

Running head: Armour PR Autonomy

Public Relations Autonomy

Luke Armour

University of Akron

February 1, 2006

ABSTRACT

Public relations can often be seen as an extension of other organizational departments. It is subsequently forced into playing technical function roles such as publicity and marketing because of it.

Professionals in the field often see the theoretical foundation for public relations as separate or nonexistent to the practical application of its duties. Furthermore, elements of organizations such as power, control, and culture inhibit the proper functioning of the public relations role. Because of this conflict, many organizations that have public relations departments are misusing the function by making it an extension of other departments or filling PR's top management with managers from other fields. This encroachment limits the public relations function, thus not enabling it to realize its full potential.

This essay examines the role of public relations in organizations and its need for autonomy to reach its full potential. The research asserts that public relations in an organization must retain its own identity while still working closely with other aspects of the organizational system. This separation must exist, at least conceptually, even in small organizations where the duties of several key functions are performed by one department. The literature review examines relationships between management, organizational culture, power, roles, encroachment, and excellence in communication.

Public Relations Defined

A review of the literature and textbooks that claim to be about public relations will most likely give almost as many definitions as sources to which one refers (Guth, 1995; Broom, Casey, & Ritchey, 1997; Hutton, 1999). Hutton (1999) gives a thorough and lengthy historical review of public relations in the United States. The most common thread being that public relations has often been defined more by its actions and less by what it *is*. Hutton cites Harlow's (1976) synthesis of 472 definitions and the input of 65 PR practitioners to retrieve the following definition:

Public relations is a distinctive management function which helps establish and maintain mutual lines of communication, understanding, acceptance and cooperation between an organization and its publics; involves the management of problems or issues; helps management to keep informed on and responsive to public opinion; defines and emphasizes the responsibility of management to serve the public interest; helps management keep abreast of and effectively utilize change, serving as an early warning system to help anticipate trends; and uses research and sound ethical communication techniques as its principal tools. (pp. 200-201)

But Hutton maintains that, more than two decades after Harlow's attempt, little consolidation has been made to give public relations its working and definitive definition. People outside the profession, Hutton suggests, are filling this void of definition in an uncontrolled manner. It is to be noted that Hutton does not offer a suggestion of his own.

Cutlip, Center and Broom (1985) are quoted by Dozier and Broom (1995) as defining public relations as "the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the public on whom its success or failure depends" (p. 5).

Broom, Lauzen, and Tucker (1991) asked a panel of public relations and marketing leaders and researchers William Ehling, Ph.D.; Patrick Jackson, APR; Larry Jones; and Philip Kotler, Ph.D. to define the term. They came up with:

Public relations is the management process whose goal is to attain and maintain accord and positive behaviors among social groupings on which an organization depends in order to achieve its mission. Its fundamental responsibility is to build and maintain a hospitable environment for an organization. (p. 223)

Those who attempt to offer definitions give similar phrasings, but not identical.

Dozier, Grunig L. A, and Grunig, J. E. (1995) pragmatically filter the 1982 IABC Excellence Study in their book, where the authors replace “public relations” with the word “communication” throughout. The first chapter is entitled *What is communication excellence?* but they avoid giving a definition – they give characteristics and inform the reader what it is *not*.

While practitioners and professionals of the field cannot agree to a meaning, it is therefore no wonder that people outside the field cannot explain the term public relations adequately. But despite this lack of formal definition, a clear theme prevails among the scholars in the industry. Public relations is a management function that develops and maintains a healthy environment – through those clusters of groups that affect the organization – for the benefit of the organization. Arguably that can be seen as a rather vague description, but the public relations role is far from precise from organization to organization. Confusion among its practitioners adds to the lack of clarification. Many of the people who claim to work in public relations often do not. Some merely utilize similar tactics and some claim the PR title to lend credibility to their own misunderstood jobs.

