to this concept, further research and conceptualization of these dimensions is needed.

When comparing the means of these dimensions and models, participants in this study reported the highest means for ethical communication, symmetrical purpose of communication, and the mediated dimension of communication. Additionally, the means measuring two-way direction of communication are among the highest scores for the items measuring the dimensions of public relations behavior. This seems to contradict results in the Excellence study, which showed that participants relied on one-way models far more than two-way models. This may be partially explained by the fact this study looks at members of professional public relations associations, whereas participants in the Excellence study were more representative of the public relations field in general. Individuals who join professional societies, regardless of the specific industry, tend to be more committed to their profession and exposed to materials and education programs detailing best practices in their respective fields. Members of public relations societies have likely

been exposed to the benefits of two-way communication, whereas the general practitioner may not.

#### Public Relations as a Management Function Separate From Other Functions

RQ4a. What is the relationship between public relations and other, related organizational functions such as marketing among participants in this study?

RQ4b. How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ4c. How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

As outlined in the discussion of results concerning public relations' involvement in the strategic management of an organization, public relations professionals communicate with publics that threaten the organization's autonomy or provide opportunities to enhance that autonomy. However as outlined in Chapter 2, if public relations is viewed as a tool for the marketing function, the organization loses its ability to build relationships with all of its strategic publics and is limited primarily to communication with consumer publics.

#### Reliability Test

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the scale consisting of eight items used to measure whether public relations is a separate function from marketing was .57 (see Table 10). I removed one item, "We compete for resources with the marketing department," from the scale increasing the alpha coefficient to .64. This indicates adequate construct reliability for this scale.

#### Descriptive Statistics

Several items measured the extent to which public relations is a separate



Table 10

Reliability Test for Public Relations as a Separate Management Function

Index	<u>Item-</u> <u>total</u> <u>corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
<i>Public relations as a separate function from marketing</i>			
We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and or product awareness	0.48	0.33	0.47
Product publicity is a primary goal	0.42	0.35	0.49
We support marketing campaigns	0.43	0.24	0.50
We identify consumer needs	0.08	0.17	0.59
We participate in sales promotion as a central task	0.41	0.23	0.49
We are in charge of tasks and responsibilities distinct from the marketing department	0.19	0.10	0.57
We share resources with the marketing department	0.34	0.17	0.52
We compete for resources with the marketing department	-0.01	0.07	0.64
Cronbach's Alpha = .57			

Note. The item "We compete for resources with the marketing department" was eventually removed from scale. The alpha when this item was removed improved to .64

function from marketing and other functions. Primary among these were the following questions: 1) We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and or product awareness; 2) Product publicity is a primary goal; 3) We support marketing campaigns; 4) We identify consumer needs; and 5) We participate in sales promotion as a central task. Among these items participants supported the marketing function least in sales promotion ( $\underline{M} = 2.88$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.21$ ), product publicity ( $\underline{M} = 2.91$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.23$ ), and sales and/or product awareness ( $\underline{M} = 3.37$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.17$ ). Participants provided a higher level of support for the marketing function in identifying consumer ( $\underline{M} = 3.79$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.05$ ) and in marketing campaigns ( $\underline{M} = 3.94$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .96$ ). Participants also indicated that the public relations department was in charge of tasks and responsibilities distinct from the marketing department ( $\underline{M} = 3.73$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.21$ ), and that they generally did not share ( $\underline{M} = 2.98$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.34$ ) or compete for ( $\underline{M} = 2.59$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.36$ ) resources with the marketing department.

Several other items were used in measuring whether the public relations function was separate from other functions. Ninety-two participants (33%,  $\underline{N} = 279$ ) reported their organizations had two separate units for marketing and public relations (see Table 11). Among these participants, 66.3% said the marketing unit had the largest budget and 15.7% reported the budgets were approximately the same. Eighteen percent of respondents reported the public relations unit had a larger budget than the marketing unit.

Participants were also asked whether the marketing department reported to a manager in the public relations department. Practitioners from organizations with separate units for marketing and public relations said they reported to a manager from

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for Public Relations as a Separate Management Function for Aggregate

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and or product awareness	279	3.37	1.17
Product publicity is a primary goal	278	2.91	1.23
We support marketing campaigns	277	3.94	0.96
We identify consumer needs	281	3.79	1.05
We participate in sales promotion as a central task	277	2.88	1.21
We are in charge of tasks and responsibilities distinct from the marketing department	101	3.73	1.21
We share resources with the marketing department	102	2.98	1.34
We compete for resources with the marketing department	98	2.59	1.36

  

Variable	<u>n</u>	Frequency	Percentage
Organization has two separate units, one for marketing-related public relations and another for public affairs (public policy)?	279	92	33.0
The public relations department reports to a manager from the marketing department	101	21	20.8
The marketing department reports to a manager from the public relations department?	99	15	15.2
The public relations department reports to a department other than public relations or marketing, such as human resources	100	21	21.0

(table continued)

Table 11 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Public Relations as a Separate Management Function for Aggregate

Variable	<u>n</u>	Frequency	Percentage
Which unit has the larger budget?	89		
Marketing-related public relations		59	66.3
Public affairs		16	18.0
Budgets approximately the same		14	15.7
Which function receives more support from the dominant coalition?	236		
Marketing-related public relations		83	35.2
Public affairs		45	19.1
Budgets approximately the same		108	45.8

Note. Top eight variables measured by five-point Likert type scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Strongly agree.

the marketing department 20.8% of the time ( $N = 101$ ) and 15.2% ( $N = 99$ ) said that the marketing unit reported to the public relations department. In 21% of the cases ( $N = 100$ ), the public relations department reported to another department other than the marketing unit.

Finally, participants were asked whether the public relations or marketing function received more support from the dominant coalition. Practitioners reported that the marketing function received greater support 35.2% of the time, and 19.1% of practitioners indicated the public relations function received higher levels of support. Both functions received equal support 45.8% of the time.

Thirty-nine percent of Italian practitioners reported that their organizations had two separate units for public relations and marketing, followed by Uganda (30.8%), Australia (28%), and Mauritius (23.3%) (see Table 12). One hundred percent of Ugandan participants reported that when this was the case, the marketing function had the larger budget whereas only 64% of Australian participants, 63% of Italian practitioners, and 75% of participants from Mauritius reported such an imbalance in resources. Taking this into account, it was not surprising that practitioners from Uganda and Mauritius showed greater activity performing duties normally associated with the marketing function than their peers in Australia and Italy.

Although there were few significant differences between these groups in items used to measure the independence of the communication function, participants from Mauritius and Uganda showed significantly higher levels of participation in sales promotion – with respective means of 3.25 and 3.33 – than their counterparts from

Table 12

ANOVA on Public Relations as a Separate Management Function with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and or product awareness			
Australia	100	3.27	1.29
Italy	138	3.36	1.06
Mauritius	30	3.60	1.25
Uganda	11	3.91	1.14
Total	279	3.79	1.17
$F=1.42$ ( $p=.237$ )			
Product publicity is a primary goal			
Australia	100	2.82	1.39
Italy	138	2.88	1.08
Mauritius	30	3.23	1.19
Uganda	11	3.27	1.56
Total	279	2.91	1.23
$F=1.21$ ( $p=.307$ )			

(table continued)

Table 12 (continued)

ANOVA on Public Relations as a Separate Management Function with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
We support marketing campaigns			
Australia	100	4.02	0.91
Italy	137	3.83	1.00
Mauritius	29	4.07	0.92
Uganda	11	4.09	0.94
Total	277	3.94	1.06
$\underline{F}=1.07$ ( $p=.362$ )			
We identify consumer needs			
Australia	101	3.77	1.06
Italy	140	3.83	1.00
Mauritius	29	3.38	1.21
Uganda	11	4.55	0.69
Total	281	3.79	1.05
$\underline{F}=3.80$ ( $p=.015$ )			

(table continued)

Table 12 (continued)

ANOVA on Public Relations as a Separate Management Function with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
We participate in sales promotion as a central task			
Australia	101	2.70	1.32
Italy	136	2.90	1.05
Mauritius	28	3.25	1.29
Uganda	12	3.33	1.44
Total	277	2.88	1.21
$F=3.18$ ( $p=.087$ )			
We are in charge of tasks and responsibilities distinct from the marketing department			
Australia	28	3.61	1.34
Italy	50	3.90	0.97
Mauritius	14	3.64	1.22
Uganda	9	3.33	1.87
Total	101	3.73	1.21
$F=0.77$ ( $p=.514$ )			

(table continued)



Table 12 (continued)

ANOVA on Public Relations as a Separate Management Function with Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
We share resources with the marketing department			
Australia	28	3.07	1.36
Italy	50	3.00	1.29
Mauritius	15	3.27	1.16
Uganda	9	2.11	1.69
Total	102	2.98	1.34
$\underline{F}=1.56$ ( $p=.205$ )			
We compete for resources with the marketing department			
Australia	28	2.75	1.38
Italy	48	2.65	1.28
Mauritius	14	2.50	1.45
Uganda	8	1.88	1.64
Total	98	2.59	1.36
$\underline{F}=0.91$ ( $p=.439$ )			

(table continued)

Table 12 (continued)

ANOVA on Public Relations as a Separate Management Function with Country of Practice

Variable	Australia	Italy	Mauritius	Uganda
Organization has two separate units, one for marketing-related public relations and another for public affairs (public policy)?	28.0%	39.0%	23.3%	30.8%
The public relations department reports to a manager from the marketing department	22.2%	20.0%	20.0%	22.2%
The marketing department reports to a manager from the public relations department?	26.9%	8.2%	20.0%	11.1%
The public relations department reports to a department other than public relations or marketing, such as human resources	13.8%	20.8%	26.7%	37.5%
Which unit has the larger budget?				
Marketing-related public relations	64.0%	63.3%	75.0%	100.0%
Public affairs	20.0%	22.4%	0	0
Budgets approximately the same	16.0%	14.3%	25.0%	0
Which function receives more support from the dominant coalition?				
Marketing-related public relations	32.0%	40.0%	30.4%	27.3%
Public affairs	25.8%	15.2%	8.7%	18.2%
Budgets approximately the same	42.3%	44.8%	60.9%	54.5%

Australia and Italy. Australian practitioners demonstrated the lowest level of participation ( $\underline{M} = 2.70$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.32$ ) followed by Italian public relations professionals ( $\underline{M} = 2.90$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.05$ ). The item measuring practitioners' efforts in identifying consumer needs also showed a significant difference between countries ( $F = 3.80$ ,  $p = .015$ ) with professionals from Uganda placing much more emphasis on this activity ( $\underline{M} = 4.55$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .69$ ) than those in Australia ( $\underline{M} = 3.77$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.06$ ), Italy ( $\underline{M} = 3.83$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.00$ ), and Mauritius ( $\underline{M} = 3.38$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.21$ ).

All countries reported that approximately 20% of public relations departments reported to a manager from the marketing department. Australian practitioners cited the most occurrences of marketing departments reporting to public relations managers (26.9%). Italian professionals reported the least number of such a dynamic (8.2%). In Uganda 37.5% of the public relations departments reported to heads of departments other than marketing or public relations. Only 13.8% of Australian practitioners reported such a reporting relationship.

As outlined in the previous chapter, I developed the most of the questions in this study measuring the relationship between marketing and public relations in the hopes of creating an index to measure this characteristic and its relationship to public relations Excellence. Thus, my ability to compare findings from this study to the Excellence study is restricted to examining the organizational component of this relationship. Participants from the Excellence study reported working in organizations with two separate units for marketing related and public affairs programs more often (42%) than participants in this study (33%). Taking into consideration some of the high means for items such as support for marketing campaigns and identification of

consumer needs, the participants in this study may also have marketing among their job responsibilities.

#### Knowledge Potential for Managerial Role and Symmetrical Public Relations

RQ5a. What public relations knowledge is available in the public relations departments among participants in this study?

RQ5b. How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ5c. How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

#### Reliability Test

I calculated Cronbach's alpha coefficients in order to test the internal consistency of the scales measuring knowledge for the managerial and technician roles as well as for the four models of public relations practice (see Table 13). The reliabilities were all above or near .70. Cronbach's alphas for knowledge to practice the managerial role, technician role, press agency model of public relations, public information model of public relations, two-way asymmetrical model of public relations, and symmetrical model of public relations were .85, .75, .72, .75, .70, and .68 respectively.

#### Descriptive Statistics

Practitioners in this study reported higher means for scales measuring knowledge of the public information ( $\underline{M} = 4.12$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .71$ ) and press agency ( $\underline{M} = 3.82$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .68$ ) models of public relations than they did for more advanced research-based asymmetrical and symmetrical models with respective means of 3.33 and 3.60 (see Table 14). Participants demonstrated a high knowledge potential for the public

Table 13

Reliability Test for Knowledge Potential Indices

Index	<u>Item- total corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
<i>Knowledge of technician role</i>			
Coordinate a press conference or arrange media coverage of an event	0.40	0.29	0.73
Produce publications	0.48	0.26	0.71
Write an advertisement	0.44	0.30	0.73
Take photographs	0.51	0.36	0.71
Write speeches	0.44	0.25	0.72
Produce audio/visual (graphics, slide shows, videos, radio spots)	0.59	0.37	0.69
Write news releases and feature articles	0.47	0.36	0.72
Cronbach's Alpha = .75			
<i>Knowledge of managerial role</i>			
Manage people	0.54	0.35	0.83
Conduct evaluation research	0.62	0.45	0.82
Develop goals and objectives for your department	0.65	0.46	0.82
Prepare a departmental budget	0.50	0.27	0.84
Perform environmental scanning (scanning the organization's environment for publics affected by the organization's behaviors)	0.50	0.29	0.84
Develop strategies for solving public relations and communication problems	0.63	0.45	0.82

(table continued)

Table 13 (continued)

Reliability Test for Knowledge Potential Indices

Index	<u>Item- total corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
<i>Knowledge of technician role</i>			
Use research to segment publics	0.62	0.47	0.82
Manage the organization's response to issues	0.67	0.48	0.82
Cronbach's Alpha = .85			
<i>Knowledge of press agency model</i>			
Convince a reporter to publicize your organization	0.51	0.26	0.67
Get your organization's name into the media	0.54	0.30	0.64
Keep bad publicity out of the media	0.47	0.22	0.69
Get maximum publicity from a staged event	0.53	0.28	0.65
Cronbach's Alpha = .72			
<i>Knowledge of public information model</i>			
Understand the news values of journalists	0.52	0.30	0.72
Prepare news stories that reporters will use	0.66	0.44	0.57
Perform as journalists inside your organization	0.56	0.35	0.70
Cronbach's Alpha = .75			
<i>Knowledge of two-way asymmetrical model</i>			
Get publics to behave as your organization wants	0.47	0.27	0.64
Use attitude theory in a campaign	0.53	0.38	0.60
Manipulate publics scientifically	0.55	0.39	0.58

