JOURNAL OF PUBLIC RELATIONS RESEARCH, *18*(2), 151–176
Copyright © 2006, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Furnishing the Edifice: Ongoing Research on Public Relations As a Strategic Management Function

James E. Grunig
Department of Communication
University of Maryland

This article traces the origins and continuing development of a research tradition that conceptualizes public relations as a strategic management function rather than as a messaging, publicity, and media relations function. The tradition began serendipitously with the development of the situational theory of publics in the late 1960s, followed by the application of organization theory to public relations, the symmetrical model of public relations, and evaluation of communication programs. The Excellence study, which began in 1985, brought these middle-level theories together and produced a general theory, a theoretical edifice, focused on the role of public relations in strategic management and the value of relationships with strategic publics to an organization. Since the completion of the Excellence study, scholars in this research tradition have continued to improve and furnish the edifice by conducting research to help public relations professionals participate in strategic decision processes. This research has been on environmental scanning and publics, scenario building, empowerment of public relelations, ethics, relationships, return on investment (ROI), evaluation, relationship cultivation strategies, specialized areas of public relations, and global strategy. I conclude that the greatest challenge for scholars now is to learn how to institutionalize strategic public relations as an ongoing, accepted practice in most organizations.

Throughout the 40 years of my academic career, I have used the literature of philosophy of science and of cognitive psychology to inform my attempts to build public relations theory. Early in my career, I rejected *logical positivism*—the idea that theories are "true" because they reflect an underlying order in the

Correspondence should be sent to James E. Grunig, Department of Communication, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. Email: jgrunig@umd.edu

universe. From Kuhn (1970), I learned that theories are subjective because the theory itself defines what evidence should be used to "prove" a theory. From Suppe (1977), I learned that theories are semantic structures: ideas in the minds of researchers. This cognitive nature of theory is supported by research in cognitive psychology, which shows that thought takes place in the form of abstract cognitive representations (see, e.g., Anderson, 2000). From Carter (1972), I learned that order is not inherent in reality. Rather, scholars construct theories to make sense of reality—to supply order to it (for further explanation of Carter's views, see J. E. Grunig, 2003).

We can judge a theory to be good, therefore, if it makes sense of reality (in the case of a positive, or explanatory, theory) or if it helps to improve reality (in the case of a normative theory). Public relations scholars need to develop both positive and normative theories—to understand how public relations is practiced and to improve its practice—for the organization, for publics, and for society. As researchers develop theories and integrate them, a research tradition, as defined by Laudan (1977), develops around a comprehensive conceptual framework, which Kuhn (1970) originally called a "paradigm" and later called a "disciplinary matrix" in the second edition of his book.

Kuhn (1970) conceptualized a paradigm as a rigid pattern of thinking that limits the ability of scientists to think outside the paradigm. Once scientists develop a paradigm, Kuhn said, they devote most of their time to solving puzzles identified by the paradigm. If they cannot solve a puzzle in the way that the paradigm predicts, the puzzle becomes an "anomaly." If researchers repeatedly cannot solve this anomaly, a scientific revolution occurs, and the paradigm is discarded and replaced by a new one. Other philosophers of science (e.g., Brown, 1977; Lakatos, 1970; Laudan, 1977; Shapere, 1977; Suppe, 1977; Toulmin, 1972) conceptualized these comprehensive cognitive structures to be more malleable and changeable than did Kuhn. In their view, scholars are similar to architects or engineers who design a structure originally for one use and then revise and add to that structure for other uses or as they see problems with the structures that they designed once they are built. As Popper argued in 1970:

> I do admit that at any moment we are prisoners caught in the framework of our theories; our expectations; our past experiences; our language. But we are prisoners in a Pickwickian sense: If we try, we can break out of our framework at any time. Admittedly, we shall find ourselves again in a framework, but it will be a better and roomier one; and we can at any moment break out of it again. (pp. 56–57)

Kuhn's (1970) concept of puzzles also now seems to be too narrow. Rather than "puzzles," for which the solutions are known but the means of reaching them are not, other philosophers substituted the terms *relevant questions* or *characteristic problems* (Suppe, 1977, p. 498). A theoretical structure suggests solutions to these questions or problems, but the solutions often vary from what is expected—therefore leading researchers to refine or enlarge the structure based on their experience in using it to solve theoretical and empirical problems.

Theoretical structures, therefore, resemble the concept of a schema in cognitive psychology: a comprehensive knowledge structure that includes many related cognitive representations and that retains its structure even as it is refined and enlarged. In this article, I call the comprehensive theoretical structure that I and many students and colleagues have developed for public relations over the last 40 years an "edifice"—a structure that can be used positively to explain public relations practice and normatively to guide public relations practice. An edifice provides a framework for public relations practice, but I do not believe that a structure alone is enough. Like the structure of a building, a theoretical edifice must be furnished as it is built. Each time the plan for an edifice is used as a structure for a new building, it can be improved and furnished in different ways. The same is true for the comprehensive general theory of public relations that I have developed.

This general theory does not attempt to explain everything in public relations, as Holtzhausen and Voto (2002) asserted. Rather, it is a comprehensive way of thinking that can be used to solve many positive and normative public relations problems. Other edifices may solve these problems in different ways. It is not necessary, however, to destroy this edifice to justify the value of another edifice, as critical and postmodern scholars (e.g., Curtin & Gaither, 2005; Durham, 2005; Holtzhausen & Voto, 2002; Leitch & Neilson, 2001; L'Etang & Pieczka, 1996; McKie, 2001; Motion & Weaver, 2005) have tried to do. Rather, multiple edifices can exist side by side, and all can be useful for solving the same or different problems. (An example of how different perspectives can be useful can be found in Hatch's, 1997, discussion of the concurrent value of modern, interpretive, and postmodern approaches to organizational theory.)

This article, therefore, focuses on the origins, continuing development, and new directions for research of the theoretical edifice that I call the strategic management role of public relations. I believe this edifice has played a central role in the development of public relations theory and research during the last 40 years. As I show, the research tradition that has produced this edifice continues to generate new ideas for theory, research, and practice in public relations. Other research traditions may join it, and critics will try to destroy it, but I believe this one will continue to guide the public relations discipline for years to come.

SERENDIPITOUS DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDIFICE

The theoretical edifice, as it stands today, both describes and prescribes the role of public relations in strategic management. It is a general theory that explains how the public relations function should be structured and managed to provide the greatest value to organizations, publics, and society. Specifically, the edifice

- Explains how public relations contributes value to organizations, publics, and society.
- Explains how an empowered public relations function makes a unique contribution to strategic management and distinguishes its role from that of other management functions, especially marketing.
- Prescribes techniques that public relations managers can use to fulfill their role in strategic management.
- Explains the critical role of relationships in the planning and evaluation of public relations programs.
- Identifies different models of communication and explains which models are the most effective strategies for cultivating relationships with publics.
- Incorporates ethics into the strategic role of public relations.
- Explains how to apply the theory globally.

