This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

ELABORATING THE CONCEPT OF
PUBLIC RELATIONS ROLES
AND A TEST OF ITS UTILITY

presented by

JOUNGHWA CHOI

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Ph.D.   degree in   Advertising, Public Relations,
and Retailing

_____
Major Professor's Signature

11/27/07
_____
Date

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

ELABORATING THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS ROLES
AND A TEST OF ITS UTILITY

By

Jounghwa Choi

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Advertising, Public Relations & Retailing

2007

ABSTRACT

ELABORATING THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS ROLES AND A TEST OF ITS UTILITY

By

Jounghwa Choi

The types of roles that public relations practitioners play in organizations are deemed an indicator of the status of public relations as a profession (J. E. Grunig, 2000). Notwithstanding its significance, the concept of public relations roles is rudimentary rather than sophisticated. Several limitations are found in previous role research. First, the majority of role studies have adopted the manager-technician dual role typology, which received substantial criticism (e.g., Leichty & Springston, 1996; Moss, Newman, & DeSanto, 2005). Second, scholars often conceptualized public relations roles based on the contents of the activities (i.e., what they do), rather than the purposes of the activities (i.e., what they do for an organization's public relations). Third, public relations roles were conceptualized at the individual level, prohibiting an examination of the relationship of public relations roles with organizational level variables. Finally, previous role measures lack construct validity as most of the studies used exploratory factor analytic techniques.

Given the limitations of previous research, the purposes of the present study were: 1) to elaborate the concepts of public relations roles at the level of public relations unit (e.g., department, division, or team) taking into account the purpose of role activities in light of an organization's public relations; and 2) to test the utility of the elaborated concepts of public relations roles in South Korea. A survey was administered to public relations practitioners employed at 226 companies that are among South Korea's top

1000 companies.

The results from a confirmatory factor analysis of public relations roles suggested seven public relations roles that include: activist, advocate, advisor, expert prescriber, liaison, monitor, and coordinator. Each of the seven roles was related differentially to the criterion variables, such as the influence of the public relations unit on an organization's decision making, environmental uncertainty of organizations, and top management's philosophy, suggesting their own distinct utility in public relations theories. More importantly, the results suggested that, depending on the type of public relations roles enacted, the organization's public relations model would differ. When public relations units had more focus on the advocate role while having less focus on the liaison, coordinator, and advisor roles, companies' public relations practices were more likely to be oriented toward the one-way asymmetric public relations model. Meanwhile, all seven public relations roles were more frequently enacted in organizations that practiced the two-way mixed-motive model.

In sum, the present study showed the utility of this elaborated concept of public relations roles. The findings suggest that using the elaborated concept of public relations roles would have better exploratory and predictive power in explaining phenomena in public relations management than using the vague concept of the manager role. It is expected that this present study provides a ground for sophisticated theorization of public relations roles. Practical implications for public relations educators and practitioners are also suggested by providing information regarding the types of public relations roles and their consequences within organizations.

This dissertation is dedicated to
my family for their unconditional love and support
and to God for making all this possible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I started my doctoral study, I was over-confident enough to think that I should do things by myself. What I realized going through my doctoral study is that nothing can be done without others and that everything becomes meaningful when I work "with" and "for" others. Here, I would like to express my appreciation to those who taught me this simple truth.

First, I thank members of my dissertation committee for their constant encouragement and intellectual support. They served me as a strong team providing unique and complementary perspectives. I am extremely grateful for the invaluable support I received from my dissertation director and committee chair, Dr. Teresa Mastin. She always put my success in the doctoral program as her priority and instructed my dissertation study to be focused whenever I wavered. While she encouraged me to be an independent thinker, she also served as an objective eye to my study preventing me from being obsessed with my own ideas. Dr. Hee Sun Park helped me to set my study in a strong conceptual and methodological framework. Her pinpointed comments revealed my under-developed ideas and help me to carve them out. Her strong knowledge in methods and statistics allowed the committee members to have confidence in the methodological approaches of my dissertation. Dr. Yoonhyeng Choi has been a superb counselor and friend during my dissertation journey. Past research projects with her provided valuable insights to my dissertation study. She trained me in building strong theoretical arguments and kept me focusing on how my study answers what it is supposed to answer. I am also greatly indebted to Dr. Kami Silk who instructed me to probe into the points that I have missed. Her comments were always very precise and helped me to position my study in

the broader theoretical context. She provided valuable insights to my study from the organizational management and communication perspective.

I am also grateful to my colleagues and professors in my program who have been advisors and friends to me: Dr. Mira Lee, Dr. Kyung Nan Kwon, Eunsun Lee, Myeng Ja Yang, Jung Sun Ahn, Mi Kyung Kim, Hyun Joo Jeong, and Sung Mi Lee. They helped me overcome setbacks and I deeply appreciate their friendship. I owe a special note of gratitude to my friends in the prayers meeting, "Sisters of Lydia," who shared the moments of sorrow and happiness: Eun Sil Lee, Miran Kim, Dr. Kumhee Yang, Jee Young Bang, Jeonghee Noh, Jin Young Choi, Yoo-mi Chin, Sunhee Moon, Sang Eun Lee, Jung Eun Lee, Hyunjoo Ha, Myung Sun Huh, Han Sook Choi, and Christina Dokter. For the past years, they have been my family.

I could have not completed my doctoral study without support and love from my family. I would like to express my heart-felt gratitude to my husband, Wooshin Kang, for his constant love and support, and to my precious baby, Joanne Si-Hyun Kang, for being a constant source of my strength and endurance all these years. I am also greatly indebted to my parents-in-law, Sung Won Kang and Bu Ja Kim, for their support and patience taking care of my baby. My special thanks go to my parents Hang Joo Choi and Man Soon Yang for their unconditional love and support. My sister, sisters-in-law, brother, and brothers-in-law deserve special thanks for their encouragement and support.

Finally, my highest thanks go to God who blessed me with these amazing people. It has been a remarkable period of growth for me during which I began to learn walking in the Lord. I thank God for showing his grace and providing wisdom and courage to go thorough this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The organizational role of public relations has been one of the most extensively studied topics in the public relations domain (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002). Such extensive academic attention to public relations roles is primarily because the organizational roles of public relations practitioners indicate the status of public relations as a profession (J. E. Grunig, 2000). Research has shown that practitioners' roles in organizations are related to an organization's public relations process and practices, such that they influence the organization's public relations model or practitioners' participation in decision making (Dozier, 1992). Because practitioners' everyday activities are likely to be defined by the way their roles are defined in their organizations and in the society in which they live, the concept of organizational roles has significant implications for public relations practitioners. While previous public relations role studies have substantially contributed to the body of knowledge in public relations, they are bounded by several limitations. In the section below, I discuss the problems with previous public relations role research and introduce the purpose and overall design of this study.

Problem Statement

Several conceptual and methodological limitations are found in previous public relations roles studies. At least four problems can be discussed: 1) limitation with the manager-technician dual-role approach; 2) conceptualization of public relations roles without considering purpose of role activities; 3) limitation with individual-focused level

of conceptualization and analysis; 4) methodological and statistical issues with previous role measures.

Limitation with the Dual-Role Approach

The first limitation arises from the simple dichotomized approach to the public relations roles. Introducing the concept of public relations roles, Broom and Smith (1979) originally suggested four types of roles: expert prescriber role, communication facilitator role, problem-solving process facilitator, and communication technician role. A follow-up study (Broom, 1982) found that the first three roles are highly correlated, and thus combined them into the manager role (Dozier, 1984). Dozier (1984) argued that this manager-technician typology provides a parsimonious way to operationalize public relations roles and to examine its relationships with other theoretical constructs. Manager role enactment was found to be one of the primary factors that characterize excellent public relations practices (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002). This dual role approach to public relations has served as a dominant framework in public relations roles research.

Notwithstanding its contribution to the body of knowledge in public relations, the dual-role approach has several limitations. First of all, scholars (Leichty & Springston, 1996; Moss et al., 2005; Porter & Sallot, 2003) argued that the dual role typology might obscure the nature of the roles that public relations practitioners play in organizations. Criticizing that the manager role was conceptualized to refer to *"everything other than technical activities"* (p. 468), Leichty and Springston (1996) commented that by simplifying practitioner roles meaningful information is lost.

Second, the dual-role approach hinders examining the differential effects of the specific aspects of the manager role. Several studies suggest that the three roles which

have been subsumed under the manager roles may have different effects on an organization's public relations or a certain type of role might be in demand more than other types of roles depending on an organization's situation. For example, Acharya (1983) reported that the type of public relations role enacted depends on an organization's environment: problem-solving process was more likely to be enacted when the organization's environment is more threatening and changeable while the expert prescriber role was enacted when the environment was less changeable while being more threatening. Broom and Smith's (1979) study also suggest that the three manager roles may differ in terms of their efficacy in public relations research: public relations consultants who functioned as a problem-solving facilitator was perceived to be better in accomplishing tasks than those who played a role as a communication process facilitator. These findings suggest that public relations research may benefit by exploring the differential effects of sub-dimensions of the manager role or the conditions under which certain roles are more likely to be efficacious. An organization's public relations needs can vary, requiring enactment of certain roles to a different degree. An amalgam of sub-dimensions of public relations manager roles makes it difficult to explore the unique effects of different aspects of the public relations manager role.

Conceptualization of Public Relations Roles without Considering Purpose

Another issue arises from the fact that scholars often conceptualized public relations roles based on the contents of the activities (i.e., what they do) rather than the purposes of the activities in light of the organization's public relations (i.e., what they do for the organization's public relations). When previous role studies mentioned "public relations roles," it was not clear whether they were referring to the roles that are germane

to the public relations function or any kind of activities that public relations practitioners carry out regardless of the nature of the public relations function. For example, among Broom and Smith's (1979) four public relations roles typology – communication facilitator, problem-solving facilitator, and expert-prescriber – describe the types of roles that public relations consultants perform with particular purposes in order to assist their clients' public relations, i.e., to provide solutions to clients' public relations problems or to serve as mediator between the clients and their publics. Meanwhile, the communication technician role activities do not connote public relations related purposes. For public relations practitioners, technical activities such as producing brochures or pamphlets or editing written materials are never the ultimate goals, while they could be the means for other purposes such as informing publics, advocating the organization's position, or advising top management. Other types of role activities could be understood in the similar manner: a group of scholars (DeSanto & Moss, 2004; Ferguson, 1979 as cited in Dozier, 1992; Moss & Green, 2001; Moss et al., 2005; Moss, Warnaby, & Newman, 2000) discussed the manager role focusing on the types of tasks that are applied to general managers, but not necessarily germane to public relations. For example, Ferguson (1979 as cited in Dozier, 1992) identified roles such as a staff manager and a meeting organizer as public relations roles. Moss and Green (2001) also suggested taking into account the common elements of managerial work identified in the management literature, such as monitoring, planning, negotiating, or allocating resources, in defining public relations manager roles. These conceptualizations of the manager role differ from Broom and Smith's three manager roles because these roles activities are general to any type of management position rather than reflecting unique role activities implying

4

specific purposes for an organization's public relations. These types of role activities would be better seen as activities that contribute to effective enactment of more generic types of public relations roles, rather than themselves being public relations roles.

