

The Role of PR Professionals in Corporate Strategic Planning in Australia: Educational Implications

Carol J. Steiner and Leeora Black*

Abstract: *This paper reports some empirical research about how senior managers in large Australian organisations view and use public relations. The evidence suggests few Australian organisations practice “symmetric public relations” which we understand to be based on power sharing with stakeholder groups. To us, seeking symmetry in PR means encouraging stakeholder participation in decisions, especially in corporate strategic planning. We see a role for PR professionals in facilitating that participation but doubt that current approaches to PR education adequately prepare graduates for that role. We suggest this may be due to how we understand “communication.”*

Introduction

For a couple of decades, public relations researchers have been exploring different approaches to PR (Grunig and Hunt, 1984; Murphy, 1991; Grunig and Grunig, 1992; Creedon, 1993; Grunig, 1993; Hallahan, 1993; Hazleton and Cutbirth, 1993; Grunig and Huang, 1998; Kruckeberg, 1998). Executives in the US, Canada and the UK have discovered the competitive advantages of embracing highly professional PR management based primarily on *two-way symmetric* communication. These competitive advantages include improved share prices, hospitable business climate, improved national standing, improved corporate image, reduced conflict with stakeholders, less regulation and litigation, increased employee productivity and increased employee satisfaction (Dozier, Grunig and Grunig, 1995, p. 218). The researchers who identified these benefits have suggested that successful organisations interested in *communication excellence* might also use a bit of *two-way asymmetric* communication (Dozier *et al.*, 1995; Grunig and Grunig, 1996). This contingency-based approach to the use of both two-way models was described as a mixed mode model.

Ms. Leeora Black is Lecturer in the Department of Marketing at Monash University, Clyde Road, Berwick, Vic 3806. Email: mystery@jitter.com.au
All correspondence relating to this article should be forwarded to Ms. Black.

Two-way asymmetric communication has been the basis of public relations since the 1920s when Bernays began to collect information from and about target audiences in order to plan more effective communication strategies. This approach was a product of its time, a time of scientific management. Scientific managers believed that if you had enough information and approached management systematically, anything could be managed (controlled) (Forster and Browne, 1996). This approach is still in widespread use in PR and involves persuading or even manipulating people to accept an organisation's viewpoint (e.g., Saffir, 1996). It is *asymmetric* because although information flow may be two-way, *influence flow* aims to be substantially one-way.

Two-way symmetric communication redresses the asymmetry in influence flow when the interests and/or sensitivities of stakeholders/publics are accommodated not just in *communicating* decisions and policies but in *planning* the strategic decisions and policies of an organisation. This approach to accommodating stakeholder/public interests and sensitivities *before* contentious decisions affecting them are made allows influence flow to be two-way. This approach also reduces the need for persuasion, manipulation and damage control *after* decisions are made. The ethical basis for this approach to communication is captured in a quote from Arthur W. Page, former Vice-President of PR for AT&T: "All business in a democratic country begins with public permission and exists by public approval." (Broom and Dozier, 1990, p. xi)

The decision that communication excellence was possible even while using some asymmetric communication (Dozier *et al.*, 1995; Grunig and Grunig, 1996) seems a wise concession to pragmatism. Based on our research, it also seems wise in the Australian context because few organisations we surveyed seemed committed to symmetric communication. As a result, our research suggests that CEOs in Australia still see PR professionals primarily in persuasive communicator roles rather than in strategic planning roles. In the final section of this paper, we explain why we think PR education may have to bear some responsibility for relegating PR professionals to limited communicator roles rather than to stakeholder advocacy roles in corporate strategic planning.

DATA COLLECTION

Data in this report came from 64 chief executive officers (CEOs) in Melbourne and Sydney. Respondents were drawn randomly from a Dun and Bradstreet database comprising the top 700 public and private companies including not-for-profit organisations, plus department heads from national, Victorian and New South Wales Government departments and instrumentalities. The populations were chosen in the expectation that PR activities at these leading organisations would be the most developed and progressive. The survey instrument was administered by telephone. It consisted of 47 statements that could be answered by selecting a number from 1 to 7, with 7 signifying “strongly agree” and 1 signifying “strongly disagree.”

Classifying data was also collected to allow analysis of response variations between organisations that had only in-house PR departments, those that used only PR consultancies and those that used both (See Appendix B). Statistically significant differences in responses between organisations which use only in-house PR services or only PR consultant services emerged for only 7 of 47 statements. There were also 2 instances in which the responses for respondents using only PR consultants were significantly lower than for organisations using in-house PR services only or a combination of both. There were, however, 25 statements showing statistically different responses for organisations using a combination of in-house and consultant PR professionals compared to those using only one PR source. However, these responses simply signal that these organisations expect more of everything than organisations using only one PR source.