Each of these components of the general theory is logically related to the others. Together, they produce a strong structural edifice that can be applied in both research and practice. Forty years ago, however, I did not envision that my research eventually would produce this structure. Instead, I worked on pieces of the structure serendipitously without realizing until I began work on the Excellence study how they would fit together.

Situational Theory of Publics

I begin the discussion of the edifice, therefore, by tracing the origins of some of its critical components. The first piece of the edifice was the situational theory of publics. When I entered the doctoral program at the University of Wisconsin in 1965, communication scientists were focused on the effects of the media and messages on attitudes and behavior. Cognitive dissonance theory attracted a great deal of attention because it seemed to explain why effects generally were limited to reinforcing existing attitudes. According to the theory, recipients of messages were most likely to accept messages that were consonant with their attitudes. More important for a theory of communication behavior, the theory explained that people were likely to selectively expose themselves to messages that supported their attitudes.

This second focus of dissonance theory on information seeking eventually led me to what I now call the situational theory of publics. In a course taught by the pioneering mass communication scholar Bruce Westley, I reviewed both rational and behavioral theories of economics to develop an understanding of why people seek information when they make economic decisions. This article, which was published as one of the first *Journalism Monographs* (J. E. Grunig, 1966), which Westley then edited, suggested that people are more likely to seek information that is relevant to decision situations in their lives than to seek information that reinforces their attitudes. Under the mentoring of Richard Carter, a pioneering scholar of communication behavior (see J. E. Grunig, 2003), I developed this theory into a study of how and why Colombian farmers seek information in decision situations, which became my doctoral dissertation (J. E. Grunig, 1968).

At the time, I did not foresee that the theory of communication behavior developed in this study would continue to develop through many studies over 40 years and become a critical component of today's theory of public relations and strategic management (for a review, see J. E. Grunig, 1997). At the time, I simply wanted to know why people seek information to explain why messages have effects. Eventually, I realized that the situational theory provides a tool to segment stakeholders into publics, to isolate the strategic publics with whom it is most important for organizations to develop relationships to be effective, and to plan different strategies for communicating with publics whose communication behavior ranged from active to passive.

Organizational Theory

The situational theory also provided a framework when I switched my attention from the communication behavior of individuals and publics to the communication behavior of organizations (J. E. Grunig, 1976). When I returned to the United States from Colombia in 1969, I was convinced that most of the failures in the communication programs of agricultural agencies in Colombia resulted not from the backwardness or resistance of farmers, but because of the nature of the communication programs that organizations developed to communicate with them. Organizations that I studied were more likely to give information than to seek information. They also were unlikely to listen to or engage in dialogue with their publics. Organizations, in other words, seemed to engage in the same types of communication behavior identified by the situational theory for individuals and publics. This one-way information giving typically resulted in policies and programs of agencies that did not work well for farmers in the situations that they faced.

My 1976 monograph and a great deal of subsequent research (reviewed in J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1989) extended this research to all kinds of organizations doing public relations in the United States. First, I identified independent variables from organizational theory that varied in the extent to which they would produce problem recognition, constraint recognition, and level of involvement—the independent variables of the situational theory—at the organizational level. These variables included organizational structure, environment, technology, size, age, culture, worldview, and power structures. The first dependent variables were simply one-way and two-way communication, but I further conceptualized them as synchronic and diachronic communication, following Thayer (1968). Eventually, I revised these two communication behaviors into the now well-known four models of public relations: press agentry/publicity, public information, two-way asymmetrical, and two-way symmetrical (J. E. Grunig, 1984).

For the most part, this program of research failed to identify organizational variables that explained why organizations practiced public relations as they did, although top management's worldview about the nature of public relations and organizational culture seemed to explain the most variance in public relations behavior. The knowledge of public relations practitioners also had a major effect. For example, even though practitioners should have been most likely to practice two-way and symmetrical public relations when the structure was organic, the environment was turbulent, management valued collaboration with publics, and the culture was participative, they did not practice public relations in that way because their knowledge of public relations was limited to one-way methods, publicity, media relations, and marketing support.

The research, therefore, suggested that the relationship among the models of public relations and these organizational variables was normative rather than positive. Logically, in other words, practitioners should have been most likely to practice two-way symmetrical public relations in certain favorable conditions. They did not do so, however, because of their lack of knowledge to do so.

Symmetrical Model of Public Relations

The next stage of my research, therefore, was an intensive program of research on the two-way symmetrical model of public relations. The idea for the symmetrical model was mostly mine, although the symmetrical model elaborated on the simple idea of two-way communication and incorporated Thayer's (1968) idea of diachronic communication. The symmetrical idea also was stimulated by Carter's (1965) and Chaffee and McLeod's (1968) conceptualization of coorientation. Coorientation represented a movement away from theories of attitudes held by one person and research on how to develop messages to change the orientations (attitudes) of a person. Instead, *coorientation* focused on how two people, or two higher level systems (such as organizations and publics; see J. E. Grunig & Stamm, 1973), oriented jointly to each other and to objects in their environment.

The symmetrical model and its parent, the coorientational model, proposed that individuals, organizations, and publics should use communication to adjust their ideas and behavior to those of others rather than to try to control how others think and behave. Although there is still a great deal of naysaying in the public relations literature about the symmetrical idea, there is so much logical, empirical, and ethical support for it after 20 years of research and theoretical development that its value seems axiomatic to me (for a review of the criticisms, theoretical development, and empirical evidence in support of the model, see L. A. Grunig, J. E. Grunig, & Dozier, 2002, chap. 8). There are many similar theories in the literature, including theories of conflict resolution, dialogic communication, relationships, rhetoric, and postmodernism. To a large extent, I have used these theories as I developed the symmetrical model, but I believe that much more work can be done to bring these theories into the public relations domain where they can be used to elaborate on the simple, but powerful, idea of symmetrical communication.

Evaluation Research

In the late 1970s, at the same time that I was working on the theories of publics, public relations behavior of organizations, and the symmetrical model of communication, James Tirone of the AT&T Corporation asked me to work on a project to develop measures for and means of evaluating the effectiveness of public relations. As described in Tirone (1977), we decided to approach this problem at the level of public relations programs rather than for the entire public relations function.

Tirone and his AT&T team developed measures and methods to evaluate media relations, community relations, employee relations, educational relations, and advertising. Coorientational theory provided the framework for conceptualizing the effects of public relations programs. My research for this project concentrated on community relations (see J. E. Grunig & Hunt, 1984, pp. 277–279) and employee relations (see J. E. Grunig, 1977). This research on the evaluation of public relations provided another critical element of the theory of public relations and strategic management. Public relations could not have a role in strategic management unless its practitioners had a way to measure its effectiveness. It is interesting that the public relations trade press today continues to debate how to evaluate public relations—a problem that I think we solved in the late 1970s with the AT&T research.