Another thing is certain: public relations has grown out from under the umbrella of other organizational tactics and become a strong field of its own. Botan and Taylor (2004) most recently noted that,

Public relations has become much more than just a corporate communication practice. Rather, it is a theoretically grounded and research-based area that has the potential to unify a variety of applied communication areas and serve different types of organizations, including nonprofit organizations with prosocial agendas. (p. 659)

It is a vibrant field of research and practice, worldwide. It includes, but is not limited to, such titles as community relations, media relations, public affairs, marketing PR, agency, employee relations, issues management, investor relations, press agency, stakeholder relations, government relations, publicity, internal relations, and strategic planning (Yaverbaum & Bly, 2001). In recent years, the focus has shifted to focus more on organization-public relationship building (Broom, Casey & Ritchey, 1997; Botan & Taylor, 2004) but the foundation is still strategic (Grunig & Grunig, 2000).

The many misconceptions of the field and its role in organizations may be, in part, attributed to how the mass media represent public relations. The media viewing PR as a function of marketing, or publicity, or even simply as a persuasive campaign detracts from its importance and relays false information about its role (Jo, 2003). It also perpetuates these misconceptions as the public accepts that which the media portrays while the PR field has no channel of counter argument. Or, perhaps, PR professionals are at a loss of what to say, and how to argue the point.

It is logical to assume that each branch of public relations specialty may adapt a synthesized version of the definitions available for its own purpose. This credo can be the foundation of the department of public relations and communication for the benefit of the organization.

Theoretical Considerations

Role Theory

The groundbreaking work by Katz and Kahn (1978) gave, “the role concept a central place in our theory of organizations. [They] have defined human organizations as role systems” (p. 186). Each “office,” as the authors refer to it, has a certain expected set of behaviors associated with it and each office is interdependently linked to other offices constituting a role-set. A role for each office has a myriad of perceptions attached to it for each *focal person*. Each role is sent and received by each office giving it what the authors refer to as four concepts, *role expectations*, *sent-role*, *received role*, and *role behavior* (pp. 194-195). Two highly important aspects of Role Theory that correlate with public relations are what Katz and Kahn refer to as *role conflict* and *role ambiguity*. Role conflict stems from numerous instances such as two conflicting and opposing role expectations, disagreements from different role senders, alternate role expectations from the same sender, or even conflicting roles of the same focal person (p. 204). Role ambiguity involves the opposite problem. Ambiguity occurs when a focal person is uncertain what actions for which the specified office is responsible or when “the membership of the role-set, the ends to be served by role enactment, and the evaluation of present role behavior” (p.206) is uncertain.

The tying together of public relations and Role Theory seems a logical fit. Works by Lauzen (1992) and Dozier and Broom (1995) review the roles public relations professionals enact in organizations and their effects.

Strategic Contingencies Theory of Power

Hickson, Hinings, Lee, Schneck and Pennings (1971) developed a progressive systems approach to organizational power. This theory explains power by “dependence on contingencies ensuing from varying combinations of coping with uncertainty, substitutability, and centrality” (p. 227). The authors posit that power is an element of the relationship between individuals in an organization, and not of the individuals themselves. To understand the authors’ theoretical perspective, further definitions must be presented. According to Hickson et al. *Power* is defined as “the determination of the behavior of one social unit by another” (p. 218). *Uncertainty* is “the lack of information about future events, so that alternatives and outcomes are unpredictable,” (p. 219). *Substitutability* is “the ability of the organization to obtain alternative performance for the activities of a subunit” (p. 221). And finally, *centrality* is “the degree to which [a subunit’s] activities are interlinked into a system” (p. 221).

Excellence in Public Relations

J. E. Grunig (1992b) developed a list of 12 characteristics that were prevalent in Excellent organizations and found some were related to Excellent Communication Management and some related specifically to public relations. These are:

1. Human resources that are empowered and appreciated.
2. Organic Structure.
3. Intrapreneurship that arises from human resources and organic structure.
4. Symmetrical, two-way communication practiced internally and externally.
5. Leadership that creates order and appears participative rather than authoritative.
6. Strong, Participative Cultures that employ elements listed above.