Many of the statements included in the survey were drawn from the Dozier *et al.* (1995) Excellence study. For the purposes of this paper, we have grouped the statements into those showing CEO attitudes toward communication, toward the PR role, toward symmetric communication and toward asymmetric communication. The following section reports the mean and mode responses of the 64 CEOs. The mean shows the average response (an equal

number of responses above and below that response); the mode shows the most common response. The higher the score, the stronger the agreement with the statement. Responses to all statements, including those not discussed in this paper, can be found at Appendix A.

FINDINGS

Attitudes Toward Communication:

The Excellence study suggested that organisations must value communication in order to achieve communication excellence. The CEOs were asked about their attitudes toward communication and how those attitudes translated into action.

		Mean (Scale 1 to 7)	Mode 1 to 7)
11	Generally speaking, a communication department is valuable to an organisation.	6.2	7
12	Our communication department is valuable to our organisation.	5.3	5
13	I support/defend our communication department's value in budget discussions.	4.7	6
14	I support/defend our communication department's value in strategy discussions.	4.3	5

These results suggest that Australia's CEOs understand the value of communication to an organisation but are less convinced of the value of their own communicators. Their view translates into less support for their communicators in budget and strategy discussions. These results could well signal that if the communicators in the surveyed organisations want to play a more significant role in their organisations, they have to either improve their performance or sell the value of their performance better so their CEOs recognise they deliver the value that the CEOs expect. Better budgets and more influence on strategic decisions may flow from CEOs more favourable perceptions of communicators' competence.

Attitudes Toward The PR Role:

How CEOs see the role of PR in their organisation determines the likelihood of adopting symmetric and even asymmetric PR practices. According to the Excellence study, the dominant coalition must be prepared to use their PR professionals as advisors rather than merely as sales people for messages and actions over which they have little influence.

		Mean (Scale 1 to 7)	Mode 1 to 7)
30	Our PR professionals are mostly responsible for disseminating information.	4.7	6
31	Our PR professionals are the eyes and ears of our organisation.	4.7	4
32	Our PR professionals participate in corporate strategic planning.	5.3	7
33	Our PR professionals make a valuable contribution to corporate strategic planning.	3.9	3
34	Our PR professionals interpret the external environment of our organisation.	4.4	4
35	Our PR professionals manage the organisation's responses to issues.	2.9	2

The surveyed CEOs appear to have moved beyond the press agency and public information models of PR (Grunig and Grunig, 1992), although not very far. While many expect more of their PR professionals than corporate writing, they do seem to see the PR role as mostly involving outward movement of information rather than inward movement of intelligence about stakeholders. Again, we also see a significant difference between CEO expectations and what they say their PR professionals deliver. In the surveyed organisations, PR professionals participate in strategic planning (they've been given a place at the table), but they are not seen to make a significant contribution to it. This may account for the CEOs' unwillingness to let their PR professionals manage the organisation's responses to issues. If PR professionals cannot be relied upon to contribute good ideas and insights to strategic planning, can they be relied upon to fix problems those strategies create or to identify appropriate positions on issues?

Attitudes Toward Symmetric Communication

The Excellence study suggested that symmetric communication requires a willingness and ability to negotiate with stakeholders and resolve conflicts creatively and equitably. Such an approach to PR is based on acceptance of the right of stakeholders to have their own opinions and the duty of organisations to accommodate those views as much as possible.

		Mean (Scale	Mode 1 to 7)
41	I expect our PR professionals to negotiate with stakeholders.	3.1	2
42	I expect our PR professionals to use conflict resolution techniques in dealing with stakeholders.	2.4	3
43	I expect our PR professionals to help me understand stakeholder opinions.	5.2	4
44	I expect our PR professionals to conduct research on how stakeholders might respond to our decisions.	5.2	5

The low responses of CEOs to statements 41 and 42 can be interpreted as signaling unfamiliarity with the principles of symmetric communication, rejection of those principles, or lack of confidence in their PR professionals to perform negotiation and conflict resolution functions. The stronger responses to the next two statements suggest many of the surveyed CEOs see some value in understanding stakeholder views and responses. This suggests many do understand and perhaps even accept the principles of at least two-way communication. While the low scores for expecting negotiation and conflict resolution may mean these CEOs only want to understand their stakeholders to manipulate them more effectively, the low scores also leave open the possibility that some of the surveyed CEOs may not trust their PR professionals to negotiate and resolve conflict on behalf of their organisations.

Attitudes Toward Asymmetric Communication:

At its worst, asymmetric communication can be synonymous with both intentional and inadvertent manipulation of the truth and stakeholders. At its best, it involves using research and professional persuasion skills to present an organisation's views or actions most sympathetically. It is based on the assumption that the organisation has the right to make its own decisions but then needs to explain those decisions to the public, either to win their approval of the decisions or to reduce opposition to them. Such a perspective assumes an asymmetry in the power to make decisions and control messages, and a willingness to use that power in the best interests of the organisation.