As such, the conceptualization of public relations roles differs based on the approach used. If we solely focus on the role activities that manifest purposes of an organization's public relations, administrative or technician roles would not be considered as public relations roles. If we focus on public relations practitioners' tasks without considering the ultimate goals of the activities, we could define public relations roles in terms of administrative and technical activities. While this former approach identifies the role activities in conjunction with purposes of the public relations function, the latter concerns the tasks or activities that public relations practitioners perform regardless of the generic public relations function.

This study argues that identifying public relations roles by considering the purposes of the activities in light of the organization's public relations is critical. A couple of public relations scholars (Bivins, 1989; Ehling, 1992) have already pointed out this issue. For example, Bivins (1989) argued that, while previous public relations role studies were successful in categorizing, they failed to address the purposes associated with the roles. He addressed the importance of identifying the public relations role in conjunction with the purpose of the public relations function. Because role does not necessarily imply purpose, purpose may determine role, therefore, considering purpose allows us to explore the normative model of public relations roles. Similarly, Ehling (1992) criticized the definition of public relations used by the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) for making the statement of public relations practitioners'

responsibilities too broad, which produces conceptual confusion. In an official statement by PRSA in 1982, the scope of public relations domain as a management function included activities such as:

> "anticipating, analyzing and interpreting public opinion, attitudes and issues which might impact" on an organization, doing research on a "continuing basis," "planning and implementing the organization's effort to influence or change public policy," and "setting objectives, planning, budgeting, recruiting and training staff" (Ehling, 1992, p. 458).

Ehling argued that this conceptualization potentially encourages individuals to view "every manager in an organization as engaging in public relations by virtue of doing what managers are supposed to do, namely, anticipate attitudes and issues, do research, set objectives, plan, fix budgets and the like" (p. 459). He further argued that this view is counter productive "because it makes public relations as a specialized administrative function irrelevant" (Ehling, 1992, p.459).

Limitation with Individual-Level Conceptualization of Public Relations Roles

The majority of role research has identified the organizational roles of individual practitioners rather than the roles of a public relations unit as a whole. The roles and status of individual practitioners in organizations has been an important issue, because in the early days of public relations many organizations had single practitioners. However, as public relations has moved toward a profession, the size of public relations units within organizations has increased and individual practitioners' responsibilities have become more specialized: entry level practitioners are more likely to take care of technical aspects of public relations while the top public relations manager is more likely to be in charge of strategic and administrative activities. As a result, the extent of an organization's public relations cannot be fully explained by an individual practitioner's

6

role. The public relations practices of an organization depends on what its public relations

unit does as a whole rather than what individual practitioners do respectively. It is

therefore important to explore the role of the public relations function in organizations as

a whole. L. A. Grunig et al. (2002) acknowledged this issue arguing that:

> "… the role of the individual respondent has been examined independently of the context of the communication department. This is especially problematic because manager role enactment involves a wide range of competences, all of which may not reside in a single individual but may be spread among a number of communicators" (p. 225).

While L. A. Grunig et al. (2002) introduced the concept of "department level competence

for manager role" (i.e., competence for administrative and strategic roles), it is not

synonymous with the roles of public relations units. The department level competence

reflect the extent to which a public relations unit or members in the unit have the

expertise or knowledge to perform strategic and administrative tasks, rather than specific

types of roles that a public relations unit plays as a whole.

Measuring public relations roles at the level of the public relations unit has

several theoretical advantages. First, it allows for exploring the relationship between

public relations roles and an organization's public relations process or outcomes. Because

the public relations role has been conceptualized at the individual level, it has primary

utility in understanding individual practitioners' behaviors, rather than in understanding

the public relations process at the organization level. For example, previous studies have

examined the relationship between type of public relations role enacted and practitioners'

participation in decision making (Dozier & Broom, 1995), use of technology (Porter &

Sallot, 2003), or competence for the two-way public relations model (Broom & Dozier,

1986; Dozier, 1992). While several role studies (e.g., Fabiszak, 1985, as cited in Lauzen

& Dozier, 1992; Lauzen & Dozier, 1992; McMillan, 1984, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992; Pollack, 1986, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992) have explored individual practitioners' role enactment in conjunction with organizational level variables, the results are subjected to a question because an individual's role may not represent the role of public relations unit. For example, in a study with a sample of PRSA and International Association of Business Communicators (IABC) members, Lauzen and Dozier (1992) related role enactment with an organizational level variable, i.e., public relations encroachment. Because the survey respondents may not be the top public relations managers, the role they enact may not represent the roles of their public relations department. In such cases, relating individual practitioners' role enactment with public relations outcomes may not capture accurate relationship between the variables.

Second, department/unit level conceptualization of public relations roles can mask the effects of role enactment with the effects of formal job rank. Tenure with organizations and professional experience were strongly related to enactment of the manager role (Dozier & Broom, 1995). As a result, it is not clear whether the effect of role enactment on participation in decision making, for example, is due to public relations practitioners' formal hierarchical position or due to the unique roles they play in organizations. It is conceivable that even though top public relations practitioners are in the similar hierarchical position, the role that they play could be different, resulting in different public relations outcomes. Conceptualizing public relations roles at the department level allows for a direct exploration of the relationships of public relations roles with various organizational-level variables, such as public relations models or

contribution of a public relations unit to an organization's bottom-line, while minimizing the potential confounding effects of respondents' job rank.

Methodological Limitation of Previous Research

Previous role measures are lacking construct validity as most of the studies used exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (e.g., Reagan, Anderson, Sumner, & Hill, 1990) or principle component factor analysis (PCA) (e.g., L. A. Grunig et al., 2002; Kelleher, 2001; Leichty & Springston, 1996; Moss et al., 2005; Porter & Sallot, 2003). To my knowledge, no study conducted confirmatory factor analysis on the measure of public relations roles. The number of factors generated from EFA or PCA depends on the samples and the number of items measured. As a result, previous role research with EFA or PCA did not generate consistent factor solutions as the samples and items changed. For example, Dozier's (1984) factor analysis with internal practitioners generated four factors that are conceptually different from Broom and Smith's (1979). In Dozier's study, the media relations specialist role and the communication liaison role emerged as minor roles along with the two major roles of manager and technician. Meanwhile, the factor analysis on agency consultants produced six factors (Dozier, 1984). In the excellence study (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002), the PCA solution on public relations roles among CEOs was different from the one that emerged from top PR managers: a dual-role structure emerged from top PR managers whereas five factors (i.e., manager, technician, media relations, senior media manager, and representative roles) emerged from CEOs' role expectation. Furthermore, the items that constituted the manager role among the top PR managers were different from the ones of the CEOs. Not just the number of factors, the content of factors was also inconsistent. For example, while previous conceptualization

of the manager role (Broom & Smith, 1979) contained all three managerial roles identified by Broom and Smith (i.e., expert prescriber, problem solving facilitator, and communication liaison), the manager role in the excellence study (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002) captured primarily the expert prescriber role, not all three roles. Meanwhile, the senior advisor role in the excellence study was consistent with the items of Broom and Smith's problem solving facilitator and communication facilitator.

A similar problem is also found in Leichty and Springston's (1996) study. They used PCA with a scale inventory that includes Broom and Smith's original 24 items and 14 items of the boundary spanning measure. Because the number of items increased, their factor solution was different from the ones in the previous studies and some of the items loaded on the factor different from the original ones. For example, "take responsibility for success or failure," which was an item of expert prescriber in Broom and Smith was clustered with "keep management actively involved," an item of problem-solving facilitator, under the factor named PR catalyst. A new factor named PR counsel also emerged, which consisted of items of expert prescriber and problem-solving facilitator.

The inconsistent results of factor analysis draw attention to problems with the statistical procedures used in the previous studies. Even though many role studies were based on Broom and Smith's conceptualization and expected emergence of manager and technician roles, principle component factor analysis (PCA) was used instead of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). It is generally recommended to use CFA in order to examine the stability of factor structure, once an instrument has been developed with EFA. The use of PCA is especially problematic, given that the purpose of PCA is data reduction rather than finding a latent factor structure, which is a goal of EFA (H. S. Park,

Dailey, & Lemus, 2002). Furthermore, varimax rotation was utilized in most studies (e.g., Kelleher, 2001; Moss et al., 2005; Porter & Sallot, 2003; Toth & Grunig, 1993), although it was expected or shown that the sub-roles were highly expected to correlate with one another. H. S. Park et al. (2002) suggested using oblique rotation when factors are expected to correlate one another. Given the limitations with the statistical procedures in the previous studies, more attempts to validate the measure are required.

Summary

In summary, previous public relations role research provides a limited understanding about the nature of public relations roles in four primary ways. First, the concrete nature of the public relations roles was obscured by relying on the manager-technician dual-role approach. Second, a critical conceptual issue also arises from the inconsistent perspectives on identifying what constitute the manager roles: i.e., any role activity that public relations managers do vs. role activities with purposes in light of an organization's public relations. Third, conceptualizing the public relations roles at the individual level also limited exploring the relationship between public relations roles and organizational level variables. Finally, the previous studies are subjected to shortcomings of statistical approaches, resulting in inconsistent factor solutions and lack of construct validity.

Purposes of the Study

Conceptual clarification is the first step of theory building. The limitations revealed in the previous research require further sophistication of the concepts of public relations roles in order to advance public relations research. Given the addressed

limitations, the purposes of the present study are: 1) to elaborate the concepts of public relations roles, in particular the manager role; and 2) to test the utility of the elaborated concepts of public relations roles. It is of particular interest to see if the concept of public relations roles derived from the Western literature would apply to South Korea.