7. Strategic Planning.

8. Social Responsibility for organizational actions, including the awareness of effects and acceptance of feedback.

9. Support for Women and Minorities.

10. Quality is a Priority.

11. Effective Operational Systems that actively incorporate all previous characteristics to implementation.

12. A Collaborative Societal Culture.

Excellence is based on the idea that public relations and excellent communication are a strategic part of an organization's everyday success. Strategic planning is an obvious tactic for the public relations professional as it embodies the concept of meta-communicating with publics to provide the most secure environment for the organization (Grunig & Repper, 1992).

Another crucial characteristic of Excellence in PR is the way in which the organization communicates with its publics. Excellence studies suggest that the most-excellent organizations engage in symmetrical two-way communication with their publics, meaning there is an ebb and flow to the communication. The organization speaks, the publics listen; the publics speak, the organization listens.

Organizational Structure

Organizational structure indicates a great deal about how groups or individuals interact inside an organization. From management to low-level technicians, public relations is affected by this innate structure.

Roles

Broom and Dozier (1986) developed four roles of public relations models: *expert prescriber*, the authority on PR and its inherent problems; *communication facilitator*, relationship builder and communicator between the organization and its publics; *problem-solving process facilitator*, the strategic management position involved in organization problem solving; and the *communication technician*, a technical, lower-level role responsible for producing communication materials for the public relations effort. The authors suggest that a single practitioner would enact all four roles at various times. Lauzen (1992) later explained that Dozier (1983) found public relations practitioners played only two dominant roles; so he distilled the roles into *managers* and *technicians* (p. 63). Implicitly giving the nod to Role Theory, Broom and Dozier wrote, “the *office* of a public relations practitioner incorporates multiple organizational *roles*” (p. 39).

Broom and Dozier (1986) found that roles predicted income. Not surprisingly, managers were found to earn more than technicians. Interestingly, they also discovered that enacted roles correlated more with decision-making than tenure and experience. Broom and Dozier write, “practitioners who play the technician role throughout their careers can anticipate not only lower salaries, but also systematic exclusion from most decision-making sessions” (pp. 54-55).

Building on this work, Dozier and Broom (1995) compared two studies in 1979 and 1991 with similar but extended results. They found gender was positively related to professional experience, which was positively related to predominant manager role enactment, which was positively related to participation in management decision making, which was positively related to income and job satisfaction.

The authors slightly counter the earlier research by Broom and Dozier (1986) by indicating that experience *does* indeed correlate with decision-making. Dozier and Broom (1995) later wrote that experience does lead to enacting the manager role of the public relations office. This manager role enactment is imperative to other aspects of public relations as described below.

Management

Excellence Theory suggests that strategic public relations is one of the most crucial elements of an effective organization (Grunig, 1992b). Unfortunately public relations, forced solely into a technical function, has little opportunity to reach its strategic potential (Lauzen, 1992). Without the ear of top management, strategic public relations goes unheard. Recall the numerous varied, but thematic, definitions at the beginning of this paper. Each listed PR as a management function. L. A. Grunig, J. E. Grunig, and Ehling (1992) proposed from their research that, “public relations is most likely to contribute to effectiveness when the senior public relations manager is a member of the dominant coalition where he or she is able to shape the organization’s goals” (p. 86).

Lauzen and Dozier (1992) posit that the PR manager role enactment is the “missing link” between the organizational environment challenges and consequences for the PR function. Their research indicates that when the environment forces the top communicator of an organization to enact the manager role, a power imbalance ensues. This inequity in power depresses the marketing function in an area managed by the public relations function.