The responses to the following statements suggest the surveyed CEOs are willing to admit that they are ethically comfortable with persuasion and even manipulation, but they are less confident about being successful when they do so.

		Mean (Scale	Mode 1 to 7)
4 5	I expect our PR professionals to persuade publics that our views are right.	5.8	7
4 6	I expect our PR professionals to get stakeholders to behave as we expect.	2.2	3
4 7	I expect our PR professionals to manipulate stakeholders scientifically.	6.0	7

These responses, especially in conjunction with the responses to the symmetric communication statements discussed in the previous section, suggest that the surveyed CEOs expect PR professionals to practice predominantly asymmetric communication. PR professionals are to be the messengers of the organisation. While the authors of the Excellence study have been persuaded that there is room for asymmetric communication in organisations aspiring to communication excellence (Dozier *et al.*, 1995), it is doubtful that such heavy emphasis on asymmetric communication can be conducive to communication excellence if communication excellence is understood as an equitable and respectful partnership between organisations and their publics.

Some of the statistically significant differences in responses among organisations using different PR sources raise even more troubling doubts. For example, CEO respondents from organisations that use only PR consultants were less likely to want them to play any strategic role in the organisation, being less interested in having them advocate for stakeholders, counsel them, advise about stakeholders, negotiate with stakeholders or manage issues. These CEOs were also less likely to defend the PR consultants in strategy discussions, to value their contribution to corporate strategy and to let them prepare the organisations' PR budgets. CEO respondents from organisations with in-house PR departments were more likely to want their PR professionals to use negotiation and conflict resolution with stakeholders. This suggests a bit more CEO trust in in-house PR professionals to practice symmetric PR. But on the other hand, these CEOs were less likely to expect their in-house PR professionals to contribute to organisational performance or to be information sources about stakeholders. We could interpret this as saying that they don't expect quite as much professionalism from their in-house PR people. This may raise doubts about the claimed links between symmetric communication, professionalism and excellence. In the final section, we ask if the reluctance to embrace symmetric PR practice in pursuit of communication excellence might not be a product of PR education itself.

Educational Implications of Findings

Our results suggest that the surveyed organisations at least, and maybe most Australian organisations, see only a limited role for PR professionals in corporate strategic planning. Instead, PR professionals continue to serve primarily as communicators of corporate views and actions rather than as shapers of those views and actions. They may be responsible for communication strategies, but with communication only narrowly understood as getting the word out effectively or scientifically (asymmetrically).

Placing Australian PR professionals in this position can be dangerous for organisations. If, as Page suggests, organisations do rely on public permission and public approval for their survival, then organisations' failure to secure that permission and approval *before* they make their decisions, adopt their positions and take their actions can, at best, result in suboptimal corporate performance and, at worst, lead to management by bushfire or a continuing state of crisis. Organisations interested in improving performance or simply avoiding crisis need to involve their PR professionals in their strategic planning processes, not only as communication advisors but as representatives and even advocates for stakeholder interests. Only in such roles can PR professionals influence an organisation's decisions, positions and actions before they become set in concrete and problematic. Only in such roles can PR professionals be said to be contributing to *corporate* strategic planning, not just *communication* strategic planning.

But we now face a chicken-and-egg question. Our survey suggests that many CEOs are prepared to welcome PR professionals to the strategy planning table, to grant them access to the dominant coalition at a crucial time in the strategy development process. This creates a significant opportunity for PR professionals to enhance their role in the organisation and increase their professional and corporate status. But our results suggest that PR professionals are not capitalising on that opportunity or are not capable of capitalising on that opportunity. We wonder if both of those limitations are not related to how PR professionals are educated. Is their education (or lack of it) preventing them playing more strategically significant roles in their organisations or are their more common tactical/technical roles in their organisation unduly influencing PR education and holding back the profession and PR practice in the process?

Whether you grant the chicken or the egg supremacy, the problem seems to lie at least partly in PR education. We believe the problem has at least two components: the lack of business orientation in PR graduates and how PR professionals understand communication. We think there is a relationship between these two components. Because of the limited way that communication is understood, there may be too little tolerance of, and too little curriculum content from, the business paradigm within public relations education. We offer philosophical interpretations of these two components of the problem to incite some further thinking about how to address the problem.