In an attempt to achieve the first research goal, this study adopted the following approaches in order to address the limitations of previous studies: (1) going beyond the dual role typology, this study attempts to identify public relations roles not just from the previous role research but also other public relations literature, in order to capture the evolving roles of public relations in this era; (2) in conceptualizing public relations roles, this study takes into account the purposes of the activities in light of an organization's public relations, rather than focusing on managerial/technical tasks; (3) this study conceptualizes public relations role at the public relations department/unit level, not at the individual level; (4) this study conducts a confirmatory factor analysis rather than exploratory factor analytic techniques.

In order to achieve the second research goal of this study, the newly developed cooncept of public relations roles will be tested against the nomological network. That is, I will examine the relationship of role enactment with several antecedents and outcome variables such as management philosophy, organizational environment, influence of public relations in decision making, value of public relations to the organizations, and public relations models. This study has a particular interest in public relations models, which lies at the core of public relations research. Aiming for extending the theoretical application of public relations role theory, this study will examine whether enactment of a certain role is more or less related to certain public relations models that organizations

practice. By examining this relationship, the study will be able to identify the roles that are unique to the public relations function and that have greater utility in predicting other public relations variables.

Significance of the Study

This study is expected to contribute to the body of knowledge in public relations with several theoretical implications. First, the present study can facilitate public relations role research by elaborating the concepts of public relations roles. The manager-technician dichotomy has served as a dominant theoretical framework, while hindering an examination of the unique effects of each sub-dimension of the manager role. When studies went beyond the dual-role typology, the role of public relations was inconsistently conceptualized, often based on the types of activities without reference to the purposes of the activities. Individual level conceptualization of roles has been a weakness also. This study addresses several limitations concerning the concept of public relations roles. Future studies will benefit by incorporating the concepts of public relations roles proposed in this study. Second, this study can contribute to theory building of public relations by testing the relationship of public relations roles with various process and outcome variables related to an organization's public relations, in particular, its public relations models. Finally, the study will provide insight regarding perspectives on public relations roles in Asian countries. Most of the public relations role measurement studies have been conducted in the United States and the United Kingdom. Only a few studies explored public relations roles outside the U.S. and U.K., e.g., Canada (Piekos & Einsiedel, 1990), Austria and Norway (Coombs, Holladay, Hasenauer, & Signitzer,

1994), Thailand (Ekachai, 1995), and Brazil (Molleda & Ferguson, 2004). Most of the studies relied on the concepts and measurement of the manager-technician dual roles. Therefore, the study will examine the applicability of the Western concept of public relations roles within a South Korean context.

This study also has several practical implications to public relations practitioners and organizations. The results of the study can be used to inform public relations practitioners of the types of public relations roles their unit should play. Education on such role norms is important, because professionalism is greatly influenced by the way practitioners view and define their profession (Cameron, Sallot, & Lariscy, 1996; Sallot, Cameron, & Lariscy, 1997). Thus, public relations educators will discover the findings of this study useful in teaching future public relations practitioners the type of roles they are expected or should play in order to practice public relations as a management function within their organizations.

Overview of the Following Chapters

The rest of the dissertation is organized as follows. In Chapter II, I will describe the theoretical frameworks and concepts within which this study is grounded. The concepts of roles and public relations roles are explained and previous research findings concerning public relations roles will be detailed. Next, I will propose a set of public relations roles that are theoretically driven. For each role, its concept and theoretical rationales will be provided. Then, antecedents and outcomes variables of public relations roles will be introduced and their relationships with public relations roles will be discussed. Finally, I will provide background information on public relations in South

Korea. The characteristics of public relations practices in South Korea and previous research conducted in South Korea, in particular, public relations role research will be introduced.

Chapter III will describe the details of the research method. First, description of the population and sample will be provided and then the data collection procedures are explained. Next, the operationalization of construct and specific measurement items for the instrument are given. Finally, the specific data analysis techniques to answer research questions are provided.

Chapter IV provides the results of the study. First, the description of the sample will be provided. Next, the findings corresponding to each research question will be presented.

Finally, Chapter V discusses the findings of the study and its theoretical and practical implications. Then, I discuss the limitations of the study and provide recommendation for future studies.

CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Background of Public Relations Role Research

Professionalism and Public Relations Roles

The driving force of role research was theorists' and practitioners' striving for professionalism of public relations, i.e., obtaining the legitimacy of public relations as a profession (J. E. Grunig, 2000). Professionalism, "the extent to which public relations is a profession and its practitioners are professionals," has been the focus of discussions at many conferences and meetings (Cutlip, Center, & Broom, 1985, p.72). Because professionalization of an occupation accompanies benefits, such as prestige, respect, and a positive public image, public relations researchers (e.g., Cameron, Sallot, & Lariscy, 1996; Marston, 1968) have searched for the characteristics of public relations that fit the standards of professionalism.

A profession is distinguished from a skilled occupation in the following aspects: having a defined area of competence; an established body of knowledge; supported with scientific research and theory building; availability of continuing education; professional values and granted autonomy to practitioners (J. E. Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Marston, 1968). If public relations is just a skilled occupation, there is no need for continuous effort for scientific research and higher level education.

Professionalism is closely related to the roles that public relations practitioners play in organizations. The traditional public relations role as publicity cannot achieve the status of professionalism, because its body of knowledge and practices would rely on other disciplines, such as journalism, rather than having an independent domain. To the

extent that the roles that public relations practitioners play in organizations is perceived specialized, non-substitutable, and critically independent from other professional domains, professionalism is likely to be achieved. As practitioners in the earlier days primarily focused on publicity, identifying public relations roles simply based on what they do cannot contribute to the professionalization of public relations. Given that understanding, public relations scholars have attempted to identify roles of public relations in terms of its operation as a management function.

Evolution of the Concept of Public Relations Roles

The concept of public relations roles were first introduced by Broom and Smith (1979). Borrowing from the consulting literature, they proposed four role types: expert prescriber role, communication facilitator role, problem-solving process facilitator, and communication technician role. When public relations practitioners act as problem-solving process facilitators, they help top management work to solve public relations problems with a satisfactory solution. Meanwhile, practitioners who play a role as expert prescribers provide solutions for public relations problems to the management, rather than making public relations issues the responsibility of management. The communication facilitator indicates a role as a go-between senior management and key publics. Finally, communication technicians focus on providing technical communication services. Broom and Smith's work served as a foundation for subsequent studies. Broom and Dozier (1986) later developed the manager-technician dual-role typology and it became one of the most frequently cited journal articles in the area of public relations from 1990 to 1995 (Pasadeos, Renfro, & Hanily, 1999).

As public relations gains recognition as a management function, the public relations functions of organizations are becoming more sophisticated and are extending their domain of activities. Accordingly, recent concepts of public relations roles have evolved to include a more diverse aspect of managerial activities by public relations practitioners (e.g., Leichty & Springston, 1996; Molleda & Ferguson, 2004; Moss et al., 2005; Ryan, 2003). For example, Leichty and Springston (1996) produced eight public relations activities: advocacy, catalyst, gatekeeping, training, counsel, communication technician, formal research, and information acquisition. Using cluster analysis, they categorized PR practitioners into five groups depending on their focus on the reported eight activities: internals, generalists, externals, managers, and outliers. These five clusters could be seen as different types of roles that public relations practitioners play in organizations. Moss et al. (2005) came up with five public relations roles typologies, such as monitor/evaluation, issue management expert, key policy and strategy advisor, trouble-shooter problem-solver, and communication technician.

Meanwhile, a group of scholars argued that public relations manager roles should be defined considering the core managerial activities identified in the management literature (DeSanto & Moss, 2004; Moss & Green, 2001). In line with this argument, Moss et al. (2000) conducted a qualitative study that explored the types of managerial work in which senior public relations managers engaged. Their study found that senior public relations professionals spend significant amounts of time on administrative tasks such as internal and external meetings, attending external events, and organizing staffs, while also playing as a communication technician role and advisor to the management.

Recently, scholars began to move beyond the organizational roles of public relations, and increasingly call for attention to the social roles of public relations. Some scholars viewed public relations practitioners as agents of social transformation (Pérez-Senac, 1998; del Rey-Morato, 2000, as cited in Molleda & Ferguson, 2004) and social integration (Simões, 1992; J. E. Grunig, 2000). In this view, promoting social progress and well-being is deemed as the ultimate purposes of the profession of public relations. For example, Molleda and Ferguson (2004) identified four types of internal and external social roles of public relations in Brazil, which include: ethics and social responsibility, employee well-being, community well-being, and government harmony. The social trends that demand honesty and transparency are asking for further attention to this extended concept of public relations roles beyond the boundary of organizations (Molleda & Ferguson, 2004).

Although recent studies have tried to extend the concept of public relations roles, researchers have continued to work primarily with the same role activities (i.e., primarily the manager role and the technician role) over a 20-year period.

The Antecedents and Outcomes of Public Relations Roles

The concept of public relations roles have served as a useful tool to predict and explain the public relations process in organizations. Previous studies have shown that practitioners' roles are associated with their participation in decision making (Broom, 1982; Gordon & Kelly, 1999; Lauzen & Dozier, 1994), public relations model of organizations (Fabiszak, 1985, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992; McMillan, 1984, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992; Pollack, 1986, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992), and encroachment of the public relations function (Lauzen, 1992a, 1993; Lauzen & Dozier,

1992). More specifically, manager role enactment was positively related to practitioners' participation in decision making (Broom, 1982; Lauzen & Dozier, 1994), while the technician role was not. Manager role enactment also had a negative effect on encroachment of the public relations function. To the extent public relations practitioners enact the manager role, they were able to prevent the assignment of individuals from outside public relations to the head of the public relations unit, suggesting the organizational power of public relations units to maintain their own domain (Lauzen & Dozier, 1992). A study by Gordon and Kelly (1999) also suggests that manager role enactment contributes to an organization's effectiveness. They found that communication departments' competencies to enact the manager role were strongly related to the departments' competencies to participate in strategic decision making, and ultimately, effectiveness of organizations.