Interestingly, Moss and Green's (2001) literature review regarding management gives rise to some interesting concepts of the manager role. Their research suggests that the demise of the classical model of management is near. Unfortunately, they posit that public relations researchers, in stark contrast to those that study management, use this archaic classical model to define management through tasks and functions concerning public relations. Future discussions should investigate this concept further.

Power

Lauzen and Dozier (1992) write, "manager role enactment is both the product of and a contributor to a practitioner's organizational power, a self-replicating loop" (p.209). The public relations practitioner who frequently enacts this management role, who participates in decision-making, can be viewed as a member of the power elite or "dominant coalition" (p.209). Prior research of the manager role supports this power control perspective (Broom and Dozier, 1986).

Recall that Strategic Contingencies Theory is based on three elements of subunit power (Hickson, et al., 1971). Public relations professionals who are separated from the *centrality* of the organization have less power (Lauzen & Dozier, 1992). This is frequently the technician role of the practitioner who is tucked away in an office, writing press releases, focusing on the asymmetrical output facet of public relations. The manager role is more central, therefore, according to the theory, having more power.

Since the management role requires more experience (Dozier & Broom, 1995), it is logical to conjecture that the manager role, as it is less *substitutable* (Hickson et al., 1971), also increases power.

Culture

Organizational culture affects a great many things. Lauzen and Dozier's (1994) literature review effectively distilled the concept of organization culture, writing that it has been defined as:

the dominant values of an organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982), the shared understanding of employees (Wallack, 1983), the shared synthesis of basic assumptions regarding the organization and its environments (Schein, 1984, 1985), and the philosophy determining organizational policy toward an organization's internal and external publics (Ouchi, 1981; Pascale & Athos, 1981)." (p. 171)

Organizational culture regarding public relations is often defined as *authoritative* or *participative*. Lauzen and Dozier explain that participative organizations often consider their environments to be more complex while authoritative organizations tend to be less concerned with monitoring their environments and consider them to be more simplistic and stable. Sriramesh, Grunig, and Dozier (1996) concluded that Excellence can still be found in both types of cultures, but the participative culture is more nourishing for that style of communication.

The type of culture is prevalent in what the organization does and believes, not necessarily in what it indicates it believes in. At times, a company may spell out an organizational philosophy that sounds good, but is not practiced. Serini (1993) noted in her research that adopting an open and honest credo was far from beneficial if the culture of the organization countered it. In her study this is exactly what happened. She writes, "the phrase from the corporate philosophy became a weapon in the arsenal of the public relations practitioners as they struggled to pry open the closed system" (p. 17).

Realistically, organizations tend to exhibit aspects of both cultures at various times, but predominantly engage in one type (Lauzen & Dozier, 1994). Sriramesh,

Grunig, and Dozier (1996) believe that it is during the times when authoritarian cultured organizations display signs of participative cultures that the Excellent PR practitioner can begin to affect the organization's culture from the inside out by incorporating Excellence through symmetrical communication.

Top management affects the roles of public relations professionals. Those practitioners, who were treated like experts by senior management, acted like experts, utilizing their experience and skill to understand public relations problems and offer solutions (Broom & Dozier, 1986). Research by Lauzen and Dozier (1994) also found that culture can affect *issues management*, the outer directed communication with publics, for which public relations is responsible. The authors explain that *issues management* is the Excellence Theory based strategic two-way, proactive, open communication which is entwined with both organizational culture and the environment in which the organization functions. Their research posits that the more complex the environment is perceived, the more the organizational culture and *issues management* increase the inclusion of the PR function, which increases the enactment of the manager role by the practitioner.

Encroachment

Encroachment regarding public relations has been studied by various researchers (Broom, Lauzen, & Tucker, 1991; Lauzen, 1992; Lauzen & Dozier, 1992; J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1998; and Lee, Jares, & Heath, 1999). Encroachment is the placement of non-public relations professionals into the top management position of public relations departments. When the PR function is encroached, it becomes little more than a technical function of other departments (Lauzen, 1992).