A Business Orientation

We think that if PR professionals are to contribute meaningfully to corporate strategic planning, they need to develop greater familiarity with the realities and values of business and a more positive, or at least a more tolerant, attitude toward business aims and values. This suggestion has been made before (Gibson, 1987; VanLeuven, 1989; Redeker, 1992; Wakefield and Cottone, 1992; Orrick, 1994), but it's not always popular in Arts-based PR courses. For example, Kruckeberg (1998, p. 242) argues against placing public relations education in business departments where "simplistic perspectives of communication often predominate." Falb (1992, p. 99) advises against placing PR programs in business schools "because then you cut them off from their roots of communication and their partial grounding in the liberal arts model."

We find these arguments unconvincing because they suggest powerlessness or a reluctance to use persuasive skills. Most public relations graduates will work for business. Hence, we believe both that it is appropriate to teach PR in a business context and that it is the responsibility of PR academics in whatever department they find themselves to lobby for an optimal approach to such studies. They must ensure that the communication perspective in business schools is not simplistic and they must ensure that their business-based PR courses are not so narrowly conceived and delivered as to "cut them off from their roots."

But more worrying: how can communication academics, who supposedly have more than a "simplistic perspective on communication" and who ground that perspective in the liberal arts model, be so quick to reject engagement with the world in which most PR graduates will have to operate? Most communication academics presumably understand and accept the social and cultural manufacture of meaning, the importance of power and status in negotiating meaning or being persuasive, and the relativity of truth (Ng and Bradac, 1993; Windahl and Signitzer, 1992). Yet some seem prepared, probably on some ideological grounds, to deny or distort access to the social and cultural reality in which most PR

graduates will find themselves, and often to deny the legitimacy of business values and perspectives essential to success in business. When employers criticise PR education for a lack of a “real world” orientation (Sparks and Conwell, 1998; Schwartz et al., 1992; Redeker, 1992; VanLeuven, 1989) or reject communication graduates or offer them low salaries (Ashenden and Milligan, 1999), they are reacting to graduate unfamiliarity with or even rejection of the business paradigm. In this way, PR education fails to practice what it preaches – tolerance of different perspectives – and, in the process, diminishes graduates’ status by preparing them only for low-value PR technician jobs (Hazleton and Cutbirth, 1993).

Our remarks are not an apologia for crass or unethical business practices, nor are we advocating uncritical indoctrination of PR students into questionable business thinking. Rather, we are challenging PR educators to use communication theory to examine the legitimacy of their objections to a stronger business orientation in their courses and to consider the effects of their positions on the future of their PR graduates. We are suggesting that PR graduates need a strong business orientation in order to use their special expertise to influence the strategic directions of their organisations. We are suggesting that PR professionals can only be “forces for good” in business organisations when they understand the world of business enough to provide credible (rather than naive or ideologically driven) criticism of it in strategic planning sessions.

Public Relations Professionals as Communicators

Grunig (1992, p. 4) has defined public relations as “the management of communication between an organisation and its publics.” Although the Excellence study placed a lower emphasis on “craft skills” important to “the technician role” (writing, editing, graphic design and media relations) and a higher emphasis on “management” skills like research, planning, budgeting and evaluation (Dozier *et al.*, pp. 53-61), the impression lingers that Grunig is still talking about communication only in a conventional “message dissemination” sense. And he is not alone. But our discipline is not called “public communication.” It is called public *relations* and, while communication is part of relating, it is not all there is to public relations (Leichty and Springston, 1993; Grunig and Huang, 2000).

We think managing relations involves understanding multiple realities so one can see how they are related to each other. It also involves understanding multiple individuals so one can see how they relate to ourselves and others. To understand myriad relations among both realities and people, PR graduates need analytic and critical skills (Wakefield and Cottone, 1992). But do we

understand what such skills are, or are they buzzwords like “communication skills” that can mean many things to many people (Murphy, 1995)? Anecdotal evidence suggests that too often “critical skills” seems to imply a willingness to make negative judgments rather than the skills of careful and analytical evaluation. Many employers of PR graduates do not appreciate this form of criticism when it comes from people who do not understand the realities of business. Such a willingness to criticise, rather than to try to understand or even recognise the legitimacy of business perspectives, does not set a good example of how to approach public relations.

We think that the effective practice of public *relations* calls for the ability to apply analytic and critical skills to one’s own professional paradigm, not only to its practices and values but also to its founding assumptions and definitions. In particular, we advocate more reflection on what it means to be a communicator and we offer for consideration a view of communication that also gives us an opportunity to ponder what it means to identify oneself with the PR profession. Our definition of “communication” comes from Martin Heidegger.

[Communication] is letting someone see with us what we have pointed out by way of giving it a definite character. Letting someone see with us shares with the other that entity which has been pointed out...That which is “shared” is our *being towards* what has been pointed out -- a being in which we see it in common (Heidegger, 1962, p. 197).