Meanwhile, the type of public relations roles enactment depends on various organizational and individual factors, such as environmental uncertainty (Acharya, 1983; White & Dozier, 1992); gender (Broom & Dozier, 1986; Toth & Cline, 1989; Toth & Grunig, 1993; Toth, Serini, Wright, & Emig, 1998); length of professional experience, tenure with an employer, previous education, and the size of the public relations function (Dozier & Broom, 1995); and competence to enact public relations roles, such as knowledge to use scientific research for program planning and evaluation (Dozier, 1984, 1990; L. A. Grunig, 2002). Environmental complexity is one of the most frequently discussed factors as an influencer on public relations role enactment. Manager role enactment by top communicators was positively related to environmental uncertainty of organizations (Lauzen & Dozier, 1992). While practitioners tended to enact technician

roles when an organization's environment is non-threatening/static, manager roles, in particular, expert prescriber and problem-solving process facilitator role, were pronounced in both dynamic and threatening environments (Acharya, 1983; Johnson & Acharya, 1982). Top management also plays a critical role in public relations role enactment. Moss et al.'s (2000) qualitative study suggested that management's understanding and expectations of the public relations function influences PR practitioners' role enactment. Another important condition for role enactment concerns expertise or knowledge to perform a certain role (L. A. Grunig, 2002). Two types of competence were suggested: competence for administrative roles and strategic roles. Administrative competence for the manager role factor consisted of activities such as developing goals and objectives, preparing a departmental budget, and managing people, whereas strategic managerial role activities included conducting evaluation research, using research to segment publics, and performing environmental scanning. Similarly, Dozier (1984, 1990) reported that having the knowledge to use scientific research for program planning and evaluation is related to manager role enactment.

Public Relations Roles in South Korea

Public relations in South Korea. The origin of the modern concept of public relations goes back to the 1940's when the U.S. Army established an administrative operation in Korea (Oh, 1991). In the 1960's and 1970's, public relations began to be practiced widely in the private sector following the dramatic economic growth of Korean corporations. The public relations activities of Korean conglomerates in this period, however, primarily focused on the publicity model (Kim & Hon, 1998). In-house public relations departments were established to prevent negative media coverage (Oh, 1991).

In the 1980's, public relations in Korea experienced qualitative growth into more sophisticated public relations practices. The domains of public relations began to expand to broader areas, such as employee relations, crisis communication, issues management, reputation management, community relations, reputation management, and investor relations. These changes were driven by various social and political changes, such as political democratization, globalization, growth of social interest groups, and the influx of foreign entities (Rhee, 2002). While the economic crisis in the 1990's slowed down the growth of in-house public relations by laying off public relations practitioners, it stimulated the growth of the public relations consulting industry, as the laid-off practitioners moved to or opened public relations consulting agencies (J. Park, 2005). The multiple media environment also stimulated the need for professional public relations, moving from marketing communication with an emphasis on advertising (J. Park, 2005). Since 2000, a large number of global public relations firms have opened their branches in South Korea, which served to accelerate the professionalization of public relations (J. Park, 2005).

Nowadays, public relations in South Korea is obtaining status as a profession and top management in Korean companies is increasingly recognizing the value of public relations (Kim & Hon, 2002).

Previous research in South Korea. Previous public relations studies conducted in South Korea primarily explored the applicability of the Western public relations theories in the context of South Korea. For example, Rhee (2002) found that cultural values of South Korea such as Confucianism and collectivism are strongly related to public relations excellence, while confirming that the excellence theory can be applied to South

Korea. Choi and Cameron (2005) examined public relations practices of multinational corporations and reported that the media environment and the local culture play key roles in shaping their public relations practices. The culture of cherishing informal interpersonal relationship is another significant factor determining public relations practices in South Korea. In South Korea, the personal influence model, where practitioners' personal networks with journalists plays a key role, is a dominant public relations model (Jo & Kim, 2004; Sriramesh, Kim, & Takasaki, 1999).

Several studies provide insight to the public relations model practiced among South Korean organizations. Kim and Hon (1998) reported that Korean practitioners aspire to practice the two-way asymmetrical and two-way symmetrical models, but are most likely to practice the craft models of press agentry and public information. A recent study by Shin, Park, and Cameron (2006) suggests that ethical public relations practice is not yet prominent among most Korean organizations: only 14.6% of the respondents reported that their organization releases information even when it negatively affects the organization.

Roles of public relations in South Korea. Few studies have examined the roles of public relations in Korean organizations, although several studies do provide insight regarding this matter. Kim and Hon (1998) suggested that public relations in Korea has been used primarily as a defensive system against the media. Park, Cameron, and Cropp (2000) examined Korean public relations practitioners' perception of professional standards. They found that Korean practitioners think there are well-established performance standards for the tasks required for technical skills but not for continuing

education, licensing, or salaries. These findings indicate that the technician role is predominant among Korean practitioners.

However, there is some evidence that the roles of Korean public relations practitioners are no longer limited to the technician role. In Park's (2005) study, when corporate public relations practitioners were asked if they think their top management perceives public relations in terms of the technician role as opposed to the manager role, on average, they answered close to "no" (Mean = 1.91, on the five point scale anchored with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). Furthermore, playing a technician role does not necessarily mean that they do not play any manager role. Scholars have acknowledged that an individual practitioner may play some or all of the public relations roles in varying degrees (Broom, 1982; Broom & Dozier, 1986; Toth & Grunig, 1993). In fact, in some studies the correlation between manager roles and technician roles was about .40 (Reagan, Anderson, Sumner, & Hill, 1990; Wright, Grunig, Springston, & Toth, 1991). Many critical aspects of public relations functions, e.g., boundary spanning, also have both technical and managerial components (White & Dozier, 1992).

The evidence for a more sophisticated role of public relations in Korean companies is also observed from the national recognition for Soon-Dong Lee, President of the Planning & Communications Team, Samsung Strategic Planning Office. In 2006 he was awarded with a national decoration for his contribution to Korean public relations and national reputation through successful public relations for Samsung in foreign countries. Many Korean public relations practitioners are also actively pursuing professionalism for their career by actively engaging in professional associations such as the Korean Public Relations Association.

Role Theory

Organizational Roles

Role theory refers to the domain of role research rather than referring to a grand theory (Thomas & Biddle, 1966a). Under the overarching name of role theory, scholars have explored how individuals' performance of their roles in social positions is determined by various factors, such as social norms, demands, and individual characteristics (Thomas & Biddle, 1966a). In the domain of role theory, various perspectives exist on the concept of role. One of the most common definitions is that "role is the set of prescriptions defining what the behavior of a position member should be" (Thomas & Biddle, 1966b, p. 29).

The concept of role is in the central place of the theories of organizations (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Organizations are often seen as a system of roles. Organizational role is defined as "standardized patterns of behavior required of all persons playing a part in a given functional relationship" (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p.43). It is the similar acts performed by the occupants of a position where they have interactions with others (Hage, 1972) and consist of a set of activities that are expected to perform as a function of individuals' positions within an organization.

Social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) suggests that roles are cognitive concepts that are socially constructed and that employees interpret social and behavioral cues related to roles from the environment. For an individual in an organizational position, expectations about the role associated with the position are sent through communication. Role expectation, as the conception of the role held by others, is the aggregate of the activities and behaviors expected of the position holder (L. A. Grunig

et al., 2002). However, individuals are not simply passive recipients of roles but actively construct their roles (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Therefore, role making is a dynamic and gradual process where individuals establish patterns of work and social behaviors according to the role expectation through ongoing social interaction (Graen, 1976). Through a feedback loop of role sending and role receiving, role expectation is modified.

Organizational Roles of Public Relations

Public relations, as a profession, has a relatively short history, thus the roles of public relations are still under social construction. According to Ahlwardt (1984 as cited in Dozier, 1992), the position of communicators in organizations involves high levels of role ambiguity. In fact, Ryan and Martinson (1983) reported that practitioners often disagree about what public relations is or should be. Role ambiguity could lead to discrepancy in role expectation between public relations practitioners and top management (Dozier, 1992). As a result, role ambiguity is possibly associated with role conflict and, in turn, practitioners' job dissatisfaction.

Role ambiguity, on the other hand, provides public relations practitioners with an opportunity to modify the roles with their own interpretation. Katz and Kahn (1978) argued that moderate level of role ambiguity could be beneficial as it allows for some level of autonomy in role making. L. A. Grunig (2002) commented that "role ambiguity provides communicators with the wiggle room needed to enact role behaviors in a strategic and proactive manner" (p. 201). Lauzen's (1992b) study, in fact, showed that public relations practitioners carve out their roles rather than practicing the roles forced upon them. This is especially more likely for public relations managers than public relations technicians as, in the latter case, responsibilities have been typified for a long

period of years (Culbertson, 1991). While the technician role is highly codified and repetitive, the manager roles, such as problem-solving facilitator, are subject to a greater level of uncertainty, thus allowing for more room for role making by practitioners (Culbertson, 1991). As public relations evolves into a management function in the recent two decades, the demand for public relations roles are extending beyond the technical aspect of communication. On the other hand, this trend necessitates clarifying the roles of public relations, in particular, the manager roles.

Elaborating Organizational Roles of Public Relations

In this section, I introduce and provide explanations on public relations roles drawing from public relations literature. In order to identify the critical aspect of public relations roles, this study referred to a wide range of public relations role studies encompassing Broom and Smith's (1979) initial work and the recently evolved concepts of public relations roles. In an attempt to theoretically derive public relations roles from the previous literature, this study went through the following process: (1) comparing the conceptualization of public relations roles in various studies, similar concepts were merged; (2) identified public relations roles in a more abstract level in light of the purpose of the public relations function; (3) conceptualized the public relations role at the public relations department/unit level, not at the individual level.

In particular, the present study identifies public relations roles on the basis of normative perspective (i.e., what practitioners should do), rather than positive perspective (i.e., what practitioners are doing). The ambiguous nature of public relations roles suggests that the model of public relations roles should be normative rather than positive.

Several scholars (Ferguson, 1979 as cited in Dozier, 1992; Moss et al., 2005) took a positive approach to public relations roles, i.e., defining the roles of public relations by what they are doing. A problem with a positive approach is that public relations has been widely equated with publicity and this practice can limit the roles of practitioners in organizations to only the communication production process. Pointing out the limited insights of public relations studies that are based on positive models, several researchers argued that an emerging profession such as public relations requires normative theories that could guide the establishment of a set of professional values, the creation of strong professional norms, and the development of a body of literature (Ehling, 1992; J. E. Grunig, 1989; Jackson, 1988). Wright (1978) also argued that public relations should be examined in terms of their norms or ideals of public relations rather than the actual practice in order to be more professional than the present position. With a normative approach, it is possible to provide the guidance for advanced professional training.

Based on the review of previous public relations role studies and literature, I introduce the roles that are considered critical to the function of public relations under the three categories: roles concerning boundary spanning; roles concerning decision making; and roles concerning the internal process. Table 1 presents public relations roles taxonomies comparing the similarity and dissimilarity among previous studies.