This encroachment can occur at either the technician or management level, (Lauzen and Dozier, 1992). This involvement at the manager level has considerable significance as it “threatens the relative autonomy of the receiving department, reducing its claim on its organizational domain” (p.211).

Research has shown that competencies, managerial aspirations, and schema regarding the PR function by the practitioner limits encroachment (Lauzen, 1992). Recall above the research on manager role enactment (Broom & Dozier, 1986; Dozier & Broom, 1995). These studies encompassed the effect roles had on the public relations professional and what those effects had on manager roles and job satisfaction. Roles are vital to the profession and participation of the professional in certain roles eliminates encroachment.

Two areas of organizations are perceived to be most guilty of this invasion: law and marketing.

Legal Encroachment

In 1984 Gross wrote “over 70 percent of both corporate and non-corporate professionals today are in agreement that lawyers are dealing heavily in public affairs issues” (p. 25). He indicated that getting equal shares of senior management’s ear in decision-making was the crux of the problems with the two departments. Gross also conjectured change in both fields on many levels. As more lawyers found themselves in management positions of public relations arenas, respect for the PR function would heighten among lawyers. It should be noted here that this idea highlights Lauzen’s (1992) very concept of encroachment. Gross also hypothesized that several other factors would

bring the two departments together and that management would accept the collaborative “two-pronged” (p. 26) approach to problem-solving.

Lee, Jares, and Heath (1999) found that before times of crisis, legal counselors’ encroachment is highest at 29%, indicating senior management’s preference for legal advice during crisis planning (p. 262).

Marketing Encroachment

The greatest misconception about public relations is that it is an extension or function of marketing (Broom, Lauzen, & Tucker, 1991; Ehling, White, & Grunig, 1992; Dozier, L. A. Grunig, & J. E. Grunig, 1995). To illustrate this misconception, Broom, Lauzen, and Tucker (1991) wrote:

Some refer to the confusion and conflict between marketing and public relations as a “turf war.” In many organizations, however, the absence of a clearly defined public relations function precludes a serious or protracted conflict. If “war” occurred in those organizations, it would have to be as insurrections, as public relations typically is already subsumed by the larger, more powerful marketing function. (p. 220)

The researchers also indicate their panel definitively moved the much debated idea of product publicity into the marketing function. Broom, Lauzen and Tucker (1991) quoted Ehling who was decisive in attributing publicity to marketing because one of the “four p’s” of marketing communication is promotion, which entails product publicity.

Grunig and Grunig (1998) analyzed results from the Excellence study and determined that public relations is often encroached by marketing or made a technical aspect of marketing because of established results. Marketing has an easier time of demonstrating effectiveness and return on investment to CEOs or other members of top management. Hon’s (1998) research has been dedicated to studying the demonstration of results in the public relations field. She states clearly that setting goals and evaluating

them is a staggering task, but important for organizations to accomplish to warrant a need for an effective public relations department. She writes:

...practitioners seem to be moving toward more systematic public relations programming. All but one practitioner said that his or her organization has written goals and objectives for public relations. It is perhaps not surprising that the one organization lacking written goals and objectives is downsizing its public relations department. (p. 128)

Clearly this aforementioned public relations department was not working with Excellence Theory communication practices. Lauzen and Dozier (1992) noticed that encroachment, specifically regarding the marketing function, is a direct result of powerlessness in public relations. Both Strategic Contingencies Theory and Role Theory jointly tackle this power struggle problem resulting in the need for factors that eliminate encroachment. Excellence Theory gives specific characteristics that make public relations departments effective and communication a keystone.

Autonomy

Autonomy Defined

In 1991, Nakra noted that the future of advertising and marketing firms would depend on adding public relations services to the mix. This incorporation of elements of public relations has done much to help organizations with their short term marketing, but with unfortunate results to both the image of public relations and the long term effectiveness of communication in organizations (Grunig & Repper, 1992).