We understand this as saying that what we share is not what we are communicating about (what we have pointed out) but, instead, our common humanity, our being.¹ Heidegger understood humanity, or human being, as our capacity to understand the full complexity of the world and our unique place in it, which together constitute who we are. What we share in communication is that capacity to understand. What is important in communication is not what we talk about (content) but *what we are*. In a Heideggerian scheme, *we are the world we experience* from our unique place in it, and our unique place gives the world a distinctively personal character. The world and our unique take on the world are mutually definitive. Communication, by bringing to light our sharing relationship with other unique individuals, also brings to light the uniqueness of the worlds that define us and our capacity for uniquely understanding the world and each other.

This notion of communication, as sharing with each other all our unique “takes” on the world in order to understand each other as individuals, seems nicely consonant with the idea of symmetric communication. For example, we might share with stakeholders our organisation’s perspective on an issue and open our organisation to the perspective of different stakeholders. Such symmetric communication implies openness both to give and receive, and it

requires tolerance and accommodation of difference, rather than denial or rejection of difference. Rather than seeking compromise and consensus designed to eliminate difference through homogenisation of positions and perspectives, such symmetric communication fosters peaceful co-existence and mutual understanding and respect. Think of how such an approach might change the way the business perspective is treated in public relations curriculum.

But this is not the limit of what communication means for Heidegger. When he says what is “shared” (in quotation marks) is “our being towards,” what he is saying is that (1) there really is no sharing and (2) we are “sharing” our common capacity for unique and individual engagement with the world and each other; we are “sharing” our capacity for being different in how we understand the world that defines our identity.

But it would be wrong to suggest this is just a tired old restatement of the subjectivity of experience and interpretation. This view of communication is different from even the most postmodern notions of what goes on in communication. This view says we will never have anything in common with each other, other than our uniqueness and difference from each other. When we think we have things in common, we cease to communicate. Nancy (1991, p. xl) writes that to understand communication in this way “we [must] dismiss all ‘theories of communication’ which begin by positing the necessity or the desire for a consensus, a continuity and a transfer of messages.” He writes,

Communication is not a bond...It consists in the appearance of the *between* as such: you *and* I (between us) – a formula in which the *and* does not imply juxtaposition, but exposition...Only in this communication are singular beings given – without a bond and without communion, equally distant from any notion of connection or joining from the outside and from any notion of a common and fusional interiority. (Nancy, 1991, p. 29)

What Nancy is challenging with those words is our unsupported assumption that common ground, mutual interest or shared identity or meaning should be the objectives of communication. Rather, Nancy and Heidegger suggest communication should foreground the difference that must exist in order for there to be relations. Without differentiation, things (and people) are the same, identical, fused, merged, amorphous, indeterminate, undefined. Under those circumstances, there is no need for relations because there is only union, shared identity. Nancy (1991, p 25) says communication should “space” us rather than bind us. It is the spacing of communication that makes relations possible. Spacing or difference creates what Nancy refers to as “singularity.”

Such a notion of communication, if adopted, would necessitate a re-evaluation of PR's *raison d'être*. The aim of PR as a communication profession would no longer be engineering consent, winning approval or neutralising dissent. PR would no longer be seeking common ground or pursuing mutual interests. Such aims would be contrary to the idea of communication as spacing. They might also be contrary to the notion of symmetric communication if we consider that symmetry assumes differentiation but equality. Pursuit of traditional PR aims could be said to create an artificial sense of communion where there is only difference. Creating an artificial sense of communion (consensus?) seems more consonant with the aims of asymmetric communication.

Nancy is deeply suspicious of the artificial sense of communion that generates a sense of community. Nancy's understanding of communication led him to conclude that there is no such thing as "community." (Echoes of Margaret Thatcher's claim that there is no such thing as society.) Nancy maintains that imagined communities only come into existence when individuals deny their singularity by embracing identity with others or with some imagined transcendent community (Nancy, 1991, pp. 1-42). Heidegger sees this as denying one's distinct being and adopting a diminished way of being that he called "inauthentic." (Heidegger, 1962, pp. 149-168)

Nancy sees denying one's singularity as undesirable, playing as it does into the hands of those who would wield power. Power relies on the surrender of one's identity or will to a "more worthy" individual or position. Nancy (p. 31) writes, "Communication is the unworking of work that is social, economic, technical and institutional." In other words, the aim of communication should be to undo any imagined communion with others rather than to create an artificial sense of communion. One might say communication is the pursuit of symmetric difference by subversion of asymmetric conformity. Common ground and common interests are part of the problem, not part of the solution. Persuasion -- turning someone else into you in the Heideggerian sense by making them see the world as you do -- is not what Nancy or Heidegger would call communication. Yet this is the aim of asymmetric communication, especially scientifically practised. Even symmetric communication may not be communication in this sense if, in the process, "mutual adaptation" and adjusting one's behaviour to other's expectations (Murphy, 1991, p. 117) goes further than acknowledging and respecting another's perspective and instead involves adopting an "inauthentic" perspective or acting against one's own interests or inclinations in the interests of advancing the "game."