Roles Concerning Boundary Spanning

Public relations practitioners are often referred to as boundary spanners. In public relations literature, a practitioner's role as a boundary spanner has been primarily focused on the information processing aspect, i.e., environment scanning involving information gathering. Meanwhile, in the management literature, boundary spanning is

Table 1

Public relations role taxonomies

Broom & Smith (1979)	Dozier (1983, 1984)	Broom & Dozier (1986)	Dozier (1991)	Leichty & Springston (1996)	Grunig et al (2002)	Moss et al (2005)
Communication Technician	Communication Technician / Media Relations Specialist	Communication Technician	Technician Role	Communication Technician	Internal Technician / Media Relations	Communication Technician
				Advocacy / PR Catalyst		Problem-solver Trouble-shooter
Expert Prescriber	Communication Manager	Communication Manager	Manager Role		PR Manager	
Problem Solving Process Facilitator			Problem Solving Facilitator / Senior Advisor	PR Counsel / PR Training	Senior Advisor	Key Policy and Strategy Advisor
Communication Facilitator	Communication Liaison					
				Gatekeeping / Information Acquisition		Issue Management Expert
						Monitor

conceptualized as a set of activities that involve representing and information processing (Aldrich & Herker, 1977). At least three distinct roles that capture different aspects of boundary spanning are proposed: advocate, communication liaison, and monitor.

Advocate. Advocacy has been the integral part of public relations ever since its emergence (Cancel, Cameron, Sallot, & Mitrook, 1997), therefore, the role of advocate has been traditionally considered as the most generic activities of public relations. This role involves delivering the organization's viewpoint and presenting the organization in a favorable way to the target stakeholders in order to create favorable attitudes toward the organization.

The advocate role was identified in the Leichty and Springston's (1996) study. In their conceptualization, the advocate role focuses on disseminating favorable information about the organization and representing the organization.

Although the advocate role could be closely related to the previously identified communication technician role or media relations roles, it should not be considered equivalent with them in the conceptual hierarchy. The advocate role does not necessarily mean exclusion from decision making because strategic representation and advocation of the organization often requires input from the public relations function during the decision making process.

Communication liaison. The communication liaison role focuses on delivering the views of key publics to top management and employees. Broom and Smith's (1979) study termed this role as communication facilitator role and conceptualized it as a "go-between," facilitating communication between the top management and the publics. A public relations unit acting as a communication liaison keep organizational members of

30

abreast opinions of key publics and creates opportunities for organization members to hear the views of key publics (Dozier & Broom, 1995, p. 9). In Dozier's (1984) study, the communication liaison role emerged as a minor role separate from the manager role. In his study, practitioners who perform as a communication liaison were characterized as specializing in linking communication between management and publics, but excluded from management decision making.

The importance of the communication liaison role is emphasized in Grunig and Hunt's (1984) two-way symmetric model, which is a normative model of public relations. In this model, public relations activities focus on facilitating mutual understanding and communication with key publics. While the one-way asymmetric model focuses on persuading the publics, the primary objective of the symmetric model lies in developing mutual understanding (J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1992). Playing communication liaison helps top management establish understanding of their key publics, thus critical for practicing the symmetric public relations model.

Monitor. The monitor role in this study is conceptualized in terms of informational boundary spanning activities that involve gathering, selecting, and relaying information from the environment to organization members. Leichty and Springston's (1996) and Springston and Leichty's (1994) concept of informational boundary spanning activities captures the monitor role. The roles activities identified in their studies, such as gatekeeping, information acquisition, and formal research, all concerns of the public relations practitioner's role to monitor organizational environments and stakeholders' opinions.

31

Communication managers as a monitor or informational boundary spanner play a critical role for organizations to interpret and construct meanings out of the environment (White & Dozier, 1992). Because organizational boundaries are often associated with communication breakdown (Tushman & Scanlan, 1981), communication managers are expected to create shared meaning across organizational boundaries. Technical monitoring, such as news clipping, has long been one of the typical activities required for public relations practitioners. The monitor role by public relations function, however, is not limited to technical monitoring. For the public relations function to influence an organization's decision making process, it is required that they provide interpretation of information. Often, top management interprets an issue differently from the key stakeholders. When public relations managers can detect such discrepancy via interpretation of information and provide a tool that changes the idiosyncratic meaning systems, they can contribute to the decision making process (White & Dozier, 1992).

Roles Concerning Decision Making

Roles concerning the decision making process include: public relations advisor, disturbance handler, and activist. The roles in this category primarily concern influencing certain aspects of an organization's decision making processes.

Advisor. When public relations units play a role as an advisor, they provide top management with solutions regarding how to handle an organization's public relations problems and advise top management on various organizational issues/policies from the public relations standpoint. The advisor role is conceptualized as the problem-solving facilitator role in Broom and Smith's (1979) study. A similar role dimension also

appeared in Moss et al.'s (2005) study. Their key policy and strategy advisor role captures this role dimension.

An important characteristic of the advisor role is engaging the top management regarding the public relations problem-solving process. Public relations units which successfully enact the advisor role "help management systematically think through organizational communication and public relations problems to solutions" (Dozier, 1992, p. 330).

The importance of advisor role enactment is obvious when we consider the role of the dominant coalition in an organization's public relations practices. The excellence study suggests that public relations' participation in decision making contributes to an organization's excellence in public relations (L. A. Grunig, 2002). By playing a role as an advisor to top management, public relations units are more likely to influence an organization's decision making processes.

Expert prescriber. The expert prescriber role is described with the activities of providing answers to public relations questions to the management and organization members. This role is often referred to being analogous to the doctor-patient relationship (Broom & Smith, 1979). Moss et al.'s (2005) problem solver role resembles the concept of the expert prescriber. Leichty and Springston's (1996) public relations training role also could be seen as a similar concept as their public relations training role concerns providing public relations-related skills to other organization members.

Previous research suggests that practitioners' expertise is an important factor for empowerment of the public relations function (L. A. Grunig, 2002). Knowledge base, such as expertise in evaluation methods and environmental scanning techniques, is

necessary in order to create a demand-supply loop between the public relations function and top management (Dozier, Grunig, & Grunig, 1995). Therefore, serving as an expert on the organization's public relations problems is deemed a critical aspect of public relations roles.

In the original conceptualization by Broom and Smith (1979), the primary difference between expert prescriber and advisor roles lies in the level of involvement of management in public relations problems and solutions. In the expert prescriber role, practitioners take a lead on the organization's public relations, while management rather passively follows the practitioners' advice. On the other hand, the advisor role encourages top management to engage in the public relations problem solving process. This conceptual distinction may apply to the agency-client relationship, but needs to be slightly changed in the context of in-house public relations. In the in-house public relations context, it is not likely the case that a public relations unit takes the lead while management remains passive. Rather, the expert prescriber role in the in-house public relations context would be better conceptualized whereby public relations units passively and reactively respond to the requests of the management. On the other hand, the advisor role should be seen as a more pro-active behavior of public relations units toward management concerning public relations issues.

Disturbance handler. The disturbance handler role concerns a public relations unit's role of taking a leading role in an organization's crises or issues management that could be potential threats to the organization. This role is different from the public relations advisor role in that the advisor role primarily concerns consulting on general managerial strategy or policy from the public relations perspective (i.e., not necessarily

34

dealing with threats or crisis), whereas the disturbance handler role focuses on handling non-routine organizational issues. Disturbance handler roles can be referred to as a fire fighter or trouble-shooting role.

The role of the public relation function in issue and crisis management has received substantial attention in public relations literature (e.g., Coombs, 2000; Coombs & Holladay, 2001; Lauzen, 1994, 1997; Lauzen & Dozier, 1994). Studies suggested that public relations contributes to issue management (Lauzen, 1994) and the extent to which the public relations function takes an active role as a disturbance handler may result in different consequences in an organization's crisis management (Fitzpatrick & Rubin, 1995). For example, Fitzpatrick and Rubin (1995) reported that, when legal strategies rather than public relations strategies dominated organizational decision making in times of crisis, an organization's decisions were often shortsighted and costly.

This role is synonymous with Moss et al.'s (2005) issue management role and trouble shooting role. Moss et al. (2005) presented them as separate roles, but their exploratory factor analysis showed that some of the items were loaded on each other, which indicates that public relations practitioners do not clearly distinguish those roles. Therefore, in this study, those two roles are subsumed under the disturbance handler role.

Activist. This role concerns the public relations unit's activities to advocate the interests of publics within their organizations. This role could be seen in opposition to the advocate role, because the primary interests of the advocate role lies in advocating organizations to the publics. The activist role is also different from the liaison role. While the liaison role reflects public relations' role as a neutral deliverer of public perspectives to the top management, activist roles involves persuading organizational members on

35

behalf of the publics and speaking for publics' interests. Although the activist role was not identified as a public relations role in previous role research, many public relations scholars implicitly recognized it as an important aspect of public relations roles. Holtzhausen and Voto (2002) are the ones who first pointed out the importance of the activist role. They argued that practitioners should be able to challenge the dominant world views and unjust practices of the organization (Holtzhausen, 2000; Holtzhausen & Voto, 2002) and proposed that public relations practitioners should be organizational activists.

The activist role is critical in its significant implication for public relations ethics. Both scholars and professionals have argued that corporate public relations departments are responsible for the moral dimension of corporate conduct (Bowen, 2004; Heath, 1994; Paluszek, 1989; Pratt, 1991; Ryan & Martinson, 1983; Wright, 1996). It has been argued that the success of organizational efforts for responsible behavior is contingent on public relations practitioners (Pratt, 1991). Holtzhausen (2000) suggested that, when public relations practitioners play a role as internal activist, they can lead an organization's ethical practices and worldview, in turn making a difference in society as well as in the organization.

Given the significance of the activist role to public relations ethics, the present study includes it as one of the primary roles of public relations units.

Roles Concerning Internal Process

Two roles related to internal process are proposed: internal communication facilitator and public relations coordinator.

Internal communication facilitator. Distinguishing from communication liaison role, I propose a role of internal communication facilitator. Internal communication facilitator, in this study, refers to public relations roles designed to facilitate communication among organizational members. While the communication liaison role focuses on facilitating communication between organizational members and external stakeholders, this role emphasizes facilitating communication within organizations. Although previous role studies did not take this into account, it is worthy of more attention.

Wright (1995) and D'Aprix (1984) commented that most public relations researchers ignore the internal communication role of public relations, even though most public relations textbooks have a chapter on it and internal communication has been considered a legitimate domain of public relations. Employees are the most important publics of organizations and the public relations function plays a critical role in linking top management and other organizational members. Furthermore, there has been an increasing trend for public relations to perform as an amalgam of organizational members by informing employees of various management decisions and policies as well as new organizational developments in other work divisions (Dozier & Grunig, 1992; van Ruler, Vercic, & Butschi, 2004).