(table continued)

Table 13 (continued)

Reliability Test for Knowledge Potential Indices

Index	<u>Item- total corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
Persuade a public that your organization is right on an issue	0.38	0.22	0.69
Cronbach's Alpha = .70			
<i>Knowledge of two-way symmetrical model</i>			
Determine how publics react to the organization	0.43	0.24	0.64
Negotiate with an activist group	0.39	0.17	0.67
Use theories of conflict resolution in dealing with public	0.48	0.24	0.61
Help management to understand the opinion of particular publics	0.58	0.35	0.55
Cronbach's Alpha = .68			

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for Knowledge Potential Indices

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
<i>Knowledge of Technician Role Index</i>	285	3.96	0.61
Coordinate a press conference or arrange media coverage of an event	285	4.37	0.77
Produce publications	285	4.26	0.83
Write an advertisement	285	3.39	1.24
Take photographs	285	3.35	1.20
Write speeches	285	4.11	0.82
Produce audio/visual (graphics, slide shows, videos, radio spots)	285	3.81	1.03
Write news releases and feature articles	285	4.46	0.69
<i>Knowledge of Managerial Role</i>	285	3.81	0.68
Manage people	285	3.68	1.08
Conduct evaluation research	285	3.64	1.05
Develop goals and objectives for your department	285	4.13	0.76
Prepare a departmental budget	285	4.00	0.95
Perform environmental scanning (scanning the organization's environment for publics affected by the organization's behaviors)	285	3.37	1.11
Develop strategies for solving public relations and communication problems	285	4.26	0.86
Use research to segment publics	285	3.51	1.02
Manage the organization's response to issues	285	3.88	0.91

(table continued)



Table 14 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Knowledge Potential Indices

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
<i>Knowledge of Press Agency Model</i>	285	3.82	0.68
Convince a reporter to publicize your organization	285	3.88	0.93
Get your organization's name into the media	285	4.12	0.97
Keep bad publicity out of the media	285	3.32	0.92
Get maximum publicity from a staged event	285	3.98	0.88
<i>Knowledge of Public Information Model</i>	285	4.12	0.71
Understand the news values of journalists	285	4.36	0.79
Prepare news stories that reporters will use	285	4.14	0.83
Perform as journalists inside your organization	285	3.88	0.98
<i>Knowledge of Two-way Asymmetrical Model</i>	285	3.33	0.69
Get publics to behave as your organization wants	285	3.33	0.87
Use attitude theory in a campaign	285	3.35	1.09
Manipulate publics scientifically	285	2.86	1.03
Persuade a public that your organization is right on an issue	285	3.76	0.82
<i>Knowledge of Two-way Symmetrical Model</i>	285	3.60	0.66
Determine how publics react to the organization	285	3.79	0.85
Negotiate with an activist group	285	3.30	0.99
Use theories of conflict resolution in dealing with public		3.39	0.98
Help management to understand the opinion of particular publics		3.94	0.87

Note. All measured by five-point Likert type scale: 1=Strongly disagree,

2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Strongly agree.

information model with a high level of understanding of journalists' news values ( $\underline{M} = 4.36$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .79$ ) and being able to prepare news stories for journalists' use ( $\underline{M} = 4.14$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .83$ ). In knowledge potential for the press agency models participants showed a proclivity for gaining publicity for their organization either by convincing a reporter to publicize their organization ( $\underline{M} = 3.88$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .93$ ), getting their organization's name into the media ( $\underline{M} = 4.12$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .71$ ), or getting maximum publicity from a staged event ( $\underline{M} = 3.98$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .88$ ). However, they demonstrated less ability in controlling how their organizations were covered, such as keeping bad publicity out of the media ( $\underline{M} = 3.32$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .92$ ).

The knowledge potential for research-based activities common to the two-way asymmetrical model of public relations was low among the study's participants. Participants did not demonstrate a high degree of knowledge concerning the use of attitude theory ( $\underline{M} = 3.35$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.09$ ) or scientific manipulation of publics ( $\underline{M} = 2.86$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.03$ ), although there was a greater knowledge in persuading publics that their organization's stance on an issue was correct ( $\underline{M} = 3.76$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .82$ ).

The knowledge potential for the two-way symmetrical model of public relations was mixed. There was a relatively low level of skills for negotiating with activist groups ( $\underline{M} = 3.30$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .99$ ) and using theories of conflict resolution in dealing with publics ( $\underline{M} = 3.39$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .98$ ), but there was a high level of knowledge for symmetrical communication as displayed in means for determining how publics react to the organization ( $\underline{M} = 3.79$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .85$ ) and helping management understand the opinions of publics ( $\underline{M} = 3.94$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .87$ ).

Participants also reported greater knowledge for the technician role ( $\underline{M} = 3.96$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .61$ ) than the managerial role ( $\underline{M} = 3.81$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .68$ ), although the gap in

knowledge was not large. Among items measuring knowledge of the technician role there were higher means reported for skills associated with media relations/journalism skills such as coordinating press conferences ( $\underline{M} = 4.37$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .77$ ), writing news releases and feature articles ( $\underline{M} = 4.46$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .69$ ), and producing publications ( $\underline{M} = 4.26$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .83$ ). There was a lower level of knowledge for specialized production skills that are often contracted out by public relations departments, such as writing advertisements ( $\underline{M} = 3.39$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.24$ ), taking photographs ( $\underline{M} = 3.35$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.20$ ), and producing audio/visual materials ( $\underline{M} = 3.81$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.03$ ).

Among items measuring knowledge of the managerial role participants displayed lower levels of skill for items related to strategic management such as environmental scanning ( $\underline{M} = 3.37$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.11$ ), evaluation research ( $\underline{M} = 3.64$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.05$ ), and conducting research to segment publics ( $\underline{M} = 3.51$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.02$ ). Participants reported greater skills as supervisors developing goals and objectives for their department ( $\underline{M} = 4.13$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .76$ ), developing strategies for solving communication problems ( $\underline{M} = 4.26$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .83$ ), and preparing departmental budgets ( $\underline{M} = 4.00$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .95$ ).

When looking at these characteristics by individual country, there was not a statistically significant difference among practitioners' knowledge of the press agency, two-way symmetrical, and two way symmetrical models of public relations (see Table 15). However, there was a statistically significant difference between countries when it came to possessing knowledge of the public information model of public relations ( $\underline{F} = 6.83$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Australian and Ugandan professionals displayed higher means (4.34 and 4.31 respectively) than those in Italy ( $\underline{M} = 4.02$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .73$ ) and Mauritius ( $\underline{M} = 3.80$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .69$ ). As was the case for public relations studies

Table 15

ANOVA on Knowledge Potential Indices With Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Knowledge of press agency model			
Australia	101	3.87	0.68
Italy	141	3.78	0.69
Mauritius	30	3.82	0.49
Uganda	13	3.90	0.99
Total	285	3.82	0.68
$F=0.40$ ( $p=.752$ )			
Knowledge of public information model			
Australia	101	4.34	0.63
Italy	141	4.02	0.73
Mauritius	30	3.80	0.69
Uganda	13	4.31	0.64
Total	285	4.12	0.71
$F=6.83$ ( $p=.000$ )			

(table continued)

Table 15 (continued)

ANOVA on Knowledge Potential Indices With Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Knowledge of two-way asymmetrical model			
Australia	101	3.32	0.69
Italy	141	3.35	0.71
Mauritius	30	3.19	0.65
Uganda	13	3.44	0.69
Total	285	3.33	0.69
$F=0.55$ ( $p=.646$ )			
Knowledge of two-way symmetrical model			
Australia	101	3.69	0.70
Italy	141	3.58	0.65
Mauritius	30	3.39	0.57
Uganda	13	3.73	0.62
Total	285	3.60	0.66
$F=1.81$ ( $p=.145$ )			

(table continued)

Table 15 (continued)

ANOVA on Knowledge Potential Indices With Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
Knowledge of technician role			
Australia	101	4.20	0.56
Italy	141	3.79	0.60
Mauritius	30	3.97	0.55
Uganda	13	4.02	0.60
Total	285	3.96	0.61
$\underline{F}=10.26$ ( $p=.000$ )			
Knowledge of managerial role			
Australia	101	4.01	0.68
Italy	141	3.73	0.66
Mauritius	30	3.60	0.62
Uganda	13	3.65	0.66
Total	285	3.81	0.68
$\underline{F}=4.87$ ( $p=.003$ )			

Note. All measured by five-point Likert type scale: 1=Strongly disagree,

2=Somewhat agree, 3=Neutral, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Strongly agree

conducted in Slovenia (J. Grunig et al., 1998), Germany (Scholz, 1998), Trinidad and Antigua (Ali, 1995), and South Korea (Rhee, 1999), practitioners from Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda perform technician roles more often than managerial roles. Participants from Australia displayed the highest knowledge for both the technician ( $\underline{M} = 4.20$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .56$ ) and managerial roles ( $\underline{M} = 4.01$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .68$ ). Italian practitioners displayed the next highest level of knowledge for the managerial role ( $\underline{M} = 3.73$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .66$ ), but the lowest score for knowledge of the technical role ( $\underline{M} = 3.79$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .60$ ). Uganda and Mauritius reported lower levels of knowledge for the managerial role, displaying means of 3.65 and 3.60, respectively. Both of these countries also displayed the greatest discrepancy between knowledge for the technician and managerial roles.

Results from this study concerning the knowledge potential for the managerial role and symmetrical public relations mirror those from the Excellence study. The means for the participants' knowledge of the public information model ( $\underline{M} = 11.39$ ) and press agency model ( $\underline{M} = 10.50$ ) were much higher than knowledge of the two-way symmetrical ( $\underline{M} = 8.73$ ) and two-way asymmetrical ( $\underline{M} = 7.74$ ) models (L. Grunig et al., 2002, p. 337). Similar to participants in this study, Excellence study participants reported equal knowledge to enact the manager and technician role ( $\underline{M} = 11.1$  for both items) while reporting the least amount of knowledge in items related to strategic management (environmental scanning, using research to segment audiences, and conducting evaluation research). This suggests that regardless of cultural and political differences, public relations departments throughout the world tend to possess the technical and administrative managerial expertise, but that strategic

knowledge – the most important variable in distinguish excellent from less than excellent departments – is a rarer commodity.

#### Organizational Context for Excellence

RQ6a. Do participants in this study believe they face activism as public relations practitioners?

RQ6b. How, if at all, do these findings differ among associations studied?

RQ6c. How, if at all, does this differ from the findings in the Excellence study countries?

L. Grunig et al. (2002) suggested that activism stimulates public relations excellence because organizations facing this pressure are likely to assign public relations a managerial role, include public relations in strategic management, and communicate more symmetrically. Although activists probably achieve some level of success regardless of how the organization responds, the difference provided by excellent public relations is that the organization achieves success as well – a symmetrical outcome for the organization and the activists. When asked how successful the organization had been in dealing with the activists and vice versa, practitioners reported their organizations being more successful ( $\underline{M}$  = 3.13,  $\underline{SD}$  = .99) than the activist groups ( $\underline{M}$  = 2.82,  $\underline{SD}$  = .99).

Among the individual countries, practitioners from Australia and Uganda reported experiencing the greatest levels of activism. Australian participants had experienced activist pressure 63.6% of the time and 53.8% of Ugandan practitioners had experienced such pressure. Participants from Mauritius reported experiencing activism 40.7% of the time (see Table 17). Although Italian practitioners experienced the least activism, 37.8% still reported experiencing such pressure.



Using ANOVA to compare means in the success of activists and organizations revealed no statistically significant difference among public relations professionals in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda. Similar to this study's findings, participants in the Excellence study also reported higher means for the success of the organization than for the success of the activists.

Nearly half of this study's participants (48.2%) reported that their organizations had faced pressure from activists (see Table 16). When asked how successful the organization had been in dealing with the activists and vice versa, practitioners reported their organizations being more successful ( $\underline{M}$  = 3.13,  $\underline{SD}$  = .99) than the activist groups ( $\underline{M}$  = 2.82,  $\underline{SD}$  = .99).

Among the individual countries, practitioners from Australia and Uganda reported experiencing the greatest levels of activism. Australian participants had experienced activist pressure 63.6% of the time and 53.8% of Ugandan practitioners had experienced such pressure. Participants from Mauritius reported experiencing activism 40.7% of the time (see Table 17). Although Italian practitioners experienced the least activism, 37.8% still reported experiencing such pressure.

Using ANOVA to compare means in the success of activists and organizations revealed no statistically significant difference among public relations professionals in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda. Similar to this study's results, participants in the Excellence study also reported higher means for the success of the organization than for the success of the activists.

#### Isolating the Excellence Variables

I took several steps to examine whether all of the characteristics of Excellence in this study fit in a single pattern of Excellence. Initially, I conducted reliability tests

Table 16

Description of Aggregate Population

Variable	<u>n</u>	Frequency	Percentage
Organization has experienced pressure from activist groups	274	132	48.2

  

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
How successful do you think that activist group was in achieving its goals in its dealings with your organization?	136	2.82	0.99
How successful do you think the organization's response to the group was?	135	3.13	0.99

Table 17

Description by Individual Countries

Variable	Australia	Italy	Mauritius	Uganda
Organization has experienced pressure from activist groups	63.6%	37.8%	40.7%	53.8%

ANOVA on Activism With Country of Practice

Variables	<u>n</u>	M	<u>SD</u>
-----------	----------	---	-----------

How successful do you think that activist group was in achieving its goals in its dealings with your organization?

Australia	59	2.81	0.94
Italy	56	2.75	1.01
Mauritius	13	2.85	1.21
Uganda	8	3.38	0.74
Total	136	2.82	0.99

$F=0.94$  ( $p=.425$ )

How successful do you think the organization's response to the group was?

Australia	59	3.20	1.08
Italy	56	3.11	0.91
Mauritius	13	2.92	0.90
Uganda	8	3.00	1.07
Total	136	3.13	0.99

$F=0.35$  ( $p=.793$ )

Note. All measured by five-point Likert type scale :1=Not at all successful, 2=Fairly

successful, 3=Moderately successful, 4=Very successful, 5=Extremely successful

for the scales measuring characteristics such as involvement in strategic management, dimensions of public relations models, public relations as a management function separate from marketing, and the knowledge potential for the managerial role and symmetrical communications. Then, I conducted factor analysis in search of factors of Excellence, using the scales developed for each of these characteristics as well as items used to measure the value of public relations such as the level of support from the dominant coalition and the practitioners' estimate of total return on investment for the communication function.