Most of us could probably get comfortable with the notion that communication is about spacing or differentiation, but only so long as we are thinking that communication, so understood, might be directed outwards toward stakeholders. In such a situation, the principle of symmetric communication -- not trying to recruit stakeholders into the corporate community but rather respecting their different views

and values – seems quite admirable. But *two-way* symmetric communication also means that *organisations* should be free to resist subsumption into stakeholder communities. Stakeholder communities hate this resistance and usually accuse the organisation of not listening. But could the seeming resistance of the surveyed CEOs to symmetric communication be seen as a rejection of artificial stakeholder communities? Could it be the corporate assertion of difference and the rejection of communion, a refusal to surrender power to an imaginary stakeholder community? How can PR practice and education cope with that possibility, which is the unacknowledged stab delivered by the two-edged sword of symmetric communication?

Adopting the idea of communication as spacing or differentiation also challenges another of our acknowledged professional values, the value of professionalism itself.

The pursuit of professionalism, like the practice of asymmetric communication, is about homogenising singularity out of existence. Standardising thoughts, values and practices in the interests of professionalism encourages conformity rather than differentiation. From a Nancian perspective, “professional communicator” should be an oxymoron.

If we want to educate PR professionals for symmetric communication and to play an influential role in corporate strategic planning, then we need to stop arguing for professionalism (Hainsworth, 1993; Kruckeberg, 1998) and begin pursuing diverse and tolerant approaches to PR education, based on communication as spacing rather than bonding, based on valuing difference rather than commonality, based on encouraging individuality rather than conformity, based on pursuing co-existence rather than cohesion. Only then will we be able to develop an appropriate business orientation in our students, as well as the intellectual confidence, critical skills and ethics to represent and even advocate credibly for stakeholder interests in corporate strategic planning negotiations.

Note

1. This focus on human beings means that Heidegger would not apply the word “communication” to what happens between organisations and stakeholder *groups*, neither of which are human beings. As will emerge later in this section, organisations and groups may not even exist at all; they may not have any being to “share”!

References

- D. Ashenden and S. Milligan (1999), "Failures to Communicate," *The Higher Education Australian*, May 12, p. 43.
- G. Broom and D. Dozier (1990), *Using Research in Public Relations: Applications to Program Management*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- P. Creedon (1993), "Acknowledging the Infrasystem: A Critical Feminist Analysis of Systems Theory," *Public Relations Review* 19(2) Summer, pp. 157-166;
- D. Dozier, L. Grunig, J. Grunig (1995), *Manager's Guide to Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995, Chapter 17.
- R. Falb (1992), "The Place of Public Relations in Higher Education: Another Opinion," *Public Relations Review* 18(1) Spring, pp. 97-101.
- J. Forster and M. Browne (1996), *Principles Of Strategic Management*, South Melbourne: Macmillan.
- D. Gibson (1987), "Public Relations Education in a Time of Change," *Public Relations Quarterly*, Fall, pp. 25-31.
- J. Grunig (1992), ed., *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, Hillsdale; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- J. Grunig (1993), "Image and Substance: From Symbolic to Behavioural Relationships," *Public Relations Review* 19(2) Summer, pp. 121-139;
- J. Grunig and L. Grunig (1992), "Models of Public Relations and Communication, in *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, op. cit., pp. 285-326.
- J. Grunig and L. Grunig (1996), "Implications of Symmetry for a Theory of Ethics and Social Responsibility in Public Relations," unpublished paper presented to the Public Relations Interest Group International Communication Association, Chicago, May 23-27.
- J. Grunig and Y. Huang (1998), "From Organisational Effectiveness to Relationship Indicators: Antecedents of Relationships, Public Relations Strategies and Relationship Outcomes," *Relationship Management: A Relational Approach to Public Relations*, eds. J. Ledingham and S. Bruning, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- J. Grunig and T. Hunt (1984), *Managing Public Relations*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- B. Hainsworth (1993), "Commentary: Professionalism in Public Relations" *Public Relations Review* 19(4) Winter, pp.311-314.
- K. Hallahan (1993), "The Paradigm Struggle and Public Relations Practice," *Public Relations Review* 19(2) Summer, pp. 197-205;
- V. Hazelton and C. Cutbirth (1993), "Public Relations in Europe: An Alternative Educational Paradigm," *Public Relations Review* 19(2) Spring, pp. 187-196.
- M. Heidegger (1962), *Being and Time*, New York: Harper & Row.
- D. Kruckeberg (1998), "The Future of PR Education: Some Recommendations," *Public Relations Review*, 24(2) Summer, pp. 235-248.
- G. Leichty and J. Springston (1993), "Reconsidering Public Relations Models," *Public Relations Review* 19(4) Winter, pp. 327-339.
- J. Murphy (1995), "Communication in the Information Age: A Critique," *Et cetera*, Fall, pp. 336-343.
- P. Murphy (1991), "The Limits of Symmetry: A Game Theory Approach to Symmetric and Asymmetric Public Relations," *Public Relations Research Annual*, Vol. 3 (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates, 1991), pp. 115-131;
- J-L. Nancy (1991), *The Inoperative Community*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- S. Ng and J. Bradac (1993), *Power in Language*, London: Sage, 1993.
- A. Orrick (1994), "Develop Research and Management Skills," *Public Relations Journal* 50(8) October/November, pp. 32-33.
- L. Redeker (1992), "Internships Provide Invaluable Job Preparation," *Public Relations Journal*, 48(9) September, pp. 20-25.
- L. Saffir with J. Tarrant (1996), *Power Public Relations: How to Get PR to Work for You*, Lincolnwood: NTC Business Books.
- D. Schwartz, P. Yarbrough and M. Shakra (1992), "Does Public Relations Education Make the Grade?", *Public Relations Journal* 48(9) September, pp. 18-25.
- S. Sparks and P. Conwell (1998), "Teaching Public Relations -- Does Practice or Theory Prepare Practitioners?" *Public Relations Quarterly* 43(1) Spring, pp.41-44.
- J. VanLeuven (1989), "Practitioners Talk About the State of PR Education," *Public Relations Review* 15(1) Spring, pp.5-11.
- S. Windahl and B. Signitzer with J. Olson (1992), *Using Communication Theory : An Introduction to Planned Communication*, London : Sage.
- G. Wakefield and L. Cottone (1992), "Public Relations Executives' Perceptions of Disciplinary Emphases Important to Public Relations Practice for the 1990s," *Public Relations Review* 18(1) Spring, pp. 67-78.