Serini (1993) adapts Price and Mueller's (1986) organizational autonomy to apply it to a department or individual. Her definition reads, "Autonomy is the degree to which a department or individual has power with respect to the environment" (p. 5). Her research added four elements (to L. A. Grunig's (1990, 1992) cited elements of time, culture or dominant coalition values, and tenure of employee) that influence autonomy. These

influences are 1) availability of resources, 2) complexity of environmental and informational aspects (in direct relation to power), 3) ownership of information, and 4) credibility (p. 21).

Crisis Management

Much research has been done on public relations taking advantage of the opportunities presented during times of crisis (Coombs, 1999; Dozier, Grunig, & Grunig, 1995; Fearn-Banks, 2002; Fink, 1986; Guth, 1995; Lee, Jares, & Heath, 1999; Mitroff & Kilmann, 1984; Pauchant & Mitroff, 1992). Crises can stimulate change. Change is good, but why wait until something bad befalls the organization before capitalizing on change? Plan strategically and be proactive to be prepared for such change. Public relations as a marketing tool does not prepare for change. Guth (1995) discovered that an organizations experience with crisis correlated with the enactment of the manager role in the PR practitioner, indicating lessons learned. But, he continues, proactive Excellent communication is critical before a crisis, which can only happen when the PR function has the top management's attention. Having the senior management's ear, as noted previously, is only achievable when the PR function is enacting the manager role and not being encroached upon.

PR and Autonomy

Serini (1993) concedes that her research is not overly generalizable to other organizations, but it does give useful insights regarding autonomy. Specifically, she indicates that creative tension formed by public relations practitioners sparked debate, which led to the addition of alternative perspectives in the group decision-making process. The subtext here is that public relations functioning as a technical facet of

another department will not provide this counteractive influence, which often leads to effective group decision making. Inferred also is the notion that this debate cannot occur if public relations is not a part of the dominant coalition and management.

With regards to encroachment specifically from legal departments during times of crisis, Lee, Jares, and Heath (1999) found that organizations with Excellent communications had fewer incidents and led to greater cooperative relationships between the counselors. The authors posit that public relations and legal teams in these participative, Excellent organizations “share ideas and resources, show concern and interest in what others want to accomplish, are responsive, supportive, and open to each other’s needs, and discuss issues to reach mutually satisfying agreements in the process of organizational crisis management” (p. 263).

Lauzen and Dozier (1992) go to great lengths to explain the relationship between marketing and public relations. *Marketing involvement* is the infringement of the function of marketing into the public relations domain. As discussed earlier, PR practitioners who fail to enact the manager role for whatever reason are often infringed upon. Lauzen and Dozier also indicate that marketing and public relations can easily work together and share support without interrupting the boundaries or threatening the autonomy of either department.

Hickson et al.’s (1971) *uncertainty* is germane here. The authors posit that, “uncertainty itself does not give power: coping gives power” (p.219). This leads to the conclusion that strategic planning enables the public relations professionals to enact the management function as both an expert in the field and a powerful figure in the organization. This power minimizes encroachment (Lauzen, 1992) and leads to the

supposition of an autonomous public relations department. Crisis planning is especially strategic in reducing uncertainty, another argument for separating public relations from other departments (Guth, 1995).

Grunig and Grunig (1998) condensed a facet of the Excellence study and came to the conclusion that, although more research was warranted, public relations and marketing are best separate. Their interviews with CEOs from organizations with Excellent public relations departments, “showed that top management is better prepared to make informed decisions when it relies on the distinct perspectives of both marketing and public relations” (p. 156). Their research also suggested a clear power balance between the two departments, indicating that when marketing communication received greater support, senior management found less value in public relations.

Ehling, White, and J. E. Grunig (1992) wrote extensively on the similarities and differences of public relations and marketing. Their research found that the two departments serve different functions and public relations cannot be Excellent when inhibited by marketing. They argued for separate or, at the least, “conceptually and operationally distinct” (p.390) execution of the two functions within the same department.