At this point, the year was 1984, and several crucial middle-range theories were in place: publics, the role of public relations in organizational decision making, the symmetrical model of public relations, and concepts to define objectives of public relations programs and measure their accomplishment. The Excellence study then provided the means for unifying these concepts and adding other theoretical building blocks to the edifice.

THE EXCELLENCE STUDY: PUTTING THE EDIFICE TOGETHER

When the International Association of Business Communications (IABC) Foundation, now the IABC Research Foundation, issued a request for proposals in 1984 for research on “How, Why, and to What Extent Communication Contributes to the Achievement of Organizational Objectives," I first thought of the opportunity to move beyond the program level of evaluation, where we had worked in the AT&T research, to construct a theory of the overall value of the public relations function to the organization. I had read some of the literature on organizational effectiveness when I wrote my 1976 monograph, and my Maryland colleague, Mark McElreath (now at Towson University), had alerted me to the difference between evaluating public relations programs and evaluating the overall contribution of the public relations function to organizational effectiveness. Thus, the Excellence study offered the possibility of constructing a grand theory of the value of public relations.

At the same time, my collaborators on the project (David Dozier, William Ehling, Larissa Grunig, Fred Repper, and Jon White) pointed out that the project also would make it possible to integrate a number of middle-range concepts that explained how the public relations function should be organized to increase the value of the public relations function to the organization. I brought my concepts of publics, organizational theory and decision making, models of public relations, evaluation of public relations, and research on employee communication to the project. David Dozier contributed his and Glen Broom's roles theory. William Ehling contributed his knowledge of operations research and his views on the controversy over public relations and integrated marketing communication (IMC). Larissa Grunig brought her knowledge of gender, diversity, power, and activism. Jon White contributed his ideas about public relations and strategic management. To this mix, Fred Repper, our practitioner member, added his understanding of how our theories worked in practice. The package became what we now know as the Excellence theory.

The Return on Investment (ROI) of Public Relations

IABC's emphasis on explaining the value of public relations stimulated us to put measurement and evaluation into a broader perspective than the program level. Although program evaluation remained an important component of our theory, we realized that it could not show the overall value of the public relations function to the organization. Our review of the literature on organizational effectiveness first showed that public relations has value when it helps the organization achieve its goals. The literature also showed, however, that it has to develop those goals through interaction with strategic constituencies (stakeholders and publics). We theorized that public relations adds value when it helps the organization identify stakeholders and segment different kinds of publics from stakeholder categories. Second, we showed that public relations adds to this value when it uses symmetrical communication to develop and cultivate relationships with strategic publics. If it develops good relationships with strategic publics, an organization is more likely to develop goals desired by both the organization and its publics and is more likely to achieve those goals because it shares those goals and collaborates with publics.

Today, the public relations profession is focusing a great deal of attention on showing that an investment in public relations has a positve financial return on investment (ROI). Much of this effort has been devoted to research at the program level: For example, many commercial research firms are trying to show that investment in marketing communication sells products—or, at least, sells more products than a comparable amount spent on advertising. Other professionals are focused on showing that public relations messages have effects on cognitive concepts such as reputation, brand, image, or identity, which they believe increase the value of an organization beyond its tangible assets (an argument also made by business scholars such as Fombrun, 1996; Fombrun & van Riel, 2004). For the most part, I believe these explanations of ROI rationalize the enduring belief among practitioners and their clients that traditional publicity-oriented public relations creates value through a change in one of these cognitive concepts.

The Excellence study revealed a more complicated, but logically more satisfying, explanation of the value of public relations. For an organization to be effective, we argued, it must behave in ways that solves the problems and satisfies the goals of stakeholders as well as of management. If it does not, stakeholders will either pressure the organization to change or oppose it in ways that add cost and risk to organizational policies and decisions. To behave in socially acceptable ways, organizations must scan their environment to identify stakeholders who are affected by potential organizational decisions or who want organizations to make decisions to solve problems that are important to them. Then, organizations must communicate symmetrically with the different kinds of publics found within these stakeholder categories to develop high-quality, long-term relationships with them.

Although we concluded that it is difficult to place a monetary value on relationships with publics, to measure ROI exactly, our interviews with CEOs and senior public relations officers revealed numerous examples of how good relationships had reduced the costs of litigation, regulation, legislation, and negative publicity caused by poor relationships; reduced the risk of making decisions that affect different stakeholders; or increased revenue by providing products and services needed by stakeholders. Those examples provided powerful evidence of the value of good relationships with strategic publics.

Best Practices in Public Relations

In addition to explaining the value of public relations, the Excellence study provided solid theory and empirical evidence of how the function should be organized to maximize this value. The reasoning flowed logically from our general premise about the value of public relations: Public relations must be organized in a way that makes it possible to identify strategic publics as part of the strategic management process and to build quality long-term relationships with them through symmetrical communication programs.

First, following Jon White's (White & Dozier, 1992) lead, our research showed that involvement in strategic management was the critical characteristic of excellent public relations. We found that public relations must be empowered through representation in the dominant coalition or from having access to these powerful members of the organization. Unless it is empowered to be heard, public relations will have little effect on organizational decisions. The importance of involvement in strategic management expanded our knowledge of the managerial role to include strategic managerial and administrative managerial roles (see chap. 6 of L. A. Grunig, J. E. Grunig, & Dozier, 2002)—the strategic manager being the essential role for excellence.

Second, the debate over IMC helped us to focus on how the public relations function should be organized both vertically and horizontally in an organizational structure. We learned that if public relations is sublimated to marketing or other management functions, it loses its unique role in strategic management. Sublimation to another management function typically resulted in attention only to the stakeholder category of interest to that function, such as consumers for marketing or employees for human resources. Sublimation to marketing also usually resulted in asymmetrical communication, which our research has consistently shown is not an effective strategy for cultivating relationships.

In the vertical structure, public relations programs for different stakeholders were gathered into a single department or coordinated through a senior vice president of corporate communication or similar title. In the horizontal structure, an excellent public relations function worked with other management functions in a matrix type of arrangement to help those functions build relationships with the stakeholders with which they interact. Thus, public relations, marketing, and other functions collaborated more than they competed for resources when the public relations function was excellent.

Third, because of IABC's traditional interest in employee communication, we used theories of organizational communication, sociology, and psychology in the Excellence study—adding the concepts of organizational structure, culture, and systems of internal communication to the theoretical edifice (see J. E. Grunig, 1992; L. A. Grunig et al., 2002, chap. 11). We also measured two types of employee satisfaction—satisfaction with the job and with the organization. This made it possible to build a bridge to the study of relationships, in research subsequent to the Excellence study, because satisfaction was one of four key characteristics of relationships that we identified (see, e.g., J. E. Grunig & Huang, 2000; H.-S. Kim, 2005).