APPENDIX A CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER SURVEY

		Mean (Scale	Mode 1 to 7)
1	I want our public relations professionals to tell me what stakeholders know.	5.4	5
2	I want our public relations professionals to tell me how stakeholders feel.	5.0	4
3	I want our public relations professionals to tell me how stakeholders will react to our strategies.	5.5	7
4	I want our public relations professionals to advocate for stakeholders' views in strategy planning.	3.7	5
5	I want our public relations professionals to counsel me about stakeholders' views so we make better strategic decisions	5.8	7
6	I want our public relations professionals to communicate with stakeholders to achieve our strategic objectives.	7.0	7
7	I am prepared to accept the counsel of our public relations professionals on how to achieve our strategic objectives.	5.5	5
8	I use communication to achieve strategic objectives.	6.0	7
9	I expect communication to improve organisational performance.	6.0	5
10	I measure the communication contribution to organisational performance.	2.6	2
11	Generally speaking, a communication department is valuable to an organisation.	6.2	7
12	Our communication department is valuable to this organisation.	5.3	5
13	I support/defend our communication department's value in budget discussions.	4.7	6
14	I support/defend our communication department's value in strategy discussions.	4.3	5
15	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our shareholders.	2.9	1

		Mean (Scale 1 to 7)	Mode 1 to 7)
16	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our customers.	6.0	6
17	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to the media.	6.8	7
18	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our neighbouring community.	4.2	4
19	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to the general public.	5.4	4
20	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our opponents.	2.2	2
21	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to politicians.	2.5	2
22	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our employees.	4.2	4
23	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand our shareholders.	2.7	1
24	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand our customers.	5.5	7
25	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand the media.	6.7	7
26	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand our neighbouring community.	4.3	4
27	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand the general public.	4.7	4
28	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand our opponents.	2.1	1
29	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand political realities.	2.6	1
30	Our public relations professionals serve primarily as our corporate writers.	4.2	4
31	Our public relations professionals are mostly responsible for disseminating information.	4.7	6
32	Our public relations professionals are the eyes and ears of our organisation.	4.7	4
33	Our public relations professionals participate in corporate strategic planning.	5.3	7
34	Our public relations professionals make a valuable contribution to corporate strategic planning.	3.9	3
35	Our public relations professionals interpret the external environment of our organisation.	4.4	4
36	Our public relations professionals manage the organisation's response to issues.	2.9	2
37	Our public relations professionals use research to segment publics	2.3	2
38	Our public relations professionals develop goals and objectives for his/her department	5.6	6
39	Our public relations professionals conduct evaluation research.	3.2	2
40	Our public relations professionals prepare his/her department's budget.	3.5	3
41	I expect our public relations professionals to negotiate with activist stakeholders.	3.1	2
42	I expect our public relations professionals to use conflict resolution techniques in dealing with stakeholders.	2.4	3