Factor analysis is a multivariate statistical procedure used primarily for data reduction, construct development, and the investigation of relationships among variables (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000). Using factor analysis I was able to identify the most-excellent public relations departments as well as less-excellent ones. The Excellence factors were also used in examining relationships with related public relations variables such as activism and demographic items.

### Factor Analysis

The variables and scales considered candidates for the index of Excellence in public relations were as follows: dimensions of communication, knowledge potential in the public relations department—for the managerial role and for the two-way models, strategic management, the variables on support for public relations, and value of public relations. All the variables and scales dealt with the characteristics of public relations practice except for the variable of value of public relations. This variable is slightly different from other public relations variables in that it is an assessment of the value of public relations itself.

Fourteen variables were put into a factor analysis using principal axis factoring method with two factors assigned. The variables consisted of several items for the dimensions of communication (direction of communication, ethical-unethical dimension, mediated communication, interpersonal communication, symmetrical purpose, and asymmetrical purpose), involvement in strategic management, knowledge potential in the public relations department (for managerial role and the two-way models of communication), the support for public relations, and value of public relations (estimates for practitioner and dominant coalition).

All variables loaded positively on the same factor. However, variables for public relations as a separate function, mediated communication, interpersonal communication, asymmetric purpose of communication, and the estimates for the return on investment for public relations did not have factor loadings high enough to be considered as a meaningful component for the factor (see Table 18). All other factor loadings had values well over .40, which scholars (Hair et al., 1995) consider the minimal level to be considered as a meaningful component for the factor. To further examine these three variables, factor rotation was conducted resulting in the public relations value variables then loading on a separate factor much as they did for Rhee (1999). However, another variable that can be used to measure the value of public relations, support of the public relations department by the dominant coalition, did show a significant factor loading (.51) for the first factor. This item also displayed a strong correlation between the Excellence of the public relations function and value in the original Excellence study (L. Grunig et al., 2002). The eigenvalue of 4.24 for the first Excellence factor was at a level significant enough for interpretation.

Table 18

Factor Analysis to Produce a Single Scale of Excellence in Public Relations

Variable (Z-scores)	Commonalties		Factor		Factor rotated	
	Initial	Extraction	1	2	1	2
Direction of communication	0.52	0.63	0.72	0.02	0.72	0.31
Ethical-unethical communication	0.40	0.44	0.52	0.09	0.59	0.18
Mediated communication	0.25	0.27	0.36	0.03	0.51	-0.02
Interpersonal communication	0.24	0.19	0.37	-0.11	0.40	0.14
Symmetrical purpose of communication	0.48	0.55	0.56	-0.10	0.68	0.19
Asymmetrical purpose of communication	0.26	0.71	0.25	-0.15	0.10	0.10
Involvement in strategic management	0.39	0.42	0.63	0.09	0.53	0.33
Knowledge for two-way symmetrical model	0.65	0.72	0.73	-0.15	0.24	0.81
Knowledge for two-way asymmetrical model	0.54	0.62	0.63	-0.22	0.15	0.76
Knowledge for managerial role	0.68	0.79	0.78	-0.14	0.30	0.83
Public relations as a separate function from marketing	0.19	0.04	0.25	-0.05	0.14	-0.02
Support of the dominant coalition	0.38	0.32	0.51	0.14	0.42	0.23
Estimate of the practitioner's value of public relations	0.45	0.46	0.17	0.63	0.03	0.04
Practitioner's estimate of the dominant coalition's value of public relations	0.47	0.85	0.18	0.89	0.05	0.07
Eigenvalue			4.24	1.68	2.39	2.29
Percentage of variance explained			32.63	12.94	18.35	17.62

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

### Canonical Correlation

In the original Excellence study, it was theorized that the dominant coalition would support and assign greater value to public relations when the department possessed the characteristics of Excellence (L. Grunig et al., 2002). However, these variables were included in the Excellence scale with the reasoning that the direction of causation between excellent public relations and valued public relations could run in the opposite direction. For instance, it is possible that a dominant coalition that supported and valued public relations would develop a public relations department with the characteristics of Excellence. However, the Excellence team was able to verify that departments with high levels of Excellence characteristics were valued more by the dominant coalition than departments featuring lower levels of these characteristics, by conducting canonical correlation analyses.

Canonical correlation is an analysis allowing researchers to investigate the relationship between two sets of variables in order to examine whether they correlate with each other simultaneously. It also indicates the number of underlying variates that can be extracted that are statistically significant and enables the researcher to determine the strength of the relationship of each variable with the underlying variable.

The canonical correlation between the value of public relations and other Excellence variables is significant at the .05 level, with a canonical correlation of .55 (see Table 19). Again as in factor analysis, the estimated values of return on investment by practitioners showed lower levels of correlation with the characteristics of Excellence. However, the support of the dominant coalition displayed a high correlation (.99).

Table 19

Canonical Correlation of Variables Measuring Value of Public Relations With Other Variables

Variable	Correlation With canonical Variate
Characteristics of public relations (variable group 1)	
Direction of communication	0.79
Ethical-unethical communication	0.41
Symmetrical purpose of communication	0.77
Involvement in strategic management	0.80
Knowledge for two-way symmetrical communication	0.56
Knowledge for two-way asymmetrical communication	0.45
Knowledge for managerial role	0.59
Value of public relations (variable group 2)	
Support of the dominant coalition	0.99
Estimate of the value practitioners assign to public relations	0.19
Estimate of the value dominant coalition would assign to public relations	0.19
Canonical Correlation = .55 P<.05	



All variables had a positive correlation with the underlying variable. Involvement in strategic management (.80), direction of communication (.79), and symmetrical purpose of communication (.77) were the most important contributors to the value of public relations. On the other hand the indices measuring ethical-unethical communication and knowledge for two-way asymmetrical communications showed lower levels of correlation (.41 and .45 respectively).

#### Reliability Test

In order to produce a final scale of Excellence in public relations, reliability analysis of the underlying Excellence variables was conducted. I did not include the return on investment value questions since the factor analysis and canonical correlation indicated these variables were not correlated with the other variables. In the IABC study, the Excellence scale was highly reliable with a Cronbach's alpha of .85. Rhee (1999) had similar results with a level of reliability of .83. The Cronbach's alpha for the Excellence scale in this study was .86 (see Table 20).

The strongest item-total correlation was for the knowledge potential for the managerial role (.71). The two-way direction of communication (.70), knowledge for two-way symmetrical communication (.64), and involvement of public relations in strategic management (.60) also showed high correlation. These data suggest that knowledge of the managerial role and the ability that comes with it to conduct symmetrical communication programs that contribute to the strategic management of an organization are significant factors in separating excellent public relations departments from less-excellent ones. These findings are very similar to Rhee's (1999), although the involvement of public relations in the strategic management of an organization did not have nearly so much of a role in her study's results.

Table 20

Reliability Test for Excellence Indices

Index	<u>Item- total corr.</u>	Squared mult. Corr.	Alpha if item deleted
Direction of communication	0.65	0.46	0.82
Ethical-unethical communication	0.45	0.28	0.85
Symmetrical purpose of communication	0.56	0.38	0.83
Involvement in strategic management	0.60	0.38	0.83
Knowledge for two-way symmetrical communication	0.67	0.62	0.82
Knowledge for two-way asymmetrical communication	0.54	0.48	0.84
Knowledge for managerial role	0.72	0.67	0.81
Support of the dominant coalition	0.50	0.31	0.84
Cronbach's Alpha = .86			

I used this Excellence scale to calculate an Excellence score for each respondent, which in turn was used to rank the organizations into 5 categories of public relations excellence: 1) most excellent; 2) above average in excellence; 3) average in excellence; 4) below average in excellence; and 5) least excellent. I then compared these five groups using other demographic variables, such as age, education, country, public served, and so forth.

Initially it appeared that level of education played no role in an organization's level of excellence. Over 54 percent of those in the most-excellent category had taken post-graduate courses or completed such programs (see Table 21). Nearly mirroring this, over 49 percent in the least-excellent group had at least begun post-graduate education. However, when looking at this issue from another perspective – the mean excellence scores by level of education – there did appear to be significant difference in the level of excellence in relation to education ( $p = .000$ ,  $F = 13.01$ ) (see Table 22). The mean excellence scores for professionals having attended post-graduate courses or achieving a master's degree or higher ( $\bar{M} = 1.91$  and  $\bar{M} = -.41$  respectively) was higher than those for practitioners whose highest level of education was some college ( $\bar{M} = -.74$ ) or a bachelor's degree ( $\bar{M} = -.64$ ). However, it was a bit perplexing that professionals with less than a high school diploma ( $\bar{M} = 1.74$ ) or a high school diploma ( $\bar{M} = 1.01$ ) showed relatively high scores in comparison with those who had pursued higher education.

These scores were likely influenced by the items used to measure education. It is likely that the participants came from educational systems different from that in the United States where these education measures were developed. Hence, participants

Table 21

Demographic Information for Level of Public Relations Excellence

Variable	Least Excellent	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Most Excellent
<u>Highest education level</u>					
Less than a high school diploma	0	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%
High school diploma	7.3%	5.4%	3.6%	12.7%	5.5%
Some college	7.3%	12.5%	7.1%	10.9%	3.6%
A bachelor's degree	36.4%	39.3%	35.7%	30.9%	32.7%
Some graduate or professional school	7.3%	17.9%	16.1%	16.4%	23.6%
A professional, master's, or doctoral degree	41.8%	23.2%	35.7%	27.3%	32.7%
<u>Type of organization</u>					
Corporation	43.1%	26.8%	20.4%	20%	22.2%
Multinational corporation subsidiary	2%	5.4%	9.3%	10.9%	0
Non-governmental or non-profit organization	5.9%	8.9%	18.5%	10.9%	22.2%
Government agency	15.7%	10.7%	13%	14.5%	13%
Advertising agency	0	3.6%	0	1.8%	1.9%
Public relations agency	15.7%	28.6%	25.9%	30.9%	25.9%
Office/affiliate of multinational public relations firm	0	0	5.6%	0	0

(table continued)

Table 21 (continued)

Demographic Information for Level of Public Relations Excellence

Variable	Least Excellent	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Most Excellent
Country of Practice					
Australia	30.4%	28.6%	32.1%	35.7%	51.8%
Italy	50%	60.7%	50%	44.6%	39.3%
Mauritius	14.3%	10.7%	14.3%	10.7%	3.6%
Uganda	5.4%	0	3.6%	8.9%	5.4%

Table 22

ANOVA on Excellence Scores With Demographic Variables

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Excellence index scores by country			
Australia	100	0.92	5.55
Italy	137	-0.41	5.53
Mauritius	30	-1.81	5.67
Uganda	13	1.63	5.47
Total	280	-0.08	5.60
$\underline{F}=1.28$ ( $p=.309$ )			
Excellence index scores by education			
Less than high school diploma	4	1.74	2.88
High school diploma	19	1.01	4.24
Some college	23	-0.74	5.34
Bachelor's degree	97	-0.64	5.35
Some graduate of professional school	45	1.91	5.17
Master's or doctoral degree	89	-0.41	6.26
Total	277	-0.01	5.58
$\underline{F}=13.01$ ( $p=.000$ )			

(table continued)

Table 22 (continued)

ANOVA on Excellence Scores With Demographic Variables

Variables	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Excellence index scores by type of organization			
Corporation	71	-1.44	6.57
MNC subsidiary	15	0.52	3.72
Non-governmental or non-profit agency	36	2.04	5.05
Government agency	36	-0.05	5.03
Advertising firm	4	1.66	5.74
Public relations firm	69	0.89	4.20
Office/affiliate of multinational PR firm	3	1.15	0.16
Other	36	-0.78	6.56
Total	270	0.08	5.52
<u>F</u> =6.83 ( <u>p</u> =.000)			

may not have understood what I meant by the difference between high school and college or college and post-graduate education.

Although the participants' country of practice did not appear to affect the level of public relations excellence in this study ( $p = .309$ ), the type of organization they practiced for did ( $p = .000$ ). Those working in non-governmental or non-profit agencies displayed the largest means ( $\underline{M} = 2.04$ ) on standardized Excellence scores, followed by professionals working for advertising firms ( $\underline{M} = 1.66$ ), affiliates of multinational public relations firms ( $\underline{M} = 1.15$ ), and public relations firms ( $\underline{M} = .89$ ). Displaying the lowest excellence scores were professionals within corporations ( $\underline{M} = -1.44$ ).

Similarly, 43% of practitioners in the least-excellent group worked for a corporation. This percentage ranged from 20% to 26.8% in all other categories of excellence. On the other hand, only 5.9% and 8.9% of practitioners in the least excellent and below-average groups, respectively, worked for non-governmental or non-profit agencies; whereas such agencies accounted for 22.2% of practitioners in the most-excellent category although they represented less than 13% of the total participants in this study. These data reflect how the focus on the bottom line – normally associated with corporations – may prevent practitioners from incorporating principles of excellence, based upon collaborative advocacy, into their practice.



## Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

This thesis surveyed public relations professionals in Australia, Italy, Uganda, and Mauritius with the purpose of examining their public relations practice and determining whether the generic principles of the Excellence Theory apply to this diverse assortment of countries outside of the scope of the original Excellence study: Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. This project went beyond previous studies examining the applicability of the Excellence in countries outside of the United States because it looked at practice in several countries simultaneously. This study also introduced and tested the mixed-mode survey, involving physical mail and Web-based questionnaires, to public relations research. This survey revealed several important implications for public relations professionals practicing both domestically and internationally.

In this chapter I first summarize the study's results. Then, I discuss the implications extrapolated from these findings, followed by an examination of this study's limitations. Finally, I make recommendations for future research based on this project.

### Characteristics of Public Relations Practice in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda

This project examined several principles of public relations excellence such as involvement of public relations in strategic management, organizational context for excellence, empowerment of public relations in the dominant coalition, knowledge potential for public relations, public relations as a management function separate from other functions, and the theoretical dimensions of public relations behavior (the basis of the reconceptualized theory of models of public relations). Most of the items used

to measure these concepts were based on items from the Excellence study and later replications.

Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated to measure the reliability of these items and indices for each principle were then developed. A series of factor analyses and canonical correlations were produced with these principles, resulting in a single Excellence factor nearly identical to that uncovered by the Excellence study and later extensions of this study in Slovenia and South Korea.

Data collected revealed several important results. Most importantly, this study's findings imply that the generic principles of excellence are applicable worldwide. This study's index of characteristics contributing to public relations excellence in participating organizations in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda is very similar to those uncovered in the Excellence study, which focused on practice in North America (Canada and the United States) and Europe (the United Kingdom and later Slovenia). Additionally, members of public relations professional associations in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda had much more commonalities than differences. This was also true when comparing participants with those in the original Excellence study. These results suggest the validity of global theory of public relations excellence.