Fourth, we focused on gender in the Excellence study because of the growing number of women in public relations and because of evidence that women had difficulty entering managerial roles—thus limiting the number of knowledgeable public relations professionals available for a strategic role. We found that organizations with excellent public relations valued women as much as men for the strategic role and developed programs to empower women throughout the organization.

The emphasis on gender, however, also focused our attention on diversity of race and ethnicity—a fifth part of the Excellence edifice. This focus, along with the international nature of the project, helped us to expand the edifice to make it appropriate for use outside the United States—in diverse cultural, political, and economic contexts. Our replication of the research in Slovenia (L. A. Grunig, J. E. Grunig, & Verčič, 1998; Verčič, L. A. Grunig, & J. E. Grunig, 1996) made it possible to conceptualize the Excellence theory as a theory generic to many contexts, as long as the theory is applied differently when contextual variables are different.

Although we had discussed ethics in the books that resulted from the Excellence study, our subsequent research in Slovenia called attention to the need for an ethics component of the edifice (see L. A. Grunig et al., 2002, chap. 12)—a sixth component. We began to develop such a theory in a conference paper (J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1996), and as I discuss following, our students have filled in the gap.

Since completing the Excellence study, my colleagues, doctoral students, and I have developed concepts and tools needed to furnish the edifice for a theory and practice of public relations and strategic management. Our recent research has focused on the three segments of this process: (a) identifying and segmenting stakeholders and publics and the issues they create, (b) developing communication strategies and programs to cultivate relationships with publics, and (c) evaluating communication programs and the public relations function by their success in producing quality relationships with publics. In the rest of this article, I summarize this research and suggest how other researchers can help in solving what I earlier called the "characteristic problems" (Suppe, 1977, p. 498) that this edifice addresses.

DEVELOPING TOOLS FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

In the Excellence study, we asked CEOs and heads of public relations the extent to which public relations contributed to strategic management in six specific ways: (a) regular research activities, (b) research to answer specific questions, (c) other formal approaches to gathering information, (d) informal approaches to gathering information, (e) contacts with knowledgeable people outside the organization, and (f) judgment based on experience.

All but the last of these six contributions consist of methods of scanning the environment of the organization for information relevant to strategic management. All six contributions increased dramatically when we compared the organizations valued least by CEOs with those valued the most. We followed up the survey by conducting in-depth qualitative interviews of the CEOs whose organizations had the most excellent public relations functions. We asked them, specifically, what contribution their communication function made to organizational goals. One of the most frequent responses was the value of hearing external voices in the strategic management process—voices amplified by public relations professionals who scan the publics in the organization's environment.

At the same time, we found that participation in strategic management meant different things to public relations professionals. Even in some organizations with excellent public relations departments, participation meant only providing media relations or information campaigns to support strategic goals chosen by others. The most excellent departments participated fully in strategic management by scanning the social, political, and institutional environment of the organization to bring an outside perspective to strategic decision making. Most did not participate fully in strategic management, however, because of lack of knowledge and the tools to do so.

Chang (2000) found much the same thing in a Delphi study of senior public relations executives in U.S. corporations. Only a few of them reported having a sophisticated system of environmental scanning in their public relations department. Most also were skeptical that public relations professionals had the skills to do environmental scanning. And, most said that they believed senior management did not have confidence in the ability of public relations professionals to be environmental scanners. Some did not even understand the term *environmental scanning*, believing that it had something to do with reacting to pollution and other natural environmental issues.

Environmental Scanning and Publics

One of our major research programs, therefore, has been devoted to developing tools and concepts that public relations executives can use in environmental scanning. Chang (2000), for example, found that personal sources of information are more useful than impersonal sources such as media, public opinion polls, or published information. The communication executives in her study said the most useful external personal contacts were customers, activist groups, journalists, and government officials. The most useful internal personal sources were supervisors, cross-division staff, and employees. Based on Chang's research, J. E. Grunig and L. A. Grunig (2000) developed an ideal process of environmental scanning that included monitoring strategic decisions of management to identify consequences on publics, monitoring Web sites and other sources of information from activists, using the situational theory to segment publics, developing a database to analyze information, and monitoring media and other sources to track the process of issues management.

Environmental scanning requires a theory and method of identifying stakeholders and segmenting publics from categories of stakeholders. Yet, few public relations professionals use tools more sophisticated than demographic breakdowns to identify publics. When it is used, the situational theory of publics provides a sophisticated method of identifying different types of publics and for planning strategies to communicate with them. Few public relations scholars have developed a theory of publics other than the situational theory. With the exception of Price (1992), who developed a similar theory of public opinion, mass communication scholars also have ignored the behavior of publics and how it tempers the effects of media on them.

Recently, a few public relations scholars have jumped into the breach to either add concepts to the situational theory or develop an alternative theory. Hallahan (2000, 2001), for example, called for more attention to what he called "inactive publics"—the passive publics that, according to the situational theory, seldom respond to messages related to the problems that created the publics. Others (Cozier & Witmer, 2001; Vasquez, 1993; Vasquez & Taylor, 2001) disputed the assumption of the situational theory that publics develop about problems in the life situations of people, which often result from the consequences of organizational behaviors, and called for a more social theory of publics.

Research on the situational theory already has moved to accommodate these suggestions. For example, Aldoory (2001) identified conditions that led women to perceive a greater level of involvement in heath problems, and Sha (1995) showed how cultural identity affects problem recognition—both of which suggest antecedent variables explaining why inactive publics become active. J.-N. Kim (2005) added a comprehensive set of new independent and dependent variables to the theory based on theories of social psychology and social movements. His expanded conceptualization of the theory showed the conditions that encourage actively communicating individuals to join with others socially to become collective publics. His conceptualization also included the active and passive giving of information to others (explaining the social nature of publics) and active and passive cognitive processing (explaining communication effects or lack of effects) as new dependent variables explained by the theory.

In addition to this fundamental work on the situational theory itself, new research continues to demonstrate the value of the theory in its original formulation. Yang (2005) included the independent variables of the theory in a study of the interaction of an organization's relationships with its publics and its reputation. Applied researchers studying reputation often have found a correlation between familiarity with an organization and the favorability of its reputation. This correlation often is cited as support for the idea that favorable publicity improves reputation. By using the situational theory, Yang was able to show that this correlation could be explained by how actively an organization communicates with its active publics. When active communication was controlled, publicity by itself had little effect on reputation, except for low-involvement, inactive publics, which are unimportant to the organization.