Scholars are increasingly recognizing the role of the public relations function for internal communications (Brønn, Roberts, & Breunig, 2004; Wright, 1995). For example, Brønn et al. (2004) emphasized the communication manager's role as an internal communication facilitator as well as an external communication liaison, arguing that "a

large part of this new role [of communication managers] is helping organizational members relate to each other and to the world outside the organization" (p.23).

Public relations coordinator. This role concerns the public relations function's role to integrate and coordinate organization-wide public relations efforts in cooperation with other management functions in organizations. In fact, substantial academic attention has been given to the integrative perspective of various communication functions, such as marketing and public relations (Cornelissen & Thorpe, 2001; Heath, 1994; Leuven, 1991). The excellence study suggested that excellent public relations departments exist as a single and independent department but also perform an integrated communication function coordinating communication programs managed by other departments, such as marketing, human resources, legal, and finance (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002).

This coordination role is critical because public relations is not only a function but also a process which engage all functions of organizations. Multiple departments, not just the public relations department, are involved in boundary spanning, building relationships with an organization's stakeholders, and implementing public relations programs. In this sense, public relations can be seen as an organization-wide process. Therefore, the public relations function should be able to coordinate activities of other organizational functions that have implications for an organization's public relations.

This coordinator role did not emerge as a separate construct in the early study by Broom and Smith (1979). However, in Leichty and Springston's (1996) study that utilized Broom and Smith's items, the concept of public relations catalyst emerged as a separate factor, which captured the extent to which public relations practitioners work with non-public relations personnel and function as PR catalysts. Springston and

Leichty's (1994) study also revealed the dimension of collaborative public relations similar to the communication coordinator in this study.

In summary, I propose nine types of public relations roles based on the previous literature. This study will empirically test the model of public relations roles under the following research question.

RQ1. What is the structure of the roles of public relations units in organizations?

Antecedents and Consequences of Public Relations Role Enactment

Given the initial conceptualization, the utility of public relations roles could be evidenced by testing the constructs against the nomological network (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) that includes antecedents and outcome variables of public relations roles. This section describes the relationship of public relations role enactment with antecedents and outcome variables. Antecedent variables to public relations role enactment include environmental uncertainty, management philosophy, and prior crisis experience. The outcome variables include participation in decision making, values of public relations to organizations, and public relations model. Among the outcome variables, a public relations model will be discussed in detail in the following section, as it is a primary interest of this study.

Antecedents of Public Relations Role Enactment

Environmental uncertainty. Environmental uncertainty is conceptualized in terms of complexity and turbulence of the environment (Duncan, 1972; Lauzen & Dozier, 1992; Meznar & Nigh, 1995). The complexity dimension captures the extent to which the organization should deal with various stakeholders. The larger the number of

stakeholders and the more diversity among the stakeholders, the more complex the environment. Turbulence of environment refers to the extent to which the organization's management is affected by environmental changes. Environmental uncertainty has been considered as threats to organizations as it hinders predictability in an organization's operations (Meznar & Nigh, 1995). Rather than responding to the objective reality, organization members respond to their perception of the environment and choose their strategic option accordingly (Duncan, 1972; White & Dozier, 1992). It has been argued that the information from boundary spanners receive greater attention from top management as the environment becomes more complex (Emery & Trist, 1965).

Public relations literature suggests that perceived environmental complexity affects the roles that are enacted by public relations practitioners. Environmental uncertainty was related to manager role enactment by top communicators (Lauzen & Dozier, 1992). Also, practitioners tended to enact technician roles when an organization's environment is nonthreatening/static, whereas manager roles, in particular, the expert prescription and problem-solving process facilitation role, were pronounced in both dynamic and threatening environments (Acharya, 1983; Johnson & Acharya, 1982). Although these studies employed manager-technician role distinction, they suggest that, depending on the level of environmental complexity, certain public relations roles might be more or less sought by the top management.

When the environment surrounding organizations is uncertain, it is likely that the public relations roles involving boundary spanning activities, such as monitor, communication liaison, and advocate roles, will more likely be enacted by public relations units. To respond to the uncertain environment, organizations would need to

40

perform boundary spanning activities involving external stakeholders to a great extent (Aldrich & Herker, 1977). Meanwhile, other roles, such as internal communication facilitator and public relations coordinator, are not directly related to external activities as they focus on the internal processes of public relations. Thus, environmental uncertainty may not be related to those roles. Because there is not enough literature to guide formation of hypotheses in regard to the relationship between each of the nine public relations roles and environmental uncertainty, the following research question is put forth:

RQ2. How is an organization's environmental uncertainty related to enactment of

public relations roles?

Management philosophy. Management philosophy refers to top management's orientation toward the organization's role in society (Ansoff, 1979; R. E. Freeman, 1984; R. E. Freeman & Gilbert, 1988). According to Miles (1987), top management may have an *enterprise-oriented philosophy* at one extreme and an *institution-oriented philosophy* at the other extreme. Top management teams that possess an enterprise orientation tend to see the corporation as operating independently from society. They make decisions to maximize economic performance. In contrast, institution-oriented executives think that "society has the right to make certain claims on a private corporation and that the corporation has some duty to respond and to adapt its policies and practices to social and political change" (p. 30). Similarly, other scholars (e.g., Carroll, 1979; Meznar, Chrisman, & Carroll, 1991) conceptualized the institution-oriented philosophy as the degree to which top executives think the corporation should be a pioneer or leader in meeting social expectations. It was conceived that top managers who have a social

41

orientation try to achieve legitimacy through collaboration with multiple stakeholders
(Meznar & Nigh, 1995).

Miles (1987) suggested that management philosophy plays a critical role in an
organization's adoption of strategies toward its stakeholders. He argued that institutional
philosophy is related to bridging strategy while enterprise philosophy is related to
buffering strategy with stakeholders. Buffering refers to the strategic orientation in which
organizations respond to the environment by either resisting environmental change or
trying to control it, whereas bridging occurs when organizations promote internal
adaptation to changing external circumstances (Meznar & Nigh, 1995). Buffering
strategy involves "trying to keep the environment from interfering with internal
operations and trying to influence the external environment" through various means such
as lobbying or advocacy (Meznar & Nigh, 1995, p. 976). Meanwhile, with bridging
strategy, organizations actively try to adapt organizational activities in order to conform
to external expectations (Meznar & Nigh, 1995). Organizations exercising the bridging
strategy try "to meet and exceed regulatory requirements in its industry" and attempt to
"identify changing social expectation" (p. 976). An empirical study by Meznar and Nigh
(1995) suggests that top management's philosophy is critical for the strategies adopted in
public affair departments. They found that organizations whose top management has a
more socially oriented philosophy attempted to bridge with their stakeholders while being
less engaged in buffering strategy in their public affair practices.

Given that management philosophy influences an organization's strategies toward
its publics, it is conceivable that top management's philosophy will influence enactment
of public relations roles. In particular, it is expected that the liaison and the activist roles

42

will be strongly influenced by top management's philosophy. Specifically, top executives with strong social orientation (i.e., institutional orientation) would place greater importance on communication liaison and activist roles, than those who are less socially oriented. They are more concerned about the social role of organizations (Miles, 1987), thus they will be more concerned about the views held by their primary publics. Effective enactment of the communication liaison role by public relations function will help top management adopt the perspectives of key publics. Likewise, functioning as an activist will encourage top managers to consider social responsibility as they make decisions. In order to explore the relationship between public relations roles and top management's philosophy, the following research question is posed:

RQ3. How is the top management's philosophy related to enactment of public

relations roles?

Prior crisis experience. Organizational crisis experience has been deemed as one of the important antecedents of an organization's public relations practices. Communication plays a pivotal role during crisis events and organizations often grow to appreciate the value of public relations after they experience a crisis that affects their reputation. In fact, the excellence study (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002) reported that crises provide an opportunity for public relations to become a critical function within organizations. The qualitative research of the excellence study revealed that public relations practitioners may obtain better access to top decision makers via responsive handling of organizational crises. During crises, organizations were more likely to rely on top communicators to a greater extent and their top communicators were more likely to enact the senior advisor roles. Crisis experience may also stimulate enactment of the

advocate and expert prescriber roles. As organizations experience crises, management demands the public relations unit to operate as a buffer for the organization, i.e., playing the advocate role. In addition, organizations will require their public relations functions to become more sophisticated, functioning as experts. In order to explore this relationship, the following research question is posed:

RQ4. How is an organizations' crisis experience related to enactment of public relations roles?

Outcomes of Public Relations Role Enactment

Influence of public relations in an organization's strategic decision making. The issue of power of public relations within organizations has received increasing attention lately (e.g. Berger, 2005; Berger & Reber, 2006). The power of public relations can be evidenced by the extent to which it influences an organization's decision making. Because an organization's strategic decisions affect their key publics, public relations' involvement in the decision making process is critical (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002). To the extent that top public relations managers participate in strategic decision making, the public relations function is empowered. With this reason, top communicators' participation in decision making has been identified as a characteristic of an excellent public relations department (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002).

Several role studies explored the relationship between participation in decision making and role enactment. Manager role enactment was positively related with participation in decision making (Broom, 1982; Dozier & Broom, 1995). Similarly, Gordon and Kelly (1999) reported that manager role competencies in the public relations department are positively related to public relations' participation in strategic planning.

On the contrary, technician role enactment was not significantly related to participation in management decision making (Broom, 1982).

Among the nine types of public relations roles proposed in the section above, the advisor role is likely to have the most significant implication to the influence of public relations in an organization's decision making. The advisor role involves providing recommendations and advice to top management concerning a variety of organizational issues that have public relations implications. Because the members of top management are responsible for decision making, to the extent that public relations units function as an advisor to top management, their public relations unit would be able to influence an organization's decision making processes. Enactment of other public relations roles may also contribute to the influence of a public relations unit within an organization, thus the following research question is posed:

RQ5. How do public relations roles contribute to the influence a public relations

unit has in an organization's decision making processes?

Value of public relations to organizations. A few studies examined how role enactment influences the value of public relations units to organizations. "Value of public relations" is a concept that manifests public relations' contributions to organizational effectiveness (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002). It is important to test if certain role activities are more strongly associated with the value of public relations, as it would provide insight into what kinds of roles public relations units should perform to guarantee excellence in public relations.