Similar to participants in the Excellence study, practitioners surveyed in this research project were more likely to participate in routine operations than strategic planning. They also reported greater involvement in strategic management of an organization through informal activities rather than more formal, research-based contributions. For instance, participants reported much lower contribution through regularly conducted research to answer specific questions than for more informal

contributions such as making contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization and judgement based on experience.

In support of this idea, participants demonstrated a proclivity for the theoretical dimension of two-way communication, particularly researching the opinion of publics. The only other dimension of public relations behavior they relied on more was the ethical dimension.

These research activities were used for mixed motives. Practitioners felt equally that the purpose of public relations was to persuade publics to agree with the organization's point of view and to also provide mediation between these publics and the organization. This may explain why practitioners in this study were just as likely to conduct research-based activities as they were to participate in media relations. However, participants indicated having far less knowledge in negotiation and conflict resolution with publics than in determining how publics react to an organization and conveying this to management. Not surprisingly, given the fact that so much attention was spent on the opinion of publics on organizational decision-making, participants in this study showed a far greater preference for the ethical dimension of communication over the unethical dimension.

Participants in this study had similar levels of knowledge for the technician and managerial practitioner roles. Although reporting that they conduct research-based activities just as much as media relations, they described having more expertise in the latter than the former. Specifically, they reported having a higher level of expertise in what Rhee (1999) considered supervisory management skills (preparing budgets and developing departmental goals and objectives) than in strategic skills

such as performing environmental scanning and using research for segmenting publics and evaluating programs.

Finally, although participants were likely to provide some extent of support to marketing campaigns, they also reported a high level of autonomy, with tasks and responsibilities distinct from the marketing department. The marketing department reported to a manager from the public relations department nearly as often as the other way around. This level autonomy may have been required because of the level of activism that practitioners in all of these countries faced. Nearly 50 percent of the participants worked for an organization that had experienced pressure from activist groups. Australian practitioners faced this the most with nearly 64 percent having experienced activism. However, even in the lowest-ranking country, Italy, in regards to activism, practitioners reported facing activism nearly 40 percent of the time.

#### Characteristics of Excellence in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda

A series of factor and reliability analyses was performed to compare characteristics of excellence among this study's participants with those uncovered in the Excellence study. These analyses described a single factor of excellence used to construct an index of excellence. This index was very similar to that in the IABC study and later replicated by Rhee (1999) and Vercic, L. Grunig, and J. Grunig (1996). In all three research projects this Excellence scale demonstrated reliability levels near or above .80.

Similar to Rhee's (1999) results, the factor loadings for the estimates for the return on investment for public relations were not high enough to be considered in this factor. However, another variable used to measure the value of public relations,

support of the public relations by the dominant coalition, displayed a significant factor loading for this single factor of excellence.

This Excellence index was used to group public relations departments from most excellent to least excellent. The best indicators of excellence among public relations departments were involvement in strategic management as well as the purpose, ethical, and two-way direction dimensions of communication.

### Theoretical Implications

The results of this survey have several theoretical implications. First and most important, it provides further support for the global theory of public relations excellence. Second, this study illustrates how important it is for public relations to be involved in strategic management. Findings from this project also provide further support for the theoretical dimensions of public relations behavior. However, results also suggest that further conceptualization of, and research on, this subject is warranted. Finally, to a lesser degree, this study also has theoretical implications for the relationship between public relations and marketing as well as the presence of activism worldwide and the use of the Internet as a research tool.

### Global Theory of Public Relations Excellence

This study's most important theoretical contribution is to the global theory of public relations excellence. It answers J. Grunig's (2001a) call for more evidence to support "that these principles (of Excellence) work in other cultures" (pg. 36). Based on results from the Excellence study, L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Vercic (1998) and Wakefield (1997) have proposed a global public relations theory of generic principles and specific applications. L. Grunig et al. (2002) described the principles of excellence as generic principles that should be applied universally in public relations

practice while also considering six specific contextual conditions: culture, political system, economic system, media system, level of economic development, and the extent of activism.

This project examined and provided further support to suggest the universal applicability of several of these generic principles of excellent public relations – dimensions of public relations behavior, involvement of public relations in strategic management, knowledge potential for the managerial role and symmetrical public relations, public relations as a management function separate from other functions, and empowerment of public relations – in four diverse countries spanning three continents. It was the first of its kind to simultaneously examine the principles of excellence in several countries with such wide-ranging societal cultures, media systems, and levels of development. This study was also the first to verify these principles in practice in African countries (Mauritius and Uganda).

L. Grunig et al. (2002) said that before the Excellence principles can be adopted as a normative theory for global practice, research must be conducted to ensure that it is not an ethnocentric theory. Results from this study imply that the Excellence principles are not ethnocentric; but rather they are valued by organizations in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda. These data also indicate that these principles are not only normative, but also positive with several participants embracing them in their practice.

Although the societal and cultural differences among the countries studied were great, this project produced an index of excellence almost identical to those developed by the Excellence study (L. Grunig et al., 2002) and replicated in Slovenia (L. Grunig et al., 1998) and Korea (Rhee, 1999). As was true in the Excellence study

( $r = .64$ ,  $p < .01$ ), the involvement of public relations in strategic management ( $r = .80$ ,  $p < .05$ ) was strongly correlated with the value placed on the public relations function by the dominant coalition in these four counties.

Two other characteristics reported by practitioners ranking high in both studies were the two-way theoretical dimension of communication and knowledge for the managerial role. Both of these characteristics are essential components in order for the public relations function to contribute to the strategic management of an organization.

#### The Importance of the Involvement of Public Relations in Strategic Management

One of the most surprising results of this study – in comparison with previous replications of the Excellence study outside of Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States – was the participants' high level of involvement in organizational strategic management. Many scholars have written about the role public relations plays in strategic management in the international arena (Moachon, 1993; Pratt, 1994; Wouters, 1991). However, actual research on the topic in several countries has produced mixed results, with L. Grunig et al. (1998) and Rhee (1999) finding that public relations practitioners in Slovenia and South Korea less involved in strategic management than their Excellence study counterparts from Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Results from this study indicate that public relations is just as likely to be as equally involved in organizational strategic management as countries in the original Excellence study, regardless of whether the country is very similar to those in the Excellence study (Australia) or vastly different (Uganda).

This study points out two important theoretical implications concerning public relations contributions to strategic management. First, it illustrates that regardless of

societal, cultural, economic, and political differences between countries, the involvement of public relations departments in organizational strategic management is the most telling characteristic of whether it brings value to an organization.

What may be of more importance theoretically, is the fact that practitioners in Australia, Canada, Italy, Mauritius, Slovenia, South Korea, Uganda, the United Kingdom, and the United States are all less likely to make research-based contributions than less formal ones to organizational strategic management. As outlined in the previous chapter, this suggests that public relations professionals are not performing the full range of research activities most beneficial to the strategic planning of their organizations.

#### Theoretical Dimensions of Public Relations Behavior

Although the four models of public relations practice have been an integral part of the growth in the body of knowledge concerning public relations, L. Grunig et al. (2002) and Huang (1997) pointed out that excellent public relations can be described better in terms of underlying dimensions of public relations behavior than in terms of these models. This study extends this new theoretical framework based on Huang's (1997) development of measures of four dimensions of public relations behavior: purpose of communication; direction of communication; mediated communication; and ethical communication.

Later, Rhee's (1999) findings suggested there were actually six dimensions of public relations behavior because the purpose of communication and mediated communication consist of two separate concepts rather than a continuum. Results from this study support the reliability of the dimensions of communication because all were reliable with Cronbach alphas near .60 or above. Supporting findings from



Rhee's study, my results suggest that the asymmetrical and symmetrical purposes of communication are separate concepts, as are mediated and interpersonal dimensions of communication. This study's reliability tests also support treating ethical and unethical communication as a continuum. Reliability tests suggest the same thing for the concepts of one-way communication and two-way communication.

Similar to previous results reported by L. Grunig et al. (2002), dimensions such as direction of communication, symmetrical purpose of communication, and ethical communication had moderate to high correlations with the Excellence scale in this study. The dimensions of direction of communication and the symmetrical purpose of communication were the dimensions with the highest correlations with excellence in both studies, reinforcing the assessment that "two-way, research-based public relations programs are perhaps the most important component of excellent public relations programs" (p. 355).

These findings also reinforce the discussion above that public relations makes its greatest contribution to the strategic management of an organization through formal, research-based activities. This study also revealed interesting results concerning how the relationship between the public relations and marketing functions of an organization can affect its abilities to conduct such research-based activities and its overall value to an organization.

#### The Relationship Between Public Relations and Marketing

The scale I constructed to measure the extent to which public relations is a separate function from marketing displayed adequate construct reliability, but to my surprise it did not factor into the Excellence scale. As pointed out in Chapter 2, the public relations function communicates with publics that affect organizational

autonomy whereas the marketing function's role is to seek out markets for the organization's products. Thus, other scholars and I had assumed that when there is confusion over the roles of these functions that organizational effectiveness, and subsequently the value of public relations, would be lessened. However, factor analysis and canonical correlation both revealed no relationship between the independence of the public relations department and value to the organization. These results may be due to the fact that the measures I had developed to gauge the independence of the public relations department really did not do so. For instance, it is possible that practitioners support marketing campaigns but the public relations department primarily focuses on identifying and communicating with strategic publics. Also, if one of the organization's strategic publics was consumers, then it would make perfect sense that the public relations department would identify consumer needs.

As J. Grunig (2001a) pointed out, many studies on domestic practice overseas have found public relations to be commonly confused with advertising and marketing, which tends to lead to the dominance of press agency and public information models of practice. This study also revealed a statistically significant difference among countries, with practitioners from Mauritius and Uganda having an increased role in marketing duties compared to those from Australia and Italy. However, this seemed to play no role in their excellence scores: Ugandan professionals displayed the highest Excellence scores and those from Mauritius the lowest among the four countries.

#### Presence of Activism Around the Globe

L. Grunig et al. (2002) pointed out that activism prompts organizations to practice excellent public relations because it requires the sophistication of research-

based, two-way communication. Results from this study reinforce thinking that organizations throughout the world face activist pressure regardless of governmental system (D. Anderson, 1992; Maddox, 1993; Welge & Hotbrugge, 1998). Although Uganda is now a republic, just 20 years ago it was dictatorship. I was surprised to find practitioners in this country faced activism to a greater extent than practitioners in Italy and Mauritius. In total, nearly 50 percent of participants in this study reported their organizations had faced pressure from activist groups.

Although I was not surprised to find that all countries in this study had faced activism, I was not expecting that professionals from the collective cultures of Mauritius and Uganda would have faced activism nearly so frequently as their Australian and Italian counterparts, who come from individualistic cultures. These results seem to counter the opinion of Sriramesh and Vercic (2003) that the level of activism in African countries like these had declined after accomplishing independence (partly because of a lack of democratic traditions).

However, although not statistically significant, practitioners from Mauritius and Uganda, reported their organizations having less success in comparison with activists. In the case of Uganda, and this is also likely true in Mauritius, activist pressure is a relatively new phenomenon. Much like results from Slovenia (L. Grunig et al., 1998), organizations in these countries had not yet learned how to effectively manage activism. These findings support the call for further research on international activism (L. Grunig et al., 2002).

#### The Use of the Internet as a Research Tool

This study has shed light on the use of the Internet for survey research among academics seeking to build basic theory and professionals wanting to apply this

technique in researching publics – the foundation of the two-way symmetrical model of public relations practice. Although response rates for this survey were low, the online mode of the survey elicited nearly the same rate of response (16%), as did the surface-mail mode (12%).

However, in most cases the turnaround time for responses to the online questionnaire was a matter of days compared to what was a matter of weeks – sometimes months – in receiving responses from the surface-mail questionnaires. The online mode of the survey also allowed me to send reminders via e-mail containing the link to the questionnaire at no additional costs. When one considers the substantial savings in time and costs this online mode provided in collecting data from participants thousands of miles away, the value of the Internet as a research tool for practitioners and researchers becomes clear.

#### Practical Implications

In addition to its theoretical implications, findings from this study also revealed several important implications for the individual practitioner in the field, as well as for the public relations profession as a whole.

#### Premium on Knowledge for Research-Based Contributions to Strategic Management

This study reinforced the value placed on public relations departments featuring research-based, two-way programs and involved in strategic management. However, even though 83% of participants had at least the equivalent to a bachelor's degree, their formal, research-based contributions to the strategic management of their organizations trailed their contributions made through informal approaches and routine operations. Although knowledge to produce research-based programs was highly correlated with the value of public relations, participants in this study

demonstrated far less knowledge of two-way symmetrical and asymmetrical practices than they did for activities associated with the press agency and public information models of public relations.

Similar to participants in the Excellence study, practitioners surveyed in this project were more likely to participate in routine operations than strategic planning. They reported greater involvement in strategic management through informal activities than more formal, research-based contributions. For instance, participants reported much lower contributions through regularly conducted research and specific research to answer specific questions than for more informal contributions such as making contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization and judgement based on experience. To further illustrate this lack of ability to participate in strategic management and manage two-way programs, participants also displayed a low level of skills for providing environmental scanning, evaluation research, and research to segment publics.

However, these findings may demonstrate a failure by the profession to recognize, standardize, and promote these research skills rather than a lack of aptitude for conducting research by public relations practitioners. As previously described in this chapter, participants in this study demonstrated a proclivity for the dimension of two-way communication among the dimensions of public relations models displaying a high mean score for the item, “Before carrying out public relations or communication activities, we first conduct research to understand how the public feels about certain issues.” Knowledge of this item was just as high as any other individual item measuring knowledge of media relations, and so forth.

Based on results from the previous Excellence study and a study by Chang (2000), this lack of research-based contributions to organizational strategic management describes the norm for the public relations industry worldwide. In a Delphi study of senior public relations managers in major U.S. corporations, Chang found that only a handful were using a sophisticated system of environmental scanning and some did not even understand the term. In the qualitative phase of the research, L. Grunig et al. (2002) discovered that “participation in strategic management meant different things to public relations professionals – even the excellent ones” (p. 549).

All of this suggests that public relations associations and universities in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda need to place a greater emphasis on promoting and teaching these skills to practitioners. This is also true of the profession across the globe as undergraduate public relations programs and societies and associations promoting the profession have developed a consistent body of knowledge concerning technician skills, such as media relations, and even supervisory management skills. However, they have yet to include, let alone emphasize, research-based contributions of public relations to organizational strategic management.