		Mean (Scale 1 to 7)	Mode 1 to 7)
43	I expect our public relations professionals to help me understand stakeholder opinions.	5.2	4
44	I expect our public relations professionals to conduct research on how stakeholders might respond to our decisions.	5.2	5
45	I expect our public relations professionals to persuade publics that our views are right.	5.8	7
46	I expect our public relations professionals to get stakeholders to behave as we expect.	2.2	3
47	I expect our public relations professionals to manipulate stakeholders scientifically.	6.0	7

**APPENDIX B
MEANS FOR CEO RESPONDENTS WHO USE IN-HOUSE OR
CONSULTANT PUBLIC RELATIONS PROFESSIONALS OR BOTH**

		In-House	Both	Consult
1	I want our public relations professionals to tell me what stakeholders know.	4.9	5.0	5.4
2	I want our public relations professionals to tell me how stakeholders feel.	4.8	5.5	4.7
3	I want our public relations professionals to tell me how stakeholders will react to our strategies.	5.4	6.2	5.0
4	I want our public relations professionals to advocate for stakeholders' views in strategy planning.	4.0	4.2	2.7
5	I want our public relations professionals to counsel me about stakeholders' views so we make better strategic decisions	5.9	6.1	5.2
6	I want our public relations professionals to communicate with stakeholders to achieve our strategic objectives.	7.0	7.0	7.0
7	I am prepared to accept the counsel of our public relations professionals on how to achieve our strategic objectives.	5.4	6.0	5.2
8	I use communication to achieve strategic objectives.	5.8	6.0	6.1
9	I expect communication to improve organizational performance.	5.7	6.3	5.9
10	I measure the communication contribution to organisational performance.	2.6	3.5	1.8
11	Generally speaking, a communication department is valuable to an organisation.	5.9	6.4	6.1
12	Our communication department is valuable to this organisation.	5.2	5.6	5.2
13	I support/defend our communication department's value in budget discussions.	4.4	5.0	4.7
14	I support/defend our communication department's value in strategy discussions.	4.3	4.7	3.7
15	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our shareholders.	3.5	3.0	2.2
16	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our customers.	6.0	6.1	5.9

		In-House	Both	Consult
17	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to the media.	7.0	6.9	6.4
18	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our neighbouring community.	4.4	4.6	3.6
19	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to the general public.	6.0	5.7	4.5
20	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our opponents.	1.6	2.7	2.3
21	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to politicians.	1.8	3.0	2.5
22	I want our public relations professionals to get our organisation's views across to our employees.	3.9	4.9	3.9
23	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand our shareholders.	1.9	3.2	3.0
24	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand our customers.	5.8	5.5	5.3
25	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand the media.	6.8	6.6	6.8
26	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand our neighbouring community.	4.1	4.7	4.0
27	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand the general public.	4.6	5.3	4.2
28	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand our opponents.	1.9	2.9	1.4
29	I want our public relations professionals to help us understand political realities	1.8	3.5	2.3
30	Our public relations professionals serve primarily as our corporate writers.	5.9	4.3	4.3
31	Our public relations professionals are mostly responsible for disseminating information.	5.3	5.6	5.1
32	Our public relations professionals are the eyes and ears of our organisation.	4.1	5.3	4.7
33	Our public relations professionals participate in corporate strategic planning.	5.4	5.8	4.5
34	Our public relations professionals make a valuable contribution to corporate strategic planning.	3.6	4.8	3.3
35	Our public relations professionals interpret the external environment of our organisation.	4.2	5.0	3.9
36	Our public relations professionals manage the organisation's response to issues.	2.9	3.3	2.3
37	Our public relations professionals use research to segment publics.	2.0	2.5	2.4
38	Our public relations professionals develop goals and objectives for his/her department	5.8	5.6	5.4
39	Our public relations professionals conduct evaluation research.	2.7	3.5	3.3
40	Our public relations professionals prepare his/her department's budget.	3.9	3.6	3.0
41	I expect our public relations professionals to negotiate with activist stakeholders.	4.0	3.4	1.9

		In-House	Both	Consult
42	I expect our public relations professionals to use conflict resolution techniques in dealing with stakeholders.	3.0	2.8	1.4
43	I expect our public relations professionals to help me understand stakeholder opinions.	4.9	5.9	4.9
44	I expect our public relations professionals to conduct research on how stakeholders might respond to our decisions	4.8	5.6	5.2
45	I expect our public relations professionals to persuade publics that our views are right.	7.0	6.4	7.0
46	I expect our public relations professionals to get stakeholders to behave as we expect	5.2	3.3	5.0
47	I expect our public relations professionals to manipulate stakeholders scientifically.	6.7	5.7	6.5