Scenario Building

Once a public relations professional who participates in strategic management identifies strategic publics related to a decision, he or she needs tools that can be used to show other managers what those publics might do and what issues they might create if different decisions are made. Management scholars have used scenarios for some time as a way of visioning the consequences of different decisions, but the technique has seldom been used in public relations.

Sung (2004) reviewed the literature on scenarios and integrated it with our theories of the role of public relations in strategic management, the situational theory of publics, and issues management. She then conducted a case study in which she worked with public relations professionals at a major insurance company to identify publics and construct scenarios related to issues. The professionals with whom she worked concluded that scenarios improved their ability to contribute to strategic organizational decisions.

Empowerment of Public Relations

The relationship of public relations to an organization's dominant coalition was a key characteristic of excellent public relations identified in the Excellence study. Pieczka (1996), a critical scholar, and Holtzhausen and Voto (2002), postmodern scholars, criticized this idea and argued that public relations executives should avoid being in the dominant coalition so that they can be an activist voice for publics in decision making. Power, in their view, would corrupt the public relations function to the detriment of publics.

This criticism, however, is based on an incorrect interpretation of the Excellence theory and of the concept of a dominant coalition. The dominant coalition does not necessarily consist of those in formal positions of power. The dominant coalition is an informal coalition, whose members can be both inside and outside the organization and who can come from different levels of an organizational hierarchy. It also can be enlarged by empowering larger numbers of people. Public relations does not have to have "authoritative power" or "power at the top of the hierarchy" (Holtzhausen & Voto, 2002, p. 61) or be at a "centre of power" (Pieczka, 1996, p. 154)—the ways in which these critics misconstrued the dominant coalition and the Excellence theory.

In the Excellence study, we conceptualized power as empowerment, the expansion of power throughout the organization and to its external stakeholders. In fact, the study showed that the more people inside and outside the organization that were included in the dominant coalition, the more likely it was that the head of public relations and outside stakeholders and activists were included. In contrast, Curtin and Gaither (2005) even coined the "Grunigian fallacy," which they claimed "excludes power as an integral and defining concept in public relations" (p. 96). This criticism is so far removed from the actual assumptions of the Excellence study that I question whether the critics even read the work that they were criticizing.

The Excellence study, the situational theory, and our previous research on activism focused on empowering the public relations function and, through it, empowering publics to have a voice in organizational decision making. Logically, the public relations function cannot serve as an in-house activist, as Holtzhausen and Voto (2002) recommended, if it is not empowered. It would be a fringe managerial function without any influence on decision making. Power does influence public relations, and its major role is to empower those with less power.

In a recent study of power and the public relations function, Berger (2005) added to our understanding of how public relations influences decisions. Like Mintzberg (1983), Berger found that there is no single dominant coalition in an organization. Rather, different coalitions of strategic managers develop for different decisions. Public relations, therefore, typically was a member of these coalitions when its expertise was relevant to a decision. This finding again reinforces the necessity for public relations to have the expertise needed to scan the environment, construct scenarios, and build relationships with strategic publics—the key roles of public relations in strategic management.

An Ethics Framework for Decision Making

If the role of public relations in strategic management is to bring the voices of publics into the decision-making process, public relations should be able to improve the ethics and social responsibility of organizational behaviors. The public relations function should not be the sole advocate of ethics in management, but it should provide an important framework for ethical decision making. Research is needed, however, to provide a framework, from a public relations perspective, that practitioners can use to apply ethical criteria to strategic decisions.

Bowen (2000, 2004) made a major contribution to the development of such a framework. She used Kantian principles of ethics to develop an ethical decision model and explored its use in two corporations. She (Bowen, 2005) is continuing this research, working with a grant team funded by the IABC Research Foundation, to determine the extent to which public relations professionals play an ethical role in decision making and the obstacles to such a role. Similar research, however, is needed to expand our knowledge of the ethical contributions of public relations to an organization and the publics that it affects.

Relationships, ROI, and Evaluation

Since the completion of the Excellence project, public relations researchers have studied relationships more than any other topic in the discipline (see, e.g., the volume edited by Ledingham & Bruning, 2000). Relationships provide a means for evaluating both the long-term and the short-term contributions of public relations programs and of the overall function to organizational effectiveness. Eventually, I believe we will be able to show that the total value, the ROI, of public relations develops through the intangible asset that relationships provide to organizations.

Huang (1997) and J. E. Grunig and Huang (2000) began this work by identifying trust, control mutuality, satisfaction, and commitment as key components of high-quality relationships that can be measured for both planning and evaluation of public relations. Huang developed and used a survey instrument to test these concepts in a study of relationships between the executive and legislative branches of the Taiwanese government. Hon and J. E. Grunig (1999) further developed this index and tested its reliability. The Strategy One research affiliate of Edelman Public Relations adopted the instrument and used it for numerous clients.

Hon and J. E. Grunig (1999) also identified two types of relationships to go along with these attributes of the quality of a relationship: exchange and communal relationships. Although we believe an organization needs both types of relationships, we argued that public relations makes a unique contribution to strategy when it helps organizations develop communal relationships with publics—relationships that benefit publics but not necessarily the organization. Based on a study of the relationships of multinational companies in China, Hung (2002, 2005) added several additional types of relationships to this list. They included mutual communal (which is less one sided than a pure communal relationship), covenantal (where both parties benefit), contractual, symbiotic (where each gains something different), manipulative, and exploitive relationships. She found that covenantal relationships helped reach a win–win ground and that mutual communal relationships benefitted multinational companies most.

In addition to conceptualizing these qualities and types of relationships and using them in evaluation research, we have moved forward in showing the value of relationships to an organization. J. E. Grunig and Hung (2002) began this work by examining the literature on reputation to show how it is affected by relationships. They developed a definition of reputation as a cognitive representation in the minds of different stakeholders and showed that reputation can be explained by the behavior of the organization and the quality of its relationships with publics.

Yang (2005) and Yang and J. E. Grunig (2005) extended this research and developed structural equation models showing that the reputation of an organization develops from the type and quality of relationships that it has with its publics. This research indicates that the value typically attributed to reputation should, instead, be attributed to relationships and that public relations can help to "manage" reputation by cultivating relationships with publics and encouraging management to make socially responsible decisions.

I am continuing to work on the ROI of relationships as the chair of a task force of the Measurement Commission of the Institute for Public Relations, which is studying how nonfinancial indicators of value are influenced by public relations. This task force was initiated by the late Patrick Jackson—the renowned public relations professional. Nonfinancial indicators of value, or intangible assets, are a hot topic in management and accounting circles. I believe that relationships are the most important of these intangible assets and that if we can show that public relations creates value in addition to financial value, we can show the overall ROI of the function. The British public relations practitioner and scholar, David Phillips (2005), also studied the literature on intangible assets and argued that relationships are the most important of these assets. I believe this approach to ROI eventually will show the value of public relations and encourage public relations scholars to join in the study of intangible assets.