On an individual level, the public relations professional can increase his or her value by pursuing post-graduate educational programs and professional development seminars focusing on the theoretical and practical application of research skills. This will equip the individual manager with the ability to conduct research-based public relations programs and the knowledge of why these skills are so important in the organization (and how they should be used). Finally, with this knowledge in hand,

public relations professionals can act as ambassadors to the profession in their organizations. This can be done by taking advantage of any opportunities to provide research-based programs, which in turn can influence the dominant coalition's views on public relations and how it can help the organization cope with its environment.

#### International Public Relations Programs

Results of this project indicate that public relations programs communicating with publics from more than one country can and should share the following common principles. They should use research to create two-way communication with publics. The relationships with these publics should feature collaborative advocacy, in which practitioners listen as well as argue. Practitioners should also treat these publics ethically.

#### The Use of the Internet as a Research Tool

As outlined in my discussion of the theoretical implications of my results, the Internet offers the academic a tool to reduce the costs and time involved in conducting a survey, especially when investigating questions among geographically dispersed populations. The same advantages hold true for practitioners, whether they are hoping to conduct a survey of stakeholder throughout the United States or throughout the world.

Online surveys offer more possibilities for the practitioner. They can go beyond a simple reproduction of a paper-and-pencil survey as this project was, and take advantage of the interactivity inherent in their technology. For instance, online surveys can include features allowing them to be passed from one individual to many others with a click of a mouse. Also, they can be much more individualized, with specific questions being prompted by a participant's answer to a previous question.

Other possibilities include measuring the latency of responses to specific items, allowing participants to instantly send questions to the researcher, mimicking eye tracking via a mouse pointer, and directing participants to online chat room focus groups based upon their answers. It may sound like a cliché, but the possibilities of this technology are truly endless.

### Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, this study's chosen methodology, survey research, collected interesting and useful data to further develop the Excellence study. However, this methodology lacked flexibility and sacrificed depth. For instance, I found that involvement of public relations in strategic management is strongly valued; but I was not able to examine why some programs are involved in strategic management while others are not. Perhaps more importantly, this methodology did not allow me to explore how these principles of excellence may be applied differently in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda.

Secondarily, the low average response rate of 16% and the primary online survey mode through which most data were collected raises questions about the population to which these results can be generalized. The population of this project was members of professional public relations associations in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda. Presumably, public relations professionals who become members of such organizations would be more committed to the profession and pursue educational activities more often than their counterparts who are not members.

Additionally, this response rate is problematic because I was attempting to conduct a census of membership. Because I did not receive a full response from invitees, this study's data may not have been drawn from a representative sample. It



was likely that participants were much different from non-responsive members. Unfortunately, since this was not a random sample this potential bias can not be measured. It should also be pointed out that most census projects don't achieve a 100% response rate.

Also, members of these organizations who participated in the online survey were probably more familiar and comfortable with using computers and the Internet than those who did not. These participants probably are also more apt to stay abreast of the latest research, news, and techniques concerning public relations practice and are likely to possess greater knowledge in the area of strategic management and research-based activities than other members. Thus, participants in this study probably exhibit a greater knowledge for all public relations activities than the general practitioner in these countries.

Finally, although the ethical-unethical dimension of public relations behavior was one of eight variables to comprise the Excellence index in this study, it demonstrated the lowest correlation. This may be explained by one of two possibilities. The first is that ethics may be too culturally bound to be a universal principle of excellence. The second possible explanation may be that the scale I used to measure ethics needs to be developed further. L. Grunig et. al (2002) identified the lack of research into ethics in public relations as one of the four crucial gaps in the profession's body of knowledge. After all, there was no measure of ethics in the original Excellence study, and this thesis project is only among a handful of studies (Huang, 1997; Rhee, 1999; Sha, 1999) that have attempted to measure this as a factor in public relations excellence. However, it is important to note that all of these studies

found ethics to be a contributing factor to excellent public relations. Obviously, this topic needs further research as well as several I mention in the following section.

### Suggestions for Future Research

#### Examining the Specific Applications of the Generic Principles of Excellence

This study suggests that the generic principles of excellence were valued in Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda, producing a factor of excellence nearly identical in composition and reliability as replications of the Excellence study in Slovenia and Korea. However, this study did not focus on examining the specific applications of these principles. To a lesser extent, the same could be said of Rhee's (1999) study. The next step in continuing to develop this global theory of public relations excellence is further research into how these principles are being applied differently from country to country. Hand in hand with this, additional research is needed to construct and refine measures or procedures that can be used to further examine these specific applications in other countries.

Research into the specific applications will also aid theory-building on the subject of managing the public relations function of organizations with multinational publics and operations (Grammer, 2000; Molleda, 2000; Wakefield, 1997; 2000b; 2001). Further research in this field would answer basic questions such as how symmetrical communication can be enacted in China with its government-produced media outlets or to communicate with vital publics in the Middle East whom are wary of messages from the United States and European countries. This topic has been somewhat neglected, but it is becoming imperative as all practice is increasingly becoming international. Thus, investigation into specific applications of the

Excellence principles, especially focusing on the dynamic environment faced by multinational public relations functions, is needed to fill this gap.

#### Theoretical Dimensions of Public Relations Behavior

Although results of this research project suggest the validity of the theoretical dimensions of public relations behavior, they also suggest that more research is needed to refine it further. Additional research is needed to further explore and explain whether these four dimensions are continuums or should be split into separate, independent concepts.

#### Coping With Activism in Rapidly Changing Countries

Similar to results in Slovenia (L. Grunig et al., 1998), practitioners in Uganda face activism at about the same level as practitioners in the Excellence study. However because activism was a relatively new phenomenon in Slovenia as the country moved away from socialism, even excellent public relations programs had a hard time learning to deal with it. This is very likely the case with practitioners from Uganda, who face activism in what was just recently a totalitarian dictatorship. Additionally, L. Grunig et al. (2002) posited that of the six specific variables that affect the application of the generic principles, the level of activism receives the least attention from practitioners; yet it may be the most important. Thus, further research into this topic will have significant practical and theoretical applications for international public relations.

#### Increasing Online Survey Response Rates

As outlined in Chapter 3, mail surveys generally achieve a response rate between 10% and 40%. The response rates in this survey fell toward the lower end of the spectrum with the online mode (16%) and the surface-mail mode (12%) showing

very similar rates. Because people generally change their e-mail address quite more often than their physical mailing address, I had followed pre-established guidelines to increase response to the online survey. I sent a pre-notification e-mail to participants (Fox, Crask, & Kim, 1989) and sent follow-up e-mail reminders to non-respondents to the link of the Web-based questionnaire (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). Considering the many advantages the online survey mode offers to researchers, more research is needed to investigate measures that can be taken to elicit a higher response rate for such methodology.

### Conclusion

Although the Excellence study began 20 years ago and has forever changed research in public relations, it continues to evolve and mature into a global theory to fit today's professional landscape in which virtually all practice takes place in some international context. This research reinforces the theory that the principles of excellence determine the value of public relations to an organization regardless of political boundaries and cultural barriers. More specifically, this project has reiterated the value of the involvement of public relations in the strategic management of an organization and of research-based, two-way practices in a diverse assortment of countries: Australia, Italy, Mauritius, and Uganda. This study's should also contribute to the emerging theoretical dimensions that underlie the models of public relations.

## Appendix A

### E-mail Cover Letter for Web-Based Questionnaire

[month, day], [year]

Dear [Mr./Ms.] [participant's last name]:

I am a M.A. student in the Communication Department at the University of Maryland. I am conducting a study exploring current public relations practices around the world as part of my thesis. The research findings will in turn help both practitioners' and academics' understanding of the field in your country. Your respondent ID is [###].

This questionnaire is a part of the study undertaken by the researcher, a graduate student at the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland. Your participation is of vital importance to the completion of this study. Please take approximately 10-15 minutes from your busy schedule to read and fill in your respondent ID to complete the consent form on the following Web page:

([http://www.glue.umd.edu/~egrammer/\[association acronym\]SurveyIntro.htm](http://www.glue.umd.edu/~egrammer/[association acronym]SurveyIntro.htm)). Then click on the link to the questionnaire on the consent form page and complete it. When finished, please hit the submit button on the questionnaire page. The responses you give will serve as invaluable information for my research.

The results will be used for academic purposes only and all responses will remain strictly confidential. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer. To maintain your confidentiality, your name, respondent ID, and e-mail address will be kept separate from the collected questionnaires. No special identifiers, such as your name will be used in analyzing and reporting data.

As a token of my appreciation, an executive summary of the results will be given to you, upon completion of the study. I truly believe it will serve as a useful reference and be of interest to you.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by email: [ericgrammer@hotmail.com](mailto:ericgrammer@hotmail.com), or by phone: 301-617-0095. You can also contact my advisor, Dr. Larissa Grunig, by e-mail: [lg32@umail.umd.edu](mailto:lg32@umail.umd.edu), or by phone: 301-405-6532. We will be happy to talk with you.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Sincerely,  
Eric Grammer  
University of Maryland  
Department of

Communication

The [association name and acronym] endorses this study.

[title and association name]  
[officer name]

Please click on the following link to begin the survey. You may also cut and paste the link into your Internet browser:

[http://www.glue.umd.edu/~egrammer/\[association acronym\]SurveyIntro.htm](http://www.glue.umd.edu/~egrammer/[association acronym]SurveyIntro.htm)

## Appendix B

### Web-based Questionnaire

RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

**This series of questions asks about your relationship, as member of a public relations department, to senior management. Please check one answer for each question unless otherwise specified. (Simply place the arrow over the selected bubble and click.)**

1. Does your public relations department report directly to the most senior manager in your company?

☐ Yes (Go to Q4) ☐ No

2. (If your answer to Q1 was no) Does an indirect reporting relationship exist, then, from the public relations department to the most senior manager (for example, in which the department reports directly on some matters but not all?)

☐ Yes (Go to Q4) ☐ No

3. (If there is no direct or indirect reporting relationship to the senior manager)  
Does the department then report to:

a. A senior manager who in turn reports to the most senior manager? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. A more junior level of management? ☐ Yes ☐ No

**The next set of questions (4-5) are about the different functions and activities that public relations departments *could be* involved in. Please enter a number from 1 to 5 to the extent you agree that each item describes what your public relations department does. A score of 1 means that you strongly disagree with the statement and 2 means that you somewhat disagree with the statement. 3 means that you have a neutral stance, 4 means that you somewhat agree with the statement, and 5 means that you strongly agree with the statement.**

4. To what extent does your public relations department contribute to strategic management of your organization? (If your department makes no contribution to strategic planning and decision making, go to Q6.) (Simply place the arrow over the selected bubble and click.)

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

We contribute to strategic planning..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

We contribute in responding to major social issues ..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

We contribute in major initiatives (e.g., acquisitions, major new programs, movements into new markets, launches of new products or services) ..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

We contribute in routine operations (e.g., development and maintenance of employee communication, community relations, or media relations programs)..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

5. Please use the scale below to estimate to what extent your department makes its contribution to strategic planning and decision making through each of the following activities. **(Simply place the arrow over the selected bubble and click.)**

1	2	3	4	5
No Contribution	Low Contribution	Moderate Contribution	High Contribution	Highest Contribution

We contribute in responding to major social issues ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Regularly conducted and routine research activities ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Specific research conducted to answer specific questions..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Formal approaches to gathering information for use in decision making other than research..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Informal approaches to gathering information ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Judgment based on experience ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Other:  ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

6. Today's organizations are so complex that many of them require more than a single leader to operate effectively. Instead of a single person, then, many organizations are controlled by a group of powerful people -- often called the "dominant coalition." In your organization, who is represented in the power elite? (Please place the arrow and click for **ALL** that apply).

a. The chief executive officer ☐

b. The chief financial officer ☐

c. The chief operating officer ☐

d. The head of public relations, public affairs, or communication ☐

e. Other:

7. Now please indicate the extent to which you believe that the "dominant coalition" or power elite you just have identified supports the public relations or communication function in this organization.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

No Support	Low Support	Moderate (neither high nor low)	Very High Support	Very High Support
------------	-------------	------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

In my organization the level of support is ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8. Now think about the value that your public relations or communication department has to this organization in terms of a cost-benefit ratio. Think of the money that your organization budgets for your department each year - both for the department itself and for outside public relations consulting firms. Then estimate the value of the department to the organization as a percentage of the department's budget. A percentage less than 100% would indicate that you think the department provides benefits worth less than the amount budgeted. 100% would indicate that the benefits equal costs. A percentage greater than 100% would indicate that the benefits are worth more than the amount budgeted. Estimate what you think the percentage is and what you think members of the dominant coalition would estimate the percentage to be.

a. Your estimate:  %

b. What you think the estimate of the dominant coalition would be:  %

9. Using the following scale, please choose a number that indicates how much you agree or disagree that the statement describes the way public relations is practiced in your organization. **YOUR RESPONSE SHOULD SHOW HOW PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTUALLY IS PRACTICED, NOT THE WAY YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE PRACTICED.**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

We take into account the effects of the public relations activities or communication activities on the public ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

The information we provide is factual..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

We consider the interests of the public as much as organizational interests..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

We explain our motivations or why we do things to the public ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

In our public relations, we believe that favorable information should be disseminated but unfavorable information should be kept from the public..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

When doing programs or projects, we avoid disclosing negative information about our organization/company ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

We believe the role of public relations is to promote the interests of the organization even if the organization's decisions have negative effects on the publics ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

We try to avoid dialogue with the public when the organization makes unpopular decisions..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐



We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and/or product awareness .....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We not only try to change the attitudes and behaviors of members Of the public, but also try to change our attitudes and behaviors.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before making final decisions or adopting policies, we seek the opinions of those groups or individuals that will be affected by the decision or policy.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We believe public relations should provide mediation for the organization – to help management and publics negotiate conflict.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We conduct programs or projects to persuade publics to agree with the organization’s point of view .....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We consider the opinions of members of the public and try to change our behaviors and policies.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In conducting public relations, we try to provide only information that will help the public to see the organization more favorably .....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We explain our motivations or why we do things to the public .....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In our public relations, we believe that favorable information should be disseminated but unfavorable information should be kept from the public.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When doing programs or projects, we avoid disclosing negative information about our organization/company .....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We believe the role of public relations is to promote the interests of the organization even if the organization’s decisions have negative effects on the publics .....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We try to avoid dialogue with the public when the organization makes unpopular decisions.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and/or product awareness .....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We not only try to change the attitudes and behaviors of members of the public, but also try to change our attitudes and behaviors.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before making final decisions or adopting policies, we seek the opinions of those groups or individuals that will be affected by the decision or policy.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We believe public relations should provide mediation for the organization – to help management and publics negotiate conflict.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We conduct programs or projects to persuade publics to agree with the organization’s point of view .....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We consider the opinions of members of the public and try to change our behaviors and policies.....	1	2	3	4	5
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In conducting public relations, we try to provide only information	1	2	3	4	5

that will help the public to see the organization more favorably .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
Product publicity is a primary goal .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We listen to the opinions of publics .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We conduct programs or projects to persuade publics to behave as the organization wants them to behave .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We support marketing campaigns .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
Before carrying out public relations or communication activities, we first conduct research to understand how the public feels about certain issues .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
After conducting public relations or communication activities, we conduct evaluations of these activities.....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
Public relations programs in this organization involve two-way communication between the organization and publics.....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We speak more than we listen in public relations .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
Public relations programs in this organization involve one-way communication - from the organization to publics.....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
Information flows out from this organization but not into it .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
Most public relations programs in this organization are designed to disseminate information to the publics.....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We distribute news releases .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We identify consumer needs .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We use advertisements .....	○	○	○	○	○
We distribute flyers, pamphlets, magazines, or other printed materials that present the company .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We stage events, tours, open houses .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We use mass media, such as television, radio, broadcasts, newspapers or magazines .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We hold news conferences .....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5
We offer information and news briefings.....	○	○	○	○	○
	1	2	3	4	5

We communicate in person with the public .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We participate in sales promotion as a central task.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We use face-to-face communication .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We make informal contact with the public.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We hold banquets .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We offer party favors or memorabilia .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We offer valuable gifts .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We contact government offices in person .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We attend meetings .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
We give speeches .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. The next series of items list tasks requiring special expertise or knowledge that is available in some public relations or communication departments but not in others. How would you rate the expertise or knowledge of you or someone in your department to perform each task listed?