It seems that the relationship between role enactment and perceived value of the public relations function requires further exploration. The excellence study reported that

performing the roles, such as manager role, senior advisor role, and media relations specialist role was positively related to overall communication excellence of an organization, whereas internal technician role was not related to (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002). However, the manager role enactment was not significantly related to the dominant coalition's perceived value of the communication function (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002). Meanwhile, the dominant coalition's role expectation of the manager role was positively related to the value that dominant coalition places on public relations.

It is likely that all public relations roles discussed above will contribute to an organization's performance when they are enacted successfully. Meanwhile, it is an empirical question to explore which of the public relations' roles are most likely to contribute to the value of public relations. To the extent the public relations roles are related to an organization's bottom line, they should be considered as core roles of public relations. Therefore, the following research question is posed:

RQ6. How do public relations roles contribute to the value that public relations adds to organizations?

Role Enactment and Public Relations Models

As one of the outcome variables of public relations, this section discusses the relationship between public relations roles and public relations models.

Public Relations Models

The concept of public relations model occupies a central role in the excellence study (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002). Four types of public relations models were proposed by J. E. Grunig and Hunt (1984): press agentry, public information, two-way asymmetrical,

and two-way symmetrical. These four types of public relations models basically reflect the historical development of public relations. The *press agentry/publicity model* was practiced in the mid-19th century when the first full time specialists emerged. The press agentry model is a propaganda model, where practitioners use any possible way to get favorable attention from the publics. At the beginning of the 20th century, the *public information model* was developed in response to "attacks on large corporations and government agencies by muckraking journalists" (J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1992, p.288). The public relations practitioners hired by organizations at this time played the role of in-house journalists whose primary tasks were writing good things about their organization but generally in a truthful and accurate manner. They primarily focused on disseminating factual but usually only favorable information about the organization. While both press agentry and public information models are a one-way approach, two-way approches were introduced during World War I, based on behavioral and social sciences (J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1992). The *two-way asymmetric model* is characterized with the use of scientific research in order to persuade publics in favor of organizations. Being successfully practiced during World War II, the two-way asymmetric practice utilized scientific theories and research in order to manipulate human behaviors and attitudes based on understanding what motivates people. Finally, the *two-way symmetrical model* is the most recent model and it focuses on using public relations to facilitate understanding and communication rather than persuasion. In the two-way symmetric model, practitioners also use scientific research but intend to build mutual understanding between organizations and publics. Later, Murphy (1991) developed the idea of the *mixed-motive model*, which posits that organizations could also

simultaneously use both two-way symmetrical and asymmetrical public relations practices. L. A. Grunig et al. (2002) stated that the concept of a mixed-motive model accurately describes the original conceptualization of the two-way symmetrical model, because the two-way symmetrical model focuses on reconciling the organization's and its publics' interests, rather than fully accommodating the publics' interest.

Among the four models, the two-way symmetrical model has been the most critical component of public relations research, while also being the most controversial and debated component (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002). Several scholars criticized that the two-way symmetrical model may only exist in theory (Leitch & Neilson, 2001; L'Etang, 1996). The argument that symmetrical communication is superior to other models (J. E. Grunig & Hunt, 1984) also has been often contested. Some scholars (e.g., Miller, 1989; Van der Meiden, 1993) argued that public relations is asymmetrical in its nature. The other groups of scholars (e.g., Leichty & Springston, 1993; Cancel, Cameron, Sallot, & Mitrook, 1997; Cancel, Mitrook, & Cameron, 1999) viewed that the value of the symmetrical model depends on various organizational factors (i.e., a contingency approach). In response to these criticisms, Grunig and colleagues (J. E. Grunig, 1989; L. A. Grunig et al., 2002) argued that plentiful evidence exists which indicates the two-way symmetrical model is also a positive model that is observed in reality as well as a normative. Furthermore, the excellence study suggests that excellent public relations departments attempt to exercise two-way symmetrical communication rather than the other model types (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002).

Meanwhile, previous research also revealed limitations with theories of public relations models. Studies (e.g., J. E. Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Lauzen, 1986) have failed to

provide a reliable measure of the public relations models. Early studies reported alphas of .53 to .62 for measures of each model (J.E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1992). Although it has improved over time, the reliability scores were typically less than .80. The excellence study reported alpha levels of .59 to .70 for the four public relations models. In addition to the reliability issue, validity of the model was also often questioned. According to the review of J. E. Grunig and L. A. Grunig (1992), the factor analysis in the previous studies often revealed a two-factor model (i.e., one-way vs. two-way model) rather than a four factor model, suggesting that only two models exist. Theorists (J. E. Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Leichty & Springston, 1993) also suggested that organizations can exercise some or all of the four models, while one of the models could be dominant in their public relations practice.

Acknowledging the limitations of previous conceptualization and that the public relations models can coexist, J. E. Grunig and L. A. Grunig (1992) proposed that an organization's public relations practices can be characterized with multiple dimensions, such as direction, intention, channel, and ethics. The dimension of direction captures the extent to which an organization's public relations is one-way or two-way. One-way public relations practices focus on disseminating information, whereas two-way practices mainly reflect activities involving an exchange of information with publics, such as formative and evaluative research. The intention dimension consists of symmetry and asymmetry. When organizations practice symmetric public relations, they intend for mutual changes between organizations and the publics, pursuing collaboration and cooperation between the two parties. On the other hand, asymmetric public relations practices intend to change their publics' attitude or behaviors in favor of the

organization's positions. The channel dimension concerns the extent to which practitioners utilize an interpersonal channel or mediated channel of communication. While the interpersonal channel involves face-to-face and direct communication with the publics, mediated channel means the mass media. Finally, the ethics dimension reflects the degree to which an organization's public relations is ethical. When organizations practice ethical public relations, they are responsible for the consequences of their public relations not only for their immediate publics but also for society as a whole (J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1996).

Given the four dimensions, the four public relations models are characterized in the following ways: the *press agentry model* is relatively one-way, asymmetrical, and unethical and mostly mediated communication; the *public information model* is one-way, asymmetrical, mediated, and generally more ethical than the press agentry model; the *two-way asymmetrical model* is two-way, asymmetrical, either ethical or unethical, and either mediated or interpersonal; the *two-way symmetrical model* is two-way, symmetrical, ethical, and either mediated or interpersonal communication (L. A. Gruning et al., 2002). Recent studies (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002; Huang, 2001; Rhee, 2002; Yun, 2006) utilized this dimensional approach to assess an organization's public relations model.

Public Relations Model and Public Relations Roles

A few studies examined the relationship between public relations models and public relations roles. In summary, studies suggest that manager role enactment is related to the two-way public relations models, but it is less clear if manager role enactment is more likely to be related to the symmetric model than the asymmetric model. Previous

research suggests that manager role enactment is positively related to an organization's practice of both two-way symmetric and asymmetric models of public relations (Fabiszak, 1985, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992; McMillan, 1984, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992; Pollack, 1986, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992). Manager roles were also positively related to competences for two-way symmetric and asymmetric model, i.e., the ability to conduct evaluation research, either formally, informally, or a mixed approach of formal and informal research (Broom & Dozier, 1986). Dozier (1992) concluded that manager roles and two-way asymmetric and symmetric models go hand in hand. Meanwhile, J. E. Grunig and Hunt (1984) presumed that the expert prescriber role would be linked to the two-way asymmetric and the press agentry model of public relations.

Previous studies have not provided clear insight about how public relations roles can contribute to the two-way symmetrical model more than the two-way asymmetrical model. Given that the symmetrical model is deemed as the normative public relations model, this distinction is important. J. E. Grunig (2006) argued that public relations as a strategic management function is equivalent to public relations as a bridging activity, implying that manager role enactment would contribute to an organization's two-way symmetric model. However, there is evidence that manager role enactment is positively related to two-way asymmetrical model while not being related to the symmetrical model (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002).

Moving beyond the manager-technician distinction may make it possible to explore if enactment of certain public relations roles contributes to the symmetrical public relations model. For example, roles such as communication liaison or advocate

51

roles might be more strongly related to the symmetric model as those role activities

would be related to dimensions of ethics and symmetric communication. There might be

certain composition of public relations roles that contribute differentially to the

symmetrical and asymmetrical models of public relations. To explore the relationship

between public relations role enactment and an organization's public relations strategy,

the following research question is posed.

RQ7. How does the enactment of public relations roles influence an

organization's practice of public relations models?

CHAPTER III. METHDOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research methodology that was used to answer the proposed research questions. First, I describe the survey research method used in the present study. I will give details on the population for the survey, sampling method, and data collection procedures. Second, the description of the survey instruments, i.e., instrument designs and operationalization of key variables, will be provided. Finally, I will review the statistical procedures for data analysis and discuss the criteria used to evaluate statistical results. Finally, the procedures taken to ensure research ethics will be described.

Research Design

Rationale for Research Method

The goal of this study is to elaborate the roles of public relations in organizations and test the utility of the elaborated conceptualization. Under this universal research goal, seven research questions were proposed. The survey research method is considered most appropriate in answering these research questions over other types of research methods such as experimental design or qualitative research because of the following reasons.

First, a quantitative research method is preferred over a qualitative research method as the first research question involves assessing the factor structure of public relations roles. While a qualitative method can provide in-depth insights, the goals of this study is not to explore all types of public relations roles. That is, this study is intended to

assess the factor structure of public relations roles that were theoretically driven from the existing public relations literature.

Second, the survey research design is deemed ideal, because this study attempts to explore associations between variables rather than assessing the effects of manipulated variables. This study intended to explore the existence and strength of the relationships between public relations roles and other criterion variables in uncontrolled settings, rather than in an artificial laboratory setting, for the purpose of obtaining more generalized findings among South Korean companies. The survey research design is more appropriate for generalizing the findings beyond the immediate settings (Judd, Smith, & Kidder, 1991).

Population and Sample

The population of the survey was identified using the following steps. First, at the organizational level, the 2007 Daily Economics (Mae-Kyung, MK) list of 1,000 Korean companies served as a sampling frame. This annual published list identifies the top 1,000 companies based on companies' business performance, i.e., revenues and net profits. Public relations/communication agencies were excluded from the population. Second, the survey respondents were essentially defined as top public relations managers (i.e., head of the public relations unit) who work in companies that met the aforementioned criterion. Top public relations managers are the ideal participants for this study because they oversee the public relations function and are in the best position to describe the company's public relations practices and the role of the public relations unit. However, because of difficulty in recruiting participants in organizations, especially those who are in the higher positions, additional criteria for participant recruitment were established.