CULTIVATION STRATEGIES AS THE HEIR TO THE SYMMETRICAL MODEL

The new concepts and tools that we have developed to help public relations professionals contribute to strategic management will be used mostly by senior-level public relations executives as they interact with other executives. Most of the day-to-day work of other practitioners, however, takes place at the level of the public relations department where they design, execute, and evaluate communication programs for specific publics—ideally, publics identified as strategic by the senior public relations executives using the tools just described.

The relationship perspective on public relations suggests that the purpose of these programs is to manage relationships with publics. Yet, logic suggests that it is not really possible to "manage" relationships—or reputation, images, or brands. All of these concepts are the outcomes of processes. It is possible to manage processes but not outcomes. The best we can do is influence outcomes by managing processes. Thus, we need a term to describe the relationship processes that we are managing. Relationship scholars in interpersonal communication have used the term *maintenance strategies* (e.g., Stafford & Canary, 1991) to describe what people do when they try to influence their relationships with other people. This term does not seem quite right, however.

In her dissertation work, Hung (2002) discovered and applied Baxter and Montgomery's (1996) dialectical approach to relationships. This approach, based on the writings of the Russian rhetorician Baktin (1981), assumes that relationships are in a constant state of flux and, therefore, that they seldom can be "maintained." After searching for an alternative concept, I chose the term *cultivation* for the strategies used in ongoing relationship processes—perhaps because of my agricultural roots. During a growing season, for example, crops are cultivated according to the conditions that affect them. They are not simply maintained. I believe the same is true for relationships.

Hon and J. E. Grunig (1999) identified several of these cultivation strategies in the literature on interpersonal communication and conflict resolution and classified them as symmetrical and asymmetrical strategies. Hung (2002, 2004) explored these strategies and identified several more in her study of multinational companies in China. Rhee (2004) identified still other cultivation strategies in a study of relationships between the Brookhaven National Laboratory and its community publics. The list of cultivation strategies now is too long to explain in this article. The strategies can be classified as either symmetrical or asymmetrical, however.

I now believe that the concept of relationship cultivation strategies is the heir to the models of public relations and the two-way symmetrical model, in particular. Cultivation strategies identify specific ways in which symmetrical communication can be used to cultivate relationships. For example, the strategy of "sharing of tasks" is a symmetrical strategy in which the organization works to solve problems of concern to stakeholders as well as problems it is concerned with. The strategy of "executive involvement in community relations" (Rhee, 2004) shows the importance of contact with a CEO for cultivating relationships with publics.

In developing the concept of symmetrical communication, I believe it is necessary to acknowledge that publics often are not willing to collaborate with organizations and often behave in ways that are destructive to the relationship and to society in general. In a study of the NATO mission in Bosnia, van Dyke (2005) examined how organizations can use coercion ethically together with symmetrical communication. In general, van Dyke concluded that coercion must be preceded by and followed with symmetrical communication to be ethical.

It is also important to recognize that symmetrical communication alone is not enough for public relations to contribute to social justice. H.-S. Kim (2005), for example, found that symmetrical internal communication had no effect on organization–employee relationships unless it also helped to produce organizational justice as perceived by employees. Roper (2005) studied the use of symmetrical communication by the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and Shell Oil. She found that these organizations did engage in dialogue with their publics and made concessions to publics in their behaviors. She also argued, however, that they changed just enough to maintain social order and to preserve their own hegemony. This argument calls to mind the need for what the European school of public relations scholars (van Ruler & Verčič, 2002) called the "reflexive" approach to public relations, in which professionals think not just about the effects of organizational behavior on publics, but also on society as a whole. In the future, I believe we need to study how symmetrical communication can be combined with coercive behaviors, the possible misuses of symmetrical communication, and variables that mediate the effects of symmetrical communication on organizational policies and behaviors.

EXTENDING THE EDIFICE TO SPECIALIZED AREAS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Public relations scholars have paid a great deal of attention to the excellence of the overall public relations function, and they now are beginning to apply this theoretical edifice to several specialized areas of public relations. The Excellence study identified the eight most common categories of stakeholders for which organizations developed specialized programs: employees, media, investors, community, customers, government, members of associations, and donors.

Of these, researchers at the University of Maryland have conducted research to apply the excellence principals and our new relationship concepts to all but media, customers, and members of associations. Kelly (1991) confirmed, first, that the excellence principles explained effective donor relations. Schickinger (1998) found concepts similar to those of the Excellence theory in the literature of investor relations and also found that use of new electronic media facilitated symmetrical communication with investors.

H.-S. Kim (2005) replicated the employee communication parts of the Excellence study and added our relationship concepts and concepts of organizational justice from organizational psychology to the Excellence model. She used sophisticated methods of multilevel analysis to sort out whether concepts such as organizational structure, the system of communication, organizational justice, and organization–employee relations are organizational or individual concepts. Her research showed organizational justice to be a critical mediating variable between symmetrical communication and relationships.

Rhee (2004) studied the effect of the Excellence characteristics as exemplified by the Brookhaven National Laboratory on relationships between the organization and community publics. In particular, she found that interpersonal communication between employees and community members had a greater effect on organization–public relationships that mediated communication. Of interest, she found that involving employees in community relations also improved employee relationships with the laboratory. Chen (2005) studied the relevance of the Excellence principles to government relations programs developed by multinational corporations in China. In doing so, she found support for the principles in this specialized area and also developed recommendations for government relations in this authoritarian political system.

The Excellence principles and the relationship concepts obviously apply also to media relations, consumer relations, and member relations. I urge researchers working in the tradition of the Excellence study to also study these areas. In particular, I believe it is time for public relations scholars, in addition to those in the IMC camp, to conceptualize marketing communication principles. Marketing scholars have developed concepts of relationship marketing—literature that Huang (1997) incorporated into her conceptualization of relationships. I believe public relations scholars can make an important contribution to marketing if we move beyond the messaging, publicity, and asymmetrical communication common in marketing communication and use our theories to develop symmetrical principles of cultivating relationships with consumers.

EXPANDING PUBLIC RELATIONS ROLE IN GLOBAL STRATEGY

The last chapter of L. A. Grunig et al. (2002) described our research in Slovenia and similar research by Wakefield (1997, 2000) that was designed to extend the Excellence principles to a global basis. We developed a theory of generic principles and specific applications that falls midway between an ethnocentric theory (that public relations is the same everywhere) and a polycentric theory (that public relations is different everywhere). The theory holds that, in a broad, abstract way, the Excellence principles can be applied in different cultures, economic systems, political systems, media systems, levels of development, and degrees of activist activity.