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Fair	Neutral	Good	Excellent

Determine how publics react to the organization .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Coordinate a press conference or arrange media coverage of an event.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Get publics to behave as your organization wants.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Negotiate with an activist group.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Manage people .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1 2 3 4 5

Conduct evaluation research .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Produce publications .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Convince a reporter to publicize your organization .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Use theories of conflict resolution in dealing with publics .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Write an advertisement.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Take photographs .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Understand the news values of journalists .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Get your organization's name into the media .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Write speeches.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Fair	Neutral	Good	Excellent

Keep bad publicity out of the media	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Develop goals and objectives for your department .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Produce audio/visual (graphics, slide shows, videos, radio spots) .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Prepare a departmental budget .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Use attitude theory in a campaign .....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Manipulate publics scientifically.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Get maximum publicity from a staged event.....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5
Perform environmental scanning (scanning the organization's environment for publics affected by the organization's behaviors).....	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1	2	3	4	5

Write news releases and feature articles..... ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Develop strategies for solving public relations  
and communication problems ..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Prepare news stories that reporters will use..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Help management to understand the opinion of particular publics ..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Use research to segment publics..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Manage the organization's response to issues..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Perform as journalists inside your organization ..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Persuade a public that your organization is right on an issue ..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

11. Does your organization have two separate units, one for marketing-related public relations and another for public affairs (public policy)?

☐ Yes ☐ No (Go to Q14)

12. Which unit has the larger budget?

- ☐ Marketing-related public relations  
☐ Public Affairs  
☐ Budgets are approximately the same

13. This series of questions measures your department's relationship with marketing.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

We are in charge of tasks and responsibilities distinct from the marketing department..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

We share resources with the marketing department ..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

We compete for resources with the marketing department ..... ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Does the public relations department report to a manager from the marketing department?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

Does the marketing department report to a manager from the public relations department?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

Does the public relations department report to a department other than public relations or marketing, such as human resources?

☐ Yes ☐ No

14. Regardless of whether you have separate units, which function - public affairs or marketing related public relations - receives more support from senior administrators in the dominant coalition?

- ☐ Marketing-related public relations or do not have public affairs
- ☐ Public affairs or do not have marketing-related public relations
- ☐ Approximately equal support

**The next series of questions (15-16) asks about the environment of your organization and about some of its internal policies.**

15. Has your organization experienced pressure from activist groups?

☐ Yes ☐ No (Go to Q17)

16. Think of the most recent case or a typical case when your organization was pressured by an activist group and answer the following questions.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all Successful	Fairly Successful	Moderately Successful	Very Successful	Extremely Successful

How successful do you think that activist group was in achieving its goals in its dealings with your organization? 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

How successful do you think the organization's response to the group was? ..... 1 2 3 4 5  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

17. Listed below are several publics for which organizations often have public relations programs. Please indicate whether a program is handled by your public relations department, another department, or is not part of the public relations function in this organization.

Publics	Specific public relations Department	Department other than a public relations department	No program
Media	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Employees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Customers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Government	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Activist/Interest Groups	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Investors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Now please tell us some basic demographic information about you and your organization.**

1. What is your sex?

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

2. Your age? Year of Birth: 19

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- ☐ Less than a high school diploma (or equivalent) **go to Q5**
- ☐ A high school diploma (or equivalent) **go to Q5**
- ☐ Some college (or associate's degree) **go to Q5**
- ☐ A bachelor's degree
- ☐ Some graduate or professional school
- ☐ A profesional, master's or doctoral degree

4. What was your major area?

College:

Graduate school:

5. Why type of organization are you working for?

- ☐ Corporation (non-pr/ad company)
- ☐ Office/Affiliate of a multinational corporation
- ☐ Non-governmental or non-profit organization
- ☐ Office/Affiliate of multinational NGO
- ☐ Government agency
- ☐ Advertising agency
- ☐ Public relations firm
- ☐ Office/Affiliate of multinational public relations firm
- ☐ Other (please specify):

6. What is the name of your department and your position?

7. Approximately, how many public relations practitioners are in your department?

8. Approximately, how many people are employed by your organization overall?

9. How long have your worked in your current job?

year(s)  month(s)

10. Have you previously worked as a journalist?

☐ Yes ☐ No

11. How long have you worked in the field of public relations?

year(s)  month(s)

12. If you had advertising experience, how long have you worked in advertising?

year(s)  month(s)

**Thank you for participating in this study. Please hit the submit button below to complete the survey.**

**Submit**



## Appendix C

### Surface-mail Questionnaire

**This series of questions asks about your relationship, as head of a public relations department, to senior management. If you consult client organizations, please answer according to your relationship with senior management within these organizations. Please check one answer for each question unless otherwise specified.**

1. Does your public relations department report directly to the most senior manager in your company?  
  
Yes (Go to Q4)      No
2. **(If your answer to Q1 was no)** Does an indirect reporting relationship exist, then, from the public relations department to the most senior manager (for example, in which the department reports directly on some matters but not all?)  
  
Yes (Go to Q4)      No
3. **(If there is no direct or indirect reporting relationship to the senior manager)**  
Does the department then report to:  

Yes      No

  - a. A senior manager who in turn reports to the most senior manager?
  - b. A more junior level of management

**The next set of questions (4-5) are about the different functions and activities that public relations departments could be involved in. Please circle a number from 1 to 5 to the extent you agree that each item describes what your public relations department does. A score of 1 means that you strongly disagree with the statement and 2 means that you somewhat disagree with the statement. 3 means that you have a neutral stance, 4 means that you somewhat agree with the statement, and 5 means that you strongly agree with the statement.**

4. To what extent does your public relations department contribute to strategic management of your organization or client organization? **(If your department makes no contribution to strategic planning and decision making, go to Q6.)**

1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

We contribute to strategic planning .....1 2 3 4 5

We contribute in responding to major social issues .....1 2 3 4 5

We contribute in major initiatives (e.g., acquisitions, major new programs, movements into new markets, launches of new products or services) .....1 2 3 4 5

We contribute in routine operations (e.g., development and maintenance of employee communication, community relations, or media relations programs).....1 2 3 4 5

5. Please use the scale below to estimate to what extent your department makes its contribution to strategic planning and decision making through each of the following activities.

1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....
Not at all Contribute	Low Contribution	Moderate Contribution	High Contribution	Highest Contribution

Regularly conducted and routine research activities .....1 2 3 4 5

Specific research conducted to answer specific questions .....1 2 3 4 5

Formal approaches to gathering information for use in  
decision making other than research .....1 2 3 4 5

Informal approaches to gathering information .....1 2 3 4 5

Contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization .....1 2 3 4 5

Judgment based on experience .....1 2 3 4 5

Other .....1 2 3 4 5

6. Today's organizations are so complex that many of them require more than a single leader to operate effectively. Instead of a single person, then, many organizations are controlled by a group of powerful people – often called the “dominant coalition.” In your organization or client organizations, who is represented in this power elite? (Please Check **ALL** that apply)

a. The chief executive officer.....

b. The chief financial officer.....

c. The chief operating officer.....

d. The head of public relations, public affairs, or communication.....

Other (Specify):.....

7. Now please indicate the extent to which you believe that the “dominant coalition” or power elite you just have identified supports the public relations or communication function in this organization.

1.....	2.....	3.....	4.....	5.....
No Support	Low Support	Moderate (neither high nor low)	Somewhat High	Very High

In my organization, the level of support is.....1 2 3 4 5

8. Now think about the value that your public relations or communication department has to this organization(s) in terms of a cost-benefit ratio. Think of the money that your organization budgets for your department each year – both for the department itself and for outside public relations consulting firms. Then estimate the value of the department to the organization as a percentage of the department's budget. A percentage less than 100% would indicate that you think the department provides benefits worth less than the amount budgeted. 100% would indicate that the benefits equal costs. A percentage greater than 100% would indicate that the benefits are worth more than the amount budgeted. Estimate what you think the percentage is and what you think members of the dominant coalition would estimate the percentage to be

a. Your estimate: \_\_\_\_\_%

b. What you think the estimate of the dominant coalition would be: \_\_\_\_\_%

9. Using the following scale, please choose a number that indicates how much you agree or disagree that the statement describes the way public relations is practiced in your organization. **YOUR RESPONSE SHOULD SHOW HOW PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTUALLY IS PRACTICED, NOT THE WAY YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE PRACTICED.**

<b>1</b> .....	<b>2</b> .....	<b>3</b> .....	<b>4</b> .....	<b>5</b> .....
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

We take into account the effects of the public relations activities or communication activities on the public .....1 2 3 4 5

The information we provide is factual .....1 2 3 4 5

We consider the interests of the public as much as organizational interests .....1 2 3 4 5

We explain our motivations or why we do things to the public .....1 2 3 4 5

In our public relations, we believe that favorable information should be disseminate but unfavorable information should be kept from the public .....1 2 3 4 5

When doing programs or projects, we avoid disclosing negative information about our organization/company .....1 2 3 4 5

We believe the role of public relations is to promote the interests of the organization even if the organization's decisions have negative affects on the publics.....1 2 3 4 5

We try to avoid dialogue with the public when the organization makes unpopular decisions.....1 2 3 4 5

We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and or product awareness .....1 2 3 4 5

We not only try to change the attitudes and behaviors of members of the public, but also try to change out attitudes and behaviors.....1 2 3 4 5

Before making final decisions or adopting policies, we seek the opinions of those groups or individuals that will be affected by the decision or policy .....1 2 3 4 5

We believe public relations should provide mediation for the organization – to help management and publics negotiate conflict.....1 2 3 4 5

We do programs or projects to persuade publics to agree with the organization's point of view.....1 2 3 4 5

We consider the opinions of members of the public and try to change our behaviors and policies.....1 2 3 4 5

In doing public relations, we try to provide only information that will help the public to see the organization more favorably.....1 2 3 4 5

Product publicity is a primary goal .....1 2 3 4 5

We listen to the opinions of publics .....1 2 3 4 5

<b>1.....</b>	<b>2.....</b>	<b>3.....</b>	<b>4.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

We do programs or projects to persuade publics to behave as the organization wants them to behave .....	1	2	3	4	5
We support marketing campaigns .....	1	2	3	4	5
Before carrying out public relations or communication activities, we first conduct research to understand how the public feels about certain issues .....	1	2	3	4	5
After conducting public relations or communication activities, we conduct evaluations of these activities .....	1	2	3	4	5
Public relations programs in this organization involve two-way communication between the organization and publics.....	1	2	3	4	5
We speak more than we listen in public relations .....	1	2	3	4	5
Public relations programs in this organization involve one-way communication – from the organization to publics .....	1	2	3	4	5
Information flows out from this organization but not into it .....	1	2	3	4	5
Most public relations programs in this organization are designed to disseminate information to the publics.....	1	2	3	4	5
We distribute news releases .....	1	2	3	4	5
We identify consumer needs .....	1	2	3	4	5
We use advertisements .....	1	2	3	4	5
We distribute flyers, pamphlets, magazines, or other printed materials that present the company .....	1	2	3	4	5
We stage events, tours, open houses .....	1	2	3	4	5
We use mass media, such as television, radio, broadcasts, newspapers or magazines .....	1	2	3	4	5
We hold news conferences .....	1	2	3	4	5
We offer information and news briefings.....	1	2	3	4	5
We communicate in person with the public .....	1	2	3	4	5
We participate in sales promotion as a central task.....	1	2	3	4	5
We use face-to-face communication .....	1	2	3	4	5
We make informal contact with the public.....	1	2	3	4	5
We hold banquets .....	1	2	3	4	5

- We offer party favors or memorabilia.....1 2 3 4 5
- We offer valuable gifts.....1 2 3 4 5
- We contact government offices in person .....1 2 3 4 5
- We attend meetings .....1 2 3 4 5
- We give speeches .....1 2 3 4 5
10. The next series of items list tasks requiring special expertise or knowledge that is available in some public relations or communication departments but not in others. How would you rate the expertise or knowledge of you or someone in your department or firm to perform each task listed?