Broom, Lauzen, and Tucker’s (1991) panel discussion gives additional clarity on the domain of each function. Recall the definition from above that the researchers gave for public relations in comparison to the definition for marketing the same panel created:

Marketing is the management process whose goal is to attract and satisfy customers (or clients) on a long-term basis in order to achieve an organization’s economic objectives. Its fundamental responsibility is to build and maintain a market for an organization’s products or services. (pp. 223-224)

Broom, Lauzen, and Tucker (1991) record the panelists agreed on certain

similarities of both marketing and public relations, to include building relationships, employing similar processes, and strategic techniques. They decided that the major difference is perception of achieved outcomes. The public relations function is concerned more with maintaining order with the organization's publics or, as quoted by Ehling in the article, "changing the equation, balancing conflict and cooperation" (p. 223). In contrast, the marketing function was decided to focus more on the beneficial exchange between an organization and a public (consumer). Kotler was quoted in the dialogue as saying that, "marketing's central concept...is the management of the exchange relationship" (p. 223).

Most importantly, the panel in question decided that the two functions needed to remain separate for the following four reasons:

1. Yet another generation of managers is being educated who do not understand how public relations contributes to organizational success.
2. Yet another generation of public relations practitioners is being educated who are unable to fulfill the management function.
3. There is vacillation between marketing and public relations because the two functions are not understood by either managers or practitioners.
4. CEOs do not know how to utilize the respective strengths of public relations and marketing to achieve organizational missions. (Broom, Lauzen, & Tucker, 1991, p. 225).

It is important to note, that in support for autonomy, the public relations department must not be so separate as to be out of the loop. Autonomy is not isolation. Strategic Contingency and Excellence theories imply that *centrality* and *substitutability* maintain that the public relations function cannot be Excellent in a vacuum. Serini (1993) notes from her research that, "public relations professionals defined themselves as generalists who relied on specialists within the organization to provide them with such

information as legal counsel and an understanding of technical language” (p. 22).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the literature indicates that organizations are most effective when public relations is a part of strategic management. Public relations cannot be practiced strategically if the practitioner is not given the ear of top management. Being part of the management of an organization requires the practitioner to enact the manager role. The practitioner cannot take this role, as the literature suggests, if other departments encroach upon the public relations function or if a non-public relations professional provides the management of the public relations function. In addition to encroachment, both organizational power and organizational culture also affect the enactment of the manager role by the public relations professional.

This chain of events leads to the postulation that public relations, whether practiced by a department or a single individual, must remain, in theory, an autonomous function. This is not to say that small organizations cannot have a professional who practices any combination of fund-raising, law, marketing, or public relations, but that the professional must fully understand the function of effective and Excellent public relations as a separate entity and practice it as such. About Excellent public relations, J. E. Grunig (1992b) wrote:

Excellent public relations, in short, seems to be the glue that holds excellent organizations together, because of the importance of symmetrical communication and collaboration in organizations that are organic, value human resources, are innovative, have leaders who inspire rather than dictate, and have strong, participative cultures. In addition, excellent organizations can develop most easily in a societal culture that values collaboration – the last characteristic. Public relations is the organizational function that could bring such a culture into the organization, or that could export a participative organizational culture to the broader society. (p. 248).