The postmodern scholars Bardan (2003) and Holtzhausen, Petersen, and Tindall (2003) challenged this theory, maintaining that postmodern conditions require different forms of public relations in each setting. In particular, they questioned the utility of the symmetrical model in non-Western settings. Although I agree that public relations cannot be the same everywhere, I find it easier to interpret Holtzhausen et al.'s data from South Africa as showing that symmetrical communication took different forms in that setting, supporting the theory of generic principles and specific applications, rather than that symmetrical communication did not exist, which was their interpretation. Similarly, Bardan used positive data suggesting that most practitioners in India do not practice symmetrical communication as evidence against the theory. Such positive data do not falsify a normative theory, such as our theory of generic principles and specific applications. A normative theory maintains that the effects of the principles would be as conceptualized if they are practiced in another country. They can be tested only by studying the work of practitioners who have actually applied the principles to see if they have the effects conceptualized in the theory.

At the same time, evidence continues to mount supporting the usefulness of our theory of generic principles and specific applications. In addition to the research cited in L. A. Grunig et al. (2002), Rhee (2002) found support for the strategic management and symmetrical principles in the work of a sample of Korean practitioners. Hung (2002) and Chen (2005) found evidence for several of the principles in the work of multinational companies in China. van Dyke (2005) found that NATO applied the principles in the public affairs work of its mission to Bosnia. Finally, Yun (2005) found similar principles in the literature of public diplomacy and extracted the same Excellence factor from research on the public diplomacy efforts of 113 of the 169 embassies in Washington, D.C., that we extracted in the Excellence study and in our research in Slovenia.

Our research now is moving beyond confirmation of the utility of the generic principles of the Excellence theory. Ni (2006) studied how the relationship-building role of public relations contributes to the global strategies of multinational corporations. She studied the management literature on global strategy to extend our understanding of the strategic role of public relations from national to global settings. Her research, in particular, will help us learn how different global strategies require different kinds of relationships with local employees.

TOWARD INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS AS A STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT FUNCTION

In this article, I believe I have shown that the theoretical edifice of public relations as a strategic management function that my colleagues, students, and I have constructed and furnished over the last 40 years is not an ossified, deteriorating structure. Rather, researchers are continuing to refine the structure and apply it to new research problems. In addition, we have steadily added rooms to the structure by identifying and studying concepts and tools that public relations professionals can use in their strategic management role.

A major task remains, however, in institutionalizing strategic public relations as actual practice in most organizations. Yi (2005) examined the sociological literature on institutionalization—of how practices and activities come to be standard and generally accepted in organizations. He learned that institutionalists, for the most part, think of public relations as a buffering activity—as something that organizations use to protect themselves from change. Public relations as a buffering activity fits the common view that its role is to use messages and symbolism to create images and reputations that justify the organization as it is. Other institutionalists think of communication as a bridging activity, in which organizations build linkages with stakeholders in their environment to transform and constitute the organization in new ways. Public relations as a bridging activity seems to be equivalent to our theoretical edifice of public relations as a strategic management function.

Unfortunately, public relations has become institutionalized as a buffering function in most organizations and in the view of most people. As a buffering activity, the effect of public relations usually is detrimental to society. Our research, in contrast, has shown the value of public relations as a bridging activity—of value to organizations, publics, and society. The Excellence study and subsequent research has shown that many organizations around the world practice bridging public relations. It is not just a normative ideal. Our next research challenge, I believe, will be to study how public relations can be institutionalized more broadly as a bridging activity so that public relations as a strategic management function becomes standard operating practice in most organizations and that most people think of public relations in that way.

REFERENCES

Aldoory, L. (2001). Making health communications meaningful for women: Factors that influence involvement. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 13,* 163–185.

Anderson, J. R. (2000). *Cognitive psychology and its implications* (5th ed.). New York: Worth.

Baktin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays.* Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Bardan, N. (2003). Rupturing public relations metanarratives: The example of India. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 15,* 199–223.

Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues & dialectics.* New York: Guilford.

Berger, B. K. (2005). Power over, power with, and power to public relations: Critical reflections on public relations, the dominant coalition, and activism. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17,* 5–28.

Bowen, S. A. (2000). *A theory of ethical issues management: Contributions of Kantian deontology to public relations' ethics and decision making.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Bowen, S. A. (2004). Expansion of ethics as the tenth generic principle of public relations excellence: A Kantian theory and model for managing ethical issues. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 16,* 65–92.

Bowen, S. A. (2005, June). *Schism in public relations ethics: Overview of grant research findings.* Paper presented at the meeting of the International Association of Business Communicators, Washington, DC.

Brown, H. I. (1977). *Perception, theory, and commitment: The new philosophy of science.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carter, R. F. (1965). Communication and affective relations. *Journalism Quarterly, 42*, 203–212.

Carter, R. F. (1972, September). *A general system characteristic of systems in general*. Paper presented to the Far West Region Meeting, Society for General Systems Research, Portland, OR.

Chaffee, S. H., & McLeod, J. (1968). Sensitization in panel design: A coorientational experiment. *Journalism Quarterly, 45,* 661–669.

Chang, Y.-C. (2000). *A normative exploration into environmental scanning in public relations*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Chen, Y.-R. (2005). *Effective government affairs in an era of marketization: Strategic issues management, business lobbying, and relationship management by multinational corporations in China.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Cozier, Z. R., & Witmer, D. F. (2001). The development of a structuration analysis of new publics in an electronic environment. In R. Heath & G. Vasquez (Eds.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 615–623). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Curtin, P. A., & Gaither, T. K. (2005). Privileging identity, difference, and power: The circuit of culture as a basis for public relations theory. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17,* 91–116.

Durham, F. (2005). Public relations as structuration. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*, 29–48.

Fombrun, C. J. (1996). *Reputation: Realizing value from the corporate image.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Fombrun, C. J., & van Riel, C. B. M. (2004). *Fame & fortune: How successful companies build winning reputations.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Grunig, J. E. (1966). The role of information in economic decision making. *Journalism Monographs,* No. 3.

Grunig, J. E. (1968). *Information, entrepreneurship, and economic development: A study of the decision-making processes of Colombian latifundistas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Grunig, J. E. (1976). Organizations and publics relations: Testing a communication theory. *Journalism Monographs,* No. 46.

Grunig, J. E. (1977). Evaluating employee communication in a research operation. *Public Relations Review, 3*(4), 61–82.

Grunig, J. E. (1984). Organizations, environments, and models of public relations. *Public Relations Research & Education*, *1*(1), 6–29.

Grunig, J. E. (1992). Symmetrical systems of internal communication. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 531–576). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Grunig, J. E. (1997). A situational theory of publics: Conceptual history, recent challenges and new research. In D. Moss, T. MacManus, & D. Verčič (Eds.), *Public relations research: An international perspective* (pp. 3–46). London: International Thomson Business.