<b>1.....</b>	<b>2.....</b>	<b>3.....</b>	<b>4.....</b>	<b>5.....</b>
Poor	Fair	Neutral	Good	Excellent

- Determine how publics react to the organization .....1 2 3 4 5
- Coordinate a press conference or arrange media coverage of an event.....1 2 3 4 5
- Get publics to behave as your organization wants .....1 2 3 4 5
- Negotiate with an activist group.....1 2 3 4 5
- Manage people .....1 2 3 4 5
- Conduct evaluation research .....1 2 3 4 5
- Provide objective information about your organization .....1 2 3 4 5
- Produce publications .....1 2 3 4 5
- Convince a reporter to publicize your organization .....1 2 3 4 5
- Use theories of conflict resolution in dealing with publics .....1 2 3 4 5
- Write an advertisement.....1 2 3 4 5
- Take photographs .....1 2 3 4 5
- Understand the news values of journalists .....1 2 3 4 5
- Get your organization's name into the media.....1 2 3 4 5
- Write speeches .....1 2 3 4 5
- Keep bad publicity out of the media .....1 2 3 4 5
- Develop goals and objectives for your department .....1 2 3 4 5
- Produce audio/visual (graphics, slide shows, videos, radio spots) .....1 2 3 4 5
- Prepare a departmental budget .....1 2 3 4 5
- Use attitude theory in a campaign .....1 2 3 4 5

<b>1.....</b>	<b>2.....</b>	<b>3.....</b>	<b>4.....</b>	<b>5.....</b>
Poor	Fair	Neutral	Good	Excellent

- Manipulate publics scientifically.....1 2 3 4 5
- Get maximum publicity from a staged event .....1 2 3 4 5
- Perform environmental scanning.....1 2 3 4 5
- Write news releases and feature articles.....1 2 3 4 5
- Develop strategies for solving public relations .....1 2 3 4 5
- Prepare news stories that reporters will use .....1 2 3 4 5
- Help management to understand the opinion of particular publics .....1 2 3 4 5
- Use research to segment publics .....1 2 3 4 5
- Manage the organization's response to issues.....1 2 3 4 5
- Perform as journalists inside your organization .....1 2 3 4 5
- Persuade a public that your organization is right on an issue .....1 2 3 4 5
11. Does your organization have two separate units, one for marketing-related public relations and another for public affairs (public policy)?  
☐ Yes  
☐ No (Go to Question 17)
12. Which unit has the larger budget?  
☐ Marketing-related public relations.  
☐ Public affairs.  
☐ Budgets are approximately the same.
13. This series of questions measures your department's relationship with marketing

<b>1.....</b>	<b>2.....</b>	<b>3.....</b>	<b>4.....</b>	<b>5.....</b>
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

- We measure the success of our campaigns in terms of sales and or product awareness .....1 2 3 4 5
- Product publicity is a primary goal .....1 2 3 4 5
- Our department supports marketing campaigns .....1 2 3 4 5
- We identify consumer needs .....1 2 3 4 5
- We participate in sales promotion as a central task.....1 2 3 4 5
- We are in charge of tasks and responsibilities distinct from the marketing function .....1 2 3 4 5

We share resources with the marketing department .....1 2 3 4 5

We compete for resources with the marketing department .....1 2 3 4 5

Does the public relations department report to a manager from the marketing department?

Yes No

Does the marketing department report to a manager from the public relations department?

Yes No

Does the public relations department report to a department other than public relations or marketing, such as human resources?

Yes No

14. Regardless of whether you have separate units, which function – public affairs or marketing-related public relations – receives more support from senior administrators – the dominant coalition?

\_\_\_\_\_ Marketing-related public relations or do not have public affairs.

\_\_\_\_\_ Public affairs or do not have marketing-related public relations.

\_\_\_\_\_ Approximately equal support.

**The next series of questions (12-13) asks about the environment of your organization or client organizations and about some of their internal policies.**

15. Has your organization experienced pressure from activist groups?

Yes (Go to Q 13) No

16. Think of the most recent case or a typical case when your organization was pressured by an activist group and answer the following questions.

<b>1.....</b>	<b>2.....</b>	<b>3.....</b>	<b>4.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Not at all	Fairly	Moderately	Very	Extremely
Successful	Successful	Successful	Successful	Successful

How do you think that activist group was successful in achieving its goals in its dealings with your organization? .....1 2 3 4 5

How successful do you think the organization's response to the group was? .....1 2 3 4 5

17. Listed below are several publics for which organizations often have public relations programs. Please Indicate whether a program is handled by your public relations department, another department, or is not part of the public relations function in this organization.

<u>Publics</u>	<u>Specific public relations department</u>	<u>Department other than a public relations department</u>	<u>No program</u>
Media .....			
Employees .....			
Community.....			
Customers.....			
Government.....			
Activist/interest Groups.....			
Students .....			
Investors .....			
Other .....			

**Now please tell us some basic demographic information about you and your organization**

1. What is your sex?

Male .....

Female.....

2. Your age? Year of Birth: 19\_\_\_\_

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Less than a high school diploma (or equivalent).....

A high school diploma (or equivalent).....

Some college (or Associate's Degree) .....

A bachelor's degree.....

Some graduate or professional school.....

A professional, master's or doctoral degree .....

4. What was your major area?

College:\_\_\_\_\_

Graduate school:\_\_\_\_\_



5. What type of organization are you working for
- Corporation (non-pr/ad company).....
- Office/Affiliate of a multinational corporations.....
- Non-governmental or non-profit organization .....
- Office/Affiliate of multinational NGO.....
- Governmental agency.....
- Advertising agency.....
- PR firm.....
- Office/Affiliate of multinational PR firm.....
- Other (Specify):\_\_\_\_\_
6. What is the name of your department and your position?\_\_\_\_\_
7. Approximately, how many public relations practitioners are in your department?
- \_\_\_\_\_
8. Approximately, how many people are employed by your overall organization?
- \_\_\_\_\_
9. How many year have you work in your current job? \_\_\_\_\_year(s) \_\_\_\_\_month(s)
10. Have you had previously worked as a journalist? Yes No
11. How long have you worked in the field of public relations? \_\_\_\_\_year(s) \_\_\_\_\_month(s)
12. If you had advertising experience, how long have you worked in advertising?
- \_\_\_\_\_year(s)\_\_\_\_\_month(s)

## Appendix D

### Cover Letter for Surface-Mail Questionnaire

**[month date], [year]**

Dear **[Mr./Ms.] [last name]**:

I am an M.A. student in the Communication Department at the University of Maryland. I am conducting a study exploring current public relations practices around the world as part of my thesis. The research findings will in turn help both practitioners' and academics' understanding of the field in your country.

This questionnaire is a part of the study undertaken by the researcher, a graduate student in the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland. Your participation is of vital importance to the completion of this study. Please take approximately 10-15 minutes from your busy schedule to fill out the questionnaire. The responses you give will serve as invaluable information for my research.

The results will be used for academic purposes only and all responses will remain strictly confidential. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer. To maintain your confidentiality, this informed consent form will be kept separate from the collected questionnaires. No special identifiers, such as your name, will be used in analyzing and reporting data.

As a token of my appreciation, an executive summary of the results will be given to you, upon completion of the study. I truly believe it will serve as a useful reference and be of interest to you.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by email: [ericgrammer@hotmail.com](mailto:ericgrammer@hotmail.com), or by phone: 301-617-0095. You can also contact my advisor, Dr. Larissa Grunig, by email: [lg32@umail.umd.edu](mailto:lg32@umail.umd.edu), or by phone: 301-405-6532. We will be happy to talk with you.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Sincerely,

Eric Grammer  
University of Maryland

The **[association name]** endorses this study.

**[image of association officer signature]**

**[association officer name]**  
**[title], [association]**

## Appendix E

### E-mail Prenotice to Web-based Questionnaire

Dear **[Mr./Ms.] [last name of participant]**,

In 1987 the most comprehensive and exhaustive study of public relations ever conducted began with a \$400,000 grant from the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC). Known as the Excellence study, research was conducted in three nations by 15 international scholars. The study's findings revealed the characteristics of public relations departments that best contribute to an organization's overall growth and survival.

The findings not only revealed how public relations departments can contribute to organizational effectiveness, but also revealed the current state of practice in the countries – Canada, the United States and United Kingdom. However, it has become evident that there is limited information concerning the nature of practice and the applicability of this theory outside of these nations. Conducting research in your country is an initial step in filling this gap in the body of knowledge concerning public relations.

Within the next couple of days we will be sending you a brief survey at this same e-mail address. We would greatly appreciate it if you could take a few moments to complete it. By doing so you will help ensure we get a clearer picture of public relations practice around the world and help build a theoretical framework applicable to practice worldwide

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Eric Grammer  
University of Maryland, College Park

**[Name of the president of professional organization]**  
**[Title and organization name]**

## Appendix F

### E-mail Reminder

**[month day], [year]**

Dear **[Mr./Ms.] [participant's last name]**,

A week ago you should have received an email with an Internet link to a Web-based questionnaire from the University of Maryland. It was sent to you as part of a study called "Testing the Generic Principles of Public Relations Excellence Worldwide." This is part of my thesis which, when completed, will allow by to earn my master's degree.

As of today, I have not received a completed survey from you. I realize that you have a very busy schedule. However, we have contacted you and others now in hopes of obtaining the insights only members of the **[name of the association]** like you can provide. As I mentioned before, answers are confidential. In case the previous questionnaire has been deleted from your e-mail account, I have included it again. Your participation is very important to the success of my efforts.

There are three ways you can respond:

1. Please take approximately 10-15 minutes from your busy schedule to read and fill in your respondent ID to complete the consent form on the following Web page: ([http://www.glue.umd.edu/~egrammer/\[association acronym\]SurveyIntro.htm](http://www.glue.umd.edu/~egrammer/[association acronym]SurveyIntro.htm)). Your respondent ID is **[###]** Then click on the link to the questionnaire on the consent form page and complete it.
2. Print this message and return it via surface mail to  
Eric Grammer  
2130 Skinner Bldg.  
Department of Communication  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland 20742
3. Print this message and fax it to **[fax number]**

Should you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at 301-617-0095, or by e-mail at [ericgrammer@hotmail.com](mailto:ericgrammer@hotmail.com). Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,  
Eric Grammer

## Appendix G

### Letter of Informed Consent for Surface-mail Questionnaire

#### INFORMED CONSENT FORM

<b>Identification of Project</b>	Are the IABC's principles of communication effectiveness generic worldwide?
<b>Statement of Age of Participant (parental consent needed for minors)</b>	I state that I am over 18 years of age, in good physical health, and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Larissa A. Grunig and Eric M. Grammer in the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.
<b>Purpose</b>	The purpose of the research is to investigate the characteristics of public relations practice around the world.
<b>Procedures</b>	The procedures involve reading and filling out questions about my professional practice. I understand my participation will require approximately 15 minutes.
<b>Confidentiality</b>	All information collected in the study will remain confidential, and my name will not be identified at any time. The data I provide will not be linked to my name and, furthermore, will be grouped with data others provide for reporting and presentation.
<b>Risks</b>	I understand that there are no foreseeable personal risks associated with my participation.
<b>Benefits</b>	I understand that the questionnaire is not designed to help me personally, but that the investigators hope to learn more about the nature of public relations practice worldwide.
<b>Freedom to withdraw and to ask questions</b>	I understand that I am free to ask questions and /or to withdraw at any time without penalty
<b>Name, Address, Phone Number of Principal Investigator</b>	Larissa A. Grunig Department of Communication, 2130 Skinner Building University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-7635 Phone: 301-405-6532; E-mail: lg32@umail.edu
<b>Obtaining a copy of the research results</b>	I understand that I may obtain a copy of the results of this research after August 31 by contacting Eric Grammer (Student Investigator) in the Dept. of Communication, 2130 Skinner Bldg., University of Maryland, College Park, MD USA 20742-7635, 301-617-0095, ericgrammer@hotmail.com.

**Printed Name of Participant** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature of Participant** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix H

### Letter of Informed Consent for Web-Based Questionnaire

**This project was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Maryland, College Park, on 21 December 2000.**

## Welcome to the Survey

### **Identification of Project**

Are the IABC's principles of communication effectiveness generic worldwide?

### **Statement of Age of Participant (parental consent needed for minors)**

I state that I am over 18 years of age, in good physical health, and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Larissa A. Grunig and Eric M. Grammer in the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the research is to investigate the characteristics of public relations practice around the world.

### **Procedures**

The procedures involve reading and filling out questions about my professional practice. I understand my participation will require approximately 25 minutes.

### **Confidentiality**

All information collected in the study will remain confidential, and my name will not be identified at any time. The data I provide will not be linked to my name and, furthermore, will be grouped with data others provide for reporting and presentation.

### **Risks**

I understand that there are no foreseeable personal risks associated with my participation.

### **Benefits**

I understand that the questionnaire is not designed to help me personally, but that the investigators hope to learn more about the nature of public relations practice worldwide.

### **Freedom to withdraw and to ask questions**

I understand that I am free to ask questions and /or to withdrawal any time without penalty.

### **Name, Address, Phone Number of Principal Investigator**

Dr. Larissa A. Grunig  
Department of Communication, 2130 Skinner Building  
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-7635  
Phone: 301-405-6532; E-mail: lg32@umail.umd.edu

### **Obtaining a copy of the research results**

I understand that I may obtain a copy of the results of this research after January 31 by contacting Eric Grammer (Student Investigator) in the Dept. of Communication, 2130 Skinner Bldg., University of Maryland, College Park, MD USA 20742-7635, 301-617-0095, [ericgrammer@hotmail.com](mailto:ericgrammer@hotmail.com).

### **Consent**

I understand that by continuing to the survey and entering my identification number I am indicating my consent to participate in this research.

---

**[Click Here To Continue](#)**

## Bibliography

Adler, N. J. (1983, Fall). A typology of management studies involving culture. Journal of International Business Studies, 29-47.

Al-Enad, A. H. (1992). Values of public relations conduct in Saudi Arabia. Public Relations Review, 18, 213-221.

Ali, D. J. (1995). Societal culture and public relations: A comparative analysis of Trinidad and Antigua, West Indies. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Anderson, D. S. (1992). Identifying and responding to activist publics: A case study. Journal of Public Relations Research, 4(3), 151-165.

Anderson, G. (1989). A global look at public relations. In B. Cantor (Ed.), Experts in action (2nd ed., pp. 412-422). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Angell, R. J. (1990, October). "International PR" a misnomer. Public Relations Journal, 46, 8.

Azen, S. P., Guilder, M., & Hill, M. A. (1989). Estimation of parameters and missing values under a regression model with non-normally distributed and non-randomly incomplete data. Statistics in Medicine, 8, 217-228.

Babbie, E. (1992). The practice of social research (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Banks, S. P. (1995). Multicultural public relations: A socio-interpretive approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1989). Managing across borders: The transnational solution. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Beng, Y. S. (1994). The state of public relations in Singapore. Public Relations Review, 20, 373-394.

Booth-Kewley, S., Edwards, J. E., & Rosenfeld, P. (1992). Impression management, social desirability, and computer administration questionnaires: Does the computer make a difference? Journal of Applied Psychology, 77(4), 562-566.

Botan, C. (1992). International public relations: Critique and reformulation. Public Relations Review, 18(2), 149-159.

Brinkerhoff, D., & Ingle, M. (1989). Integrating blueprint and process: A structured flexibility approach to development management. Public Administration and Development, 9, 487-503.