REFERENCES

- Botan, C. H. & Taylor, M. (2004). Public relations: State of the field. *Journal of Communication, 54*(4), 645-661.
- Broom, G. M., Casey, S. & Ritchey, J. (1997). Toward a concept and theory of organization – public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 9*(2), 83-98.
- Broom, G. M. & Dozier, D. M. (1986). Advancement for public relations role models. *Public Relations Review, 12*(1), 37-56.
- Broom, G. M., Lauzen, M. M., & Tucker K. (1991). Public relations and marketing: Dividing the conceptual domain and operational turf. *Public Relations Review, 17*(3), 219-225.
- Coombs, T. (1999). *Ongoing crisis communications: Planning, managing, and responding*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Dozier, D. M., & Broom, G. M. (1995). Evolution of the manager role in public relations practice. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 7*(1), 3-26.
- Dozier, D.M., Grunig, L. A. & Grunig, J. E. (1995). *Manager's guide to excellence in public relations and communication management*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ehling, W. P. White, J., & Grunig, J. E. (1992). Public relations and marketing practices. In J.E. Grunig, (ed.) *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 357–394.
- Fearn-Banks, K. (2002). *Crisis communications: A casebook approach*. Lawrence Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Fink, S. (1986). *Crisis management: Planning for the inevitable*. New York: AMACOM.
- Gross, S. (1984). Public relations prickly relationship with lawyers. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 29(1), 25-26.
- Grunig, J.E., (ed.) (1992). *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grunig, J. E. (1992). What is excellence in management? In J.E. Grunig (ed.) *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 219–250.
- Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1998). The relationship between public relations and marketing in excellent organizations: Evidence from the IABC study. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 4, 141-162.
- Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (2000). Public relations in strategic management and strategic management of public relations: Theory and evidence from the IABC Excellence project. *Journalism Studies*, 1(2), 303-321.
- Grunig, J.E. & Repper, F.C. (1992). Strategic management, publics, and issues. In J.E. Grunig (ed.) *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 117–157.
- Grunig, L.A., Grunig, J.E. & Ehling W.P. (1992). What is an effective organization? In J.E. Grunig, (ed.) *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 65–90.
- Guth, D. W. (1995). Organizational crisis experience and public relations roles. *Public Relations Review*, 21(2), 123-136.

- Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., Lee, C. A., Schneck, R. E., & Pennings, J. M. (1971). A strategic contingencies' theory of intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*, 216-229.
- Hon, L. C. (1998). Demonstrating effectiveness in public relations: Goals, objectives, and evaluation. *Journal of Public Relations Research 10*(2), 103-135.
- Hutton, J. G. (1999). The definition, dimension, and domain of public relations. *Public Relations Review, 2*, 199-214.
- Jo, S. (2003). The portrayal of public relations in the news media. *Mass Communication and Society, 6*(4), 397-411.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lauzen, M. M. (1992). Public relations, intraorganizational power and encroachment. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 4*(2), 61-80.
- Lauzen, M. M. & Dozier, D. M. (1992). The missing link: The public relations manager role as mediator of organizational environment and power consequences for the function. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 4*(4), 205-220.
- Lauzen, M. M. & Dozier, D. M. (1994). Issues management mediation of linkage between environmental complexity and management of the public relations function. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 6*(3), 163-184.
- Lee, J., Jares, S. M., & Heath, R. L. (1999). Decision-making encroachment and cooperative relation between public relations and legal counselors in the management of organizational crisis. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 11*(3), 243-270.

- Mitroff, I. I. & Kilmann, R. H. (1984). *Corporate tragedies: Product tampering, sabotage, and other catastrophes*. New York: Praeger.
- Moss, D. & Green, R. (2001). Re-examining the manager's role in public relations: What management and public relations research teaches us. *Journal of Communication Management*, 6(2), 118-132.
- Nakra, P. (2001). The changing role of public relations and marketing communication. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 36(1), 42-45.
- Pauchant, T. C. & Mitroff, I. I. (1992). *Transforming the crisis-prone organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Serini, S. A. (1993). Influence on the power of public relations professionals in organizations: A case study. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 5(1), 1-25.
- Sriramesh, K., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (1996). Observation and measurement of two dimensions of organizational culture and their relation to public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 8(4), 229-261.
- Yaverbaum, E. & Bly, B. (2001) *Public relations kit for dummies: A reference for the rest of us*. New York: IDG Books Worldwide, Inc.