Grunig, J. E. (2003). Constructing public relations theory and practice. In B. Dervin & S. Chaffee, with L. Foreman-Wernet (Eds.), *Communication, another kind of horse race: Essays honoring Richard F. Carter* (pp. 85–115). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1989). Toward a theory of the public relations behavior of organizations: Review of a program of research. In J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig (Eds.), *Public relations research annual* (Vol. 1, pp. 27–66). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1996, May). *Implications of symmetry for a theory of ethics and social responsibility in public relations*. Paper presented to the International Communication Association, Chicago.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (2000, February). Research methods for environmental scanning. *Jim and Lauri Grunig's research: A supplement of pr reporter, 7*, 1–4.

Grunig, J. E., & Huang, Y. H. (2000). From organizational effectiveness to relationship indicators: Antecedents of relationships, public relations strategies, and relationship outcomes. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 23–53). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Grunig, J. E., & Hung, C. J. (2002, March). *The effect of relationships on reputation and reputation on relationships: A cognitive, behavioral study.* Paper presented to the International, Interdisciplinary Public Relations Research Conference, Miami, FL.

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

Grunig, J. E., & Stamm, K. R. (1973). Communication and coorientation of collectivities. *American Behavioral Scientist, 16*, 567–591.

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, Inc.

Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Verčič, 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*, 335–356.

Hallahan, K. (2000). Inactive publics: The forgotten publics in public relations. *Public Relations Review, 26,* 499–516.

Hallahan, K. (2001). The dynamics of issues activation and response: An issues processes model. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 13,* 27–59.

Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Holtzhausen, D. R., Petersen, B. K., & Tindall, N. T. J. (2003). Exploding the myth of the symmetrical/asymmetrical dichotomy: Public relations models in the new South Africa. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 15,* 305–341.

Holtzhausen, D. R., & Voto, R. (2002). Resistance from the margins: The postmodern public relations practitioner as organizational activist. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 14*, 57–84.

Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations.* Gainesville, FL: The Institute for Public Relations, Commission on PR Measurement and Evaluation.

Huang, Y.-H. (1997). *Public relations, organization-public relationships, and conflict management.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Hung, C.-J. (2002). *The interplays of relationship types, relationship cultivation, and relationship outcomes: How multinational and Taiwanese companies practice public relations and organization-public relationship management in China.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Hung, C.-J. (2004). Cultural influence on relationship cultivation strategies: Multinational companies in China. *Journal of Communication Management, 8*, 264–281.

Hung, C.-J. (2005). Exploring types of organization-public relationships and their implication for relationship management in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17,* 393–425.

Kelly, K. S. (1991). *Fund raising and public relations.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Kim, H.-S. (2005). *Organizational structure and internal communication as antecedents of employee-organization relationships in the context of organizational justice: A multilevel analysis.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Kim, J.-N. (2005). *Communicant activeness, cognitive entrepreneurship, and a situational theory of problem solving.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation prospectus, University of Maryland, College Park.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (Rev. ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programs. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), *Criticism and the growth of knowledge* (pp. 91–196). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Laudan, L. (1977). *Progress and its problems.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (Eds.). (2000). *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

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.

L'Etang, J., & Pieczka, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Critical perspectives in public relations*. London: International Thomson Business.

McKie, D. (2001). Updating public relations: "New science," research paradigms, and uneven developments. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 75–91). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Motion, J., & Weaver, C. K. (2005). A discourse perspective for critical public relations research: Life sciences network and the battle for truth. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17,* 49–67.

Ni, L. (2006). *Exploring the value of public relations in strategy implementation: Employee relations in the globalization process.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Phillips, D. (2005, March). *Towards relationship management: Public relations at the core of organisational development.* Paper present to the Alan Rawal CIPR Academic Conference 2005, Lincoln, England.

Pieczka, M. (1996). Paradigms, systems theory and public relations. In J. L'Etang & M. Pieczka (Eds.), *Critical perspectives in public relations* (pp. 124–156). London: International Thomson Business.

Popper, K. R. (1970). Normal science and its dangers. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), *Criticism and the growth of knowledge* (pp. 51–58). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Price, V. (1992). *Public opinion.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rhee, Y. (2002). Global public relations: A cross-cultural study of the excellence theory in South Korea. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 14,* 159–184.

Rhee, Y. (2004). *The employee-public-organization chain in relationship management: A case study of a government organization.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Roper, J. (2005). Symmetrical communication: Excellent public relations or a strategy for hegemony. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17,* 69–86.

Schickinger, P. (1998). *Electronic investor relations: Can new media close the symmetry gap?* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Sha, B.-L. (1995). *Intercultural public relations: Exploring cultural identity as a means of segmenting publics.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Shapere, D. (1977). Scientific theories and their domains. In F. Suppe (Ed.), *The structure of scientific theories* (2nd ed., pp. 518–565). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8,* 217–242.

Sung, M.-J. (2004). *Toward a model of strategic management of public relations: Scenario building from a public relations perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Suppe, F. (1977). *The structure of scientific theories* (2nd ed.). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Thayer, L. (1968). *Communication and communication systems.* Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Tirone, J. G. (1977). Measuring the Bell system's public relations. *Public Relations Review, 3*(4), 21–38.

Toulmin, S. (1972). *Human understanding* (Vol. 1). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

van Dyke, M. A. (2005). *Toward a theory of just communication: A case study of NATO, multinational public relations, and ethical management of international conflict.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

van Ruler, B., & Verčič, D. (2002, July). *The Bled Manifesto on public relations*. Paper presented to the Ninth Public Relations Research Symposium, Bled, Slovenia.

Vasquez, G. M. (1993). A homo narrans paradigm for public relations: Combining Bormann's symbolic convergence theory and Grunig's situational theory of publics. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 5,* 201–216.

Vasquez, G. M., & Taylor, M. (2001). Research perspectives on the public. In R. Heath & G. Vasquez (Eds), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 127–138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Verčič, 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. 31–65). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

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. (2000). World-class public relations: A model for effective public relations in the multinational. *Journal of Communication Management, 5*(1), 59–71.

White, J., & Dozier, D. M. (1992). Public relations and management decision making. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 91–108). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Yang, S.-U. (2005). *The effect of organization-public relationships on reputation from the perspective of publics.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Yang, S.-U., & Grunig, J. E. (2005). Decomposing organizational reputation: The effects of organization-public relationship outcomes on cognitive representations of organizations and evaluations of organizational performance. *Journal of Communication Management.*

Yi, H. (2005). *The role of communication management in the institutionalization of corporate citizenship: Relational convergence of corporate social responsibility and stakeholder management.* Unpublished master's paper, University of Maryland, College Park.

Yun, S.-H. (2005). *Theory building for comparative public diplomacy from the perspectives of public relations and international relations: A macro-comparative study of embassies in Washington, D.C.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.