Bunz, U. K. (1998). An international communications perspective on professional Internet usage: A survey of public relations practitioners' usage of the Internet in Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom with comparisons to the United States. Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Alabama.

Cancel, A. E., Mitrook, M. A., & Cameron, G. T. (1999). Testing the contingency theory of accomodation in public relations. Public Relations Review, 25, 171-197.

Caywood, C. L. (Ed.). (1997). The handbook of strategic public relations and integrated marketing. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chen, N. (1996). Public relations in China: The introduction and development of an occupational field. In H. M. Culbertson & N. Chen (Eds.), International public relations: A comparative analysis (pp. 121-153). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.



Cheney, G. & Christensen, L. T. (2001). Public relations as contested terrain: A critical response. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), Handbook of public relations (pp. 167-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Childers, L. (1989). Credibility of public relations at the NRC. In L. A. Grunig & J. E. Grunig (Eds.), Public relations research annual (Vol. 1, pp. 97-114). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Clark, R. L., & Harrison, C. (2000, May). Impact of notification methods on response rates for Web-based surveys. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Portland, OR.

Clayton, R. L., & Werking, G. S. (1998). Business surveys of the future: The World Wide Web as a data collection methodology. In M. P. Couper, R. P. Baker, J. Bethlehem, C. Z. E. Clark, J. Martin, W. L. Nicholls, & J. M. O'Reilly (Eds.), Computer assisted survey information collection (pp. 1-22). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Coomber, R. (1997a). Using the Internet for survey research. Sociological Research Online, Vol. 2, No. 2, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/2/2.html>

Coomber, R. (1997b). The adulteration of illicit drugs with dangerous substances. Contemporary Drug Problems, 24(2), 239-271.

Coombs, W. T., Holladay, S., Hasenauer, G., & Signitzer, B. (1994). A comparative analysis of international public relations: Identification and interpretation of similarities and differences between professionalization in Austria, Norway, and the United States. Journal of Public Relations Research, 6, 23-39.

- Couper, M. P. (2000). Web surveys: A review of issues and approaches. Public Opinion Quarterly, 64, 464-494.
- Couper, M. P., & Nicholls, W. L. (1998). The history and development of computer assisted survey information collection methods. In M. P. Couper, R. P. Baker, J. Bethlehem, C. Z. E Clark, J. Martin, W. L. Nicholls, & J. M. O'Reilly (Eds.), Computer assisted survey information collection (pp. 1-22). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Culbertson, H. M. (1996). Introduction. In H. M. Culbertson & N. Chen (Eds.), International public relations: A comparative analysis (pp. 1-13). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Culbertson, H. M., & Chen, N. (Eds.). (1996). International public relations: A comparative analysis. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dilenschneider, R. L. (1992). A briefing for leaders: Communication as the ultimate exercise of power. New York: Harper Collins.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Duncan, G. T. (1996). Is my research ethical? Communications of the ACM, 39(12), 67-68.
- Dunn, S. W., Cahil, M. F., & Boddewyn, J. J. (1979). How fifteen transnational corporations manage public affairs. Chicago: Crain Books.
- Ehling, W. P., White, J., & Grunig, J. E. (1992). Public relations and marketing practices. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), Excellence in public relations and communication management (pp. 357-394). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Ekachai, D. (1995). Applying Broom's role scales to Thai public relations practitioners. Public Relations Review, 21, 325-336.
- Elliot, C. M. (1997). Activism on the Internet and its ramifications for public relations. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Epley, J. S. (1992). Public relations in the global village: An American perspective. Public Relations Review, 18(2), 109-116.
- Foster, L. G. (1999). Building global bridges: 1998 Atlas Award lecture on international public relations (International Section monograph). New York: Public Relations Society of America.
- Fox, R. J., Crask, M. R., & Kim, J. (1989). Mail survey response rate. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52(4), 467-491.
- Gonzalez, H. (1989). Interactivity and feedback in third world development campaigns. Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 6, 295-314.
- Graham, J. W., & Donaldson, S. I. (1993). Evaluating interventions with differential attrition: The importance of nonresponse mechanisms and use of follow-up data. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 119-128.
- Grammer, E. M. (2000). Global and local characteristics of excellent international public relations programs: A content analysis of Fortune 500 Web sites. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Grunig, J. E. (1989). Symmetrical presuppositions as a framework for public relations theory. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazleton, Jr. (Eds.), Public relations theory (pp. 17-44). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grunig, J. E. (Ed.). (1992). Excellence in public relations and communication management. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E. (2001a). Global public relations. In J. E. Grunig & T. Hunt, Managing public relations Manuscript in preparation.

Grunig, J. E. (2001b). Two-way symmetrical public relations. In R. Heath (Ed.), Handbook on public relations (pp. 11-30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), Excellence in public relations and communication management (pp. 285-326). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1998). The relationship between public relations and marketing in excellent organizations: Evidence from the IABC study. Journal of Marketing Communications, 4, 141 – 161.

Grunig, J. E., & Hon, L. C. (1999). Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations. Gainesville, FL: The Institute for Public Relations.

Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). Managing public relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Grunig, J., Grunig, L., Huang, Y. H., Lyra, A., & Sriramesh, K. (1995). Models of public relations in an international setting. Journal of Public Relations Research, 163-186.

Grunig, L. A. (1992). Strategic public relations constituencies on a global scale. Public Relations Review, 18(2), 127-136.

Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D.M. (2002). Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Vercic, D. (1998). Are the IABC's excellence principles generic? Comparing Slovenia and the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada. Journal of Communication Management, 2(4), 335-356.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). Factor analysis. In Grimm L. B., & P. R. Yarnolad (Eds.), Reading and understanding multivariate statistics (pp. 364-406). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, A. (1993). The seven cultures of capitalism. New York: Doubleday.

Harris, T. L. (1998). Value-added public relations: The secret weapon of integrated marketing. Lincolnwood, IL: NTC.

Heath, R. L. (2001). Globalization – The frontier of multinationalism and cultural diversity. In R. Heath (Ed.), Handbook on public relations (pp. 625-628). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Huang, Y. H. (1990). Risk communication, models of public relations and anti-nuclear activism: A case study of a nuclear power plant in Taiwan. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Huang, Y. H. (1997). Public Relations Strategies, relational outcomes, and conflict management. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Illman, P. E. (1980). Developing overseas managers and managers overseas. New York: Amacon.

Jones, R. A. (1994). The ethics of research in cyberspace. Internet Research, 4, (3), 30-35.

Judd, C. M., Smith, E. R., & Kidder, L. H. (1991). Research methods in social relations. (6<sup>th</sup> ed.) Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Kaiser, L. (1995). Electrifying potential for activism. The Animals' Agenda, 15, (2), 32-33.

Kanter, R. M. (1995). World class. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. (1986). Response effects in the electronic survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 50(3), 402-413.

Kim, Y., & Hon, L. (1998). Craft and professional models of public relations and their relation to job satisfaction among Korean public relations practitioners. Journal of Public Relations Research, 10(3), 155-175.

Kinzar, H. J., & Bohn, E. (1985, June). Public relations challenges of multinational corporations. Paper presented to the International Communication Association Conference, Honolulu, HA.

Lautenschlager, G. J., & Flaherty, V. L. (1990). Computer administration of questions: More desirable or more social desirability? Journal of Applied Psychology, 75(3), 310-314.

Leitch, S., & Neilson, D. (2001). Bringing publics into public relations: New theoretical frameworks for practice. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), Handbook of public relations (pp. 127 – 138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lyra, A. (1991). Public relations in Greece: Models, roles and gender. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Maddox, R. C. (1993). Cross-cultural problems in international business: The role of the cultural integration function. Westport, CN: Quorum Books.

Mahler, D. (1996). "Think global, act local": The public relations activities of German companies in the United States. New York: GACC Publication Services.

Manu, F. A. (1996). Multinational corporations and the environment: Hazardous incidents and their prevention. Business and the contemporary world, 1, 52-65.

Moachan, L. (1993). The role of public relations in developing and promoting a strategic plan. International Public Relations Review, 16(3), 6-7.

Molleda, J. C. (2000). Integrative public relations in international business: The impact of administrative models and subsidiary roles. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Murphy, P. (1991). The limits of symmetry: A game theory approach to symmetric and asymmetric public relations. In L. A. Grunig and J. E. Grunig (Eds.), Public relations research annual (Vol. 3, pp. 115-132). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nessman, K. (1995). Public relations in Europe: A comparison with the United States. Public Relations Review, 21(2), 151-160.

Newsom, D. A., & Carrell, B. J. (1994). Professional public relations in India: Need outstrips supply. Public Relations Review, 20, 183-188.

Ovatt, F., Jr. (1988). PR without boundaries: Is globalization an option? Public Relations Quarterly, 33(1), 5-9.

Parks, M. R., & Floyd, K. (1996, Winter). Making friends in cyberspace. Journal of Communication, 46, 80-97.

Pavlik, J. (1987). Public relations: What research tells us. Newbury Park: Sage.

Pavlik, J. V., & Dozier, D. M. (1996). Managing the information superhighway: A report on the issues facing communications professionals.

Gainesville, FL: The Institute for Public Relations Research and Education.

Penteado, R. (1996). Effect of public relations roles and models on excellent Brazilian organizations. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Pratt, C.B. (1994). Public relations, industrial peace, and economic development. In A. A. Moemeka (Ed.), Communicating for development: A new pan-disciplinary perspective (pp. 183 -205). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ramos, M., Sedivi, B. M., & Sweet, E. M. (1998). Computerized self-administered questionnaires. In M. P. Couper, R. P. Baker, J. Bethlehem, C. Z. E Clark, J. Martin, W. L. Nicholls, & J. M. O'Reilly (Eds.), Computer assisted survey information collection (pp. 389-408). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Reed, J. (1999, February). An international sensitivity. Public Relations Tactics, p. 31.

Rhee, Y. (1999). Confucian culture and excellent public relations: A study of generic principles and specific applications in South Korean public relations practice. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Schaefer, D., & Dillman, D. A. (1998). Development of a standard e-mail methodology: Results of an experiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 62, 378-397.

Scholz, J. (1998). A normative approach to the practice of public relations in the Eastern Germany. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.



Sha, B. L. (1999). Cultural public relations: Identity, activism, globalization, and gender in the Democratic Progressive party on Taiwan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Sharpe, M. L. (1992) The impact of social and cultural conditioning on global public relations. Public Relations Review, 18(2), 103-107.

Smee, A., Brennan, M., Hoek, J., & Mcpherson, T. (1998, December). A test of procedures for collecting survey data using electronic mail. Paper presented at ANXMAC98, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Sriramesh, K. (1992). The impact of societal culture in public relations: An ethnographic study of South Indian organizations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Sriramesh, K., & White, J. (1992). Societal culture and public relations. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), Excellence in public relations and communication management (pp. 597-614). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Synnott, G., & McKie, D. (1997). International issues in PR: Researching research and prioritizing priorities. Journal of Public Relations Research, 9(4), 259-282.

Taylor, M. (2000a). Cultural variance as a challenge to global public relations: A case study of the Coca-Cola scare in Europe. Public Relations Review, 26(3), 277-293.

Taylor, M. (2000b). Media relations in Bosnia: A role for public relations in building civil society. Public Relations Review, 26(1), 1-14.

Taylor, M. (2001). International public relations: Opportunities and challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In R. Heath (Ed.), Handbook on public relations (pp. 629-637).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tierney, P. (2000). Internet-based evaluation of tourism Web site effectiveness: Methodological issues and survey results. Journal of Travel Research, 39, 212-219.

Turk, J. V. (1996). Romania: from publicate past to public relations future. In H. M. Culbertson & N. Chen (Eds.), International public relations: A comparative analysis (pp. 341-348). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

van de Vijver, F. & Leung, K. (1997). Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Varey, R. J. (1998). Locating marketing within the corporate communication managing system. Journal of Marketing Communications, 4, 177 – 190.

Vasquez, G. M., & Taylor, M. (1994, November). A cultural approach to public relations research: An extension of Hofstede's variables to Grunig's models of public relations. Paper presented at Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Vercic, D., Grunig, L. A., & Grunig, J. E. (1996). Global and specific principles of public relations: Evidence from Slovenia. In H. M. Culbertson & N. Chen (Eds.), International public relations: A comparative analysis (pp. 31-66). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wakefield, R. I. (1997). International public relations: A theoretical approach to excellence based on a worldwide Delphi study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Wakefield, R. I. (1999, July). World-class public relations: A model for effective public relations in the multinational. Paper presented at the 6<sup>th</sup> Annual Public Relations Research Symposium, Lake Bled, Slovenia.

Wakefield, R. I. (2000a). Preliminary Delphi research on international public relations programming: Initial data supports application of certain generic/specific concepts. In D. Moss, D. Vercic, & G. Warnaby (Eds.), Perspectives on public relations research (pp. 179-208). London: Routledge.

Wakefield, R. I. (2000b). World-class public relations: A model for effective public relations in the multinational. Journal of Communication Management, 5(1), 59-71.

Wakefield, R. (2001). Effective public relations in the multinational organization. In R. Heath (Ed.), Handbook on public relations (pp. 639-648). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Welge, M. K., & Holtbrugge, D. (1998). International Management. In N. Berg (Ed.), Public affairs management in multinational corporations – findings of an empirical study among German corporations in India. Proceedings of the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the International Association for Business and Society.

Werner, O., & Campbell, D. T. (1970). Translating, working through interpreters, and the problem of decentering. In R. Naroll & R. Cohen (Eds.), A handbook of cultural anthropology (pp. 398 – 417). New York: American Museum of Natural History.

Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2000). Mass media research: An introduction (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wouters, J. (1991). International public relations. New York: Amacom.

Wright, D. K. (1998). Corporate communications policy concerning the Internet: A survey of the nation's senior-level, corporate public relations officers.

Gainesville, FL: The Institute for Public Relations.

Wylie, K. (1997, May 19). NFO exec sees most research going to the Internet. Advertising Age, p. 50.

Yarbrough, C. R., Cameron, G. T., Sallot, L. M., & McWilliams, A. (1998). Tough calls to make: Contingency theory and the Centennial Olympic Games. Journal of Communication Management, 3, 39-56.

Yoffie, A. J. (1998). The sampling dilemma is no different on-line. Marketing News, 32(8), 16.

Young, S. J. (1998). Perceived liability and risk management trends and issues impacting the delivery of recreational sports programs in the 21st century. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 60, 548A.

Young, S. J., & Ross, C. M. (2000). Web questionnaires: A glimpse of survey research in the future. Parks and Recreation, 35(6), 30-39.

Young, S. J., & Ross, C. M. (in press). Recreational sports trends for the 21st century: Results of a Delphi study. NIRSA Journal.