First, members of public relations units designated by top public relations managers were also considered as acceptable respondents, because it is assumed that the top public relations manager will designate individuals who can provide the appropriate answers. Second, when top public relations managers refuse to participate in the study or are not available, middle-level managers (Kwa-Jang) or those who have had at least three years of experience in public relations in their organizations were included in the population. This criterion was deemed acceptable as well because, with such a level of position or experience, they would have a reasonable understanding of their organization's public relations activities. Finally, when companies have only one or two public relations practitioners in their public relations units, the practitioners or their supervisors, if available, were recruited regardless of their job rank or experience in public relations. In this case, still, the priority of recruitment was given to those who are in the higher job rank.

Pilot Test

Before the survey was administered, a pilot test of the survey instrument was conducted in June 2007. The participants ($N = 17$, 10 males, 7 females; average age of 34.5; average experience in public relations of 5.89 years) from 10 companies were recruited through a public relations association in the South Korean IT industry, where the researcher previously served as a member. The data was collected via a survey Web site. Each participant received a gift certificate (about $10) and was entered into a lottery for an MP3 player. The survey instrument included 63 items tapping into the roles of public relations units and 42 items measuring public relations models practiced by the companies. As the last block on every survey Web page, an open-ended question asked

participants to address any suggestions or difficulties in understanding the survey questions. Participants did not indicate any difficulty in answering the survey questionnaire and only a minor revision, i.e., spelling errors, was suggested. The reliability for each measurement construct was also examined. The measures showed an acceptable level of reliability (i.e., $\alpha = .70$) except for: activist and communication coordinator among the measures of public relations roles, and mediated communication among the measures of public relations models. For these measures, the items which lowered the reliability were dropped or the wording of the items was carefully revised considering the content of other items. The companies that participated in the pilot test were excluded from the main survey.

Data Collection Procedure

The main survey was conducted from July 12, 2007, to September 7, 2007, via a research agency in South Korea, *The Opinion*. The participants were recruited following the definition of the population as described above. Based on the MK list, the research firm searched and compiled the contact information of public relations units of the companies. Once the list was generated, *The Opinion* held training sessions for its staff members who were involved in data collection to educate them regarding recruitment of participants and data gathering procedures. The potential participants were initially contacted via telephone and provided with information about the research. Once they agreed to participate in the study, the recruiters sent the survey questionnaire via either e-mail or fax and provided detailed instructions on the phone. Follow-up contact was made until the completed surveys were returned. Every completed survey was examined in terms of response sincerity and clarity. Among the 1,000 companies of the MK list, 865

companies were contacted, and 262 cases were returned (Response rate of 30.3 %). Out of 262 cases, 36 cases were not used due to insincere responses. As a result, 226 cases were retained for analysis. Out of 226 cases, 39 were collected through the referrals of the researcher's acquaintances.

Survey Instrument

Instrument Design

The survey instrument was initially constructed in English and translated into Korean by the researcher. Then, a bilingual person compared the Korean-version questionnaire with the original questionnaire and revised some questionnaire wordings.

The survey instrument contained the following measures: roles of public relations unit, measures for criterion variables including companies' practices of public relations models, characteristics of companies and their public relations unit, and participants' demographics. The first page of the survey instrument explained the research purposes and provided information about the informed consent procedure. The first section of the survey asked participants to answer the questions concerning the roles of their public relations unit. The second section consisted of questions on public relations models. Additionally, various attributes of organizations and their public relations units were assessed: perceived uncertainty of organizational environment, management philosophy, prior crisis experience, influence of public relations units in the organization's decision making process, self-assessed value of the public relations unit to the organization, top management's support of public relations, participative organizational cultures, organization size (i.e., number of employees), industry, job rank of top public relations

manager, and size of public relations unit in terms of the number of practitioners. Demographic questions included: age, public relations experience, job rank, education in public relations, accreditation in public relations, and specialty in public relations.

Because one of the goals of the study was to determine if various types of public relations roles are conceptually distinct, the items measuring different roles were mixed up and the order of the scale items was randomized rather than grouped by construct. The same procedure was applied for the measures of public relations models. Three versions of the survey instrument were developed counterbalancing the measurement items in order to control for order effect.

Measurement

Roles of public relation function. The measures of the eight roles proposed above were adopted primarily from public relations and management literature (See Table 2). Because this study explores roles of public relations units rather than the roles of individual public relations practitioners, the measurement items were revised accordingly. Four to seven items were utilized to tap various activities reflecting the nine roles of a public relations unit (a total of 45 items). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which their public relations units engage in each of the activities. Each questionnaire item had five anchored response choices ranging from not at all (1) to a great extent (5).

In addition to the eight roles which are of primary interests in this study, four roles that reflect activities as a technician and as an administrator were measured in order to determine whether these roles are distinct. The four roles included: communication

technician, media relations, administrator, and planner. Sixteen items were employed

from L. A. Grunig et al. (2002).

Table 2

Measures of public relations roles

Roles	Items
Roles concerning boundary spanning	
Advocate (Leichty & Springston, 1996)	1. Speak for corporate interests to multiple publics. 2. Deliver a favorable image of the company to the key publics. 3. Represent the company's economic or social perspectives to the publics. 4. Promote publics' understanding about the company's position.
Communication Liaison (Leslie, Dalton, Ernst, & Deal, 2002; Springston & Leichty, 1994)	1. Create opportunities for management to hear the views of the company's publics. 2. Keep the management informed of the opinions of various publics. 3. Diagnose communication problems between the organization and various publics. 4. Keep management informed of key publics' reaction to the company's decisions. 5. Keep top management informed of key publics' expectations.
Monitor (Conger & Kanungo, 1994; Moss et al., 2005)	1. Monitor constraints in the company's environment that may stand in the way of achieving the company's objectives. 2. Track social issues that may affect the company's political situation. 3. Track changes in key publics that may affect the company's strategies. 4. Monitor external trends that might affect the company. 5. Analyze external intelligence relevant to the company.
Roles concerning decision making process	
Expert Prescriber (Broom & Dozier, 1995)	1. Play a role as the company's expert in solving public relations problems. 2. Take responsibility for the success of the company's public relations programs. 3. Take responsibility for the failure of the company's public relations programs. 4. Make the communication policy decisions of the company. 5. Diagnose public relations problems of the company.

Table 2 – Continued

Roles	Items
Advisor (Problem solving facilitator) (Moss et al., 2005)	1. Advise management on a variety of important stakeholder issues. 2. Advise management on the PR/communication implications of any strategic decisions of the company. 3. Help other managers to increase their skills in solving and/or avoiding public relations problems 4. Advise management on a regular basis about relevant communication issues and challenges of the company. 5. Recommend top management courses of action for solving public relations problems. 6. Operate as a catalyst in management's decision making.
Activist	1. Persuade organization members to support a change in company's practices in order to deal with an emerging public relations problem. 2. Challenge the company's practices in public relations that are no longer appropriate. 3. Play a role in activating changes in the company in response to publics' demands. 4. Advocate for the best interests of key publics within the company. 5. Challenge the company's practices that could adversely affect publics.
Disturbance Handler (Moss et al., 2005)	1. Play a role as an expert in dealing with crises affecting the company 2. Be responsible for dealing with any unexpected events that threaten the company. 3. Help the company to manage issues arising from conflicts with external stakeholder groups. 4. Manage the company's responses to a range of issues. 5. Recommend how the company should respond to the threat from major issues.
Roles concerning the internal process	
Internal Communication Facilitator (Leichty & Springston, 1996)	1. Diagnose problems with internal communication. 2. Inform organization members of new developments (e.g., new business decisions, changes in policies) within the company. 3. Provide communication channels and programs that help communication among organization members. 4. Facilitate communication between top management and employees.

Table 2 – Continued

Roles	Items
PR Coordinator (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000; Springston & Leichty, 1994)	1. Coordinate communication-related activities with other work groups within the company. 2. Provide an overall direction concerning diverse communication-related activities of the company. 3. Collaborate with members in other work groups to diagnose public relations problems. 4. Resolve organization's public relations problems in coordination with members in other work groups in the company. 5. Coordinate a variety of communication-related activities by other work groups for consistency. 6. Explain public relations problems to others in the company.

Technical & Administrative Roles (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002)

Administrator	1. Monitor performance of the PR/Communicator function against targets. 2. Ensure that the PR/Communication function operates within the agreed budgets. 3. Regularly reports about the operation of the communication function for senior management. 4. Manage resources and workloads for the PR department/function.
Planner	1. Develop strategies to solve PR problems. 2. Develop goals and objectives for the public relations department. 3. Plan public relations programs.
Communication Technician	1. Handle the technical aspects of producing public relations materials. 2. Produce brochures, pamphlets, and other publications. 3. Write public relations materials presenting information on issues important to the organization. 4. Edit and/or rewrite for grammar and spelling the materials written by others in the organization.
Media Relations Role	1. Maintain media contacts for the company. 2. Keep others in the organization informed of what the media report about the organization and important issues related to the company. 3. Be responsible for placing news releases. 4. Figure out what the media will consider newsworthy about the company.

Public relations models. In previous research, studies were somewhat different in terms of the measurement items and the factor model utilized. For example, Huang (2001) utilized five dimensions (i.e., mediated, two-way, interpersonal, symmetrical-ethical communication, and social activities), while Rhee (2002) used six dimensions (i.e., asymmetric, symmetric, ethical, interpersonal, mediated, and direction of communication including both one-way and two-way). Yun (2006) used six dimensions (i.e., two-way, symmetrical, asymmetrical, ethical, interpersonal, and mediated communication).

In this study, the public relations models practiced by the participating companies were measured with seven factors along the four dimensions: direction (two-way/one-way communication), intention (symmetrical/asymmetrical communication), ethical communication, and channel (interpersonal/mediated communication). The items were drawn from previous studies (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002; Rhee, 2002; Huang, 2001; Yun, 2006). Following the precedents, the dimension of intention was operationalized as two separate factors, because they were deemed as coexisting continua (Yun, 2006; Rhee, 2002). The direction dimension was also measured with two separate sub-factors – one-way and two-way communication. Previous studies often utilized only a two-way communication dimension (e.g., Huang, 2001; Yun, 2006), or constructed both one-way and two-way dimensions into a single factor (e.g., Rhee, 2002). In Rhee's (2002) study, one-way and two-way communication were combined into a single factor, the items for one-way communication loaded very weakly compared to the items for two-way communication, which indicate they are distinct dimensions. One-way communication reflects information flow from organizations to their publics, while two-way communication reflects information flow in the opposite direction. Because it is possible

for a company to engage in both types of communication, this study constructs one-way and two-way communication as separate factors.

A total of 37 items were used to assess companies' public relations models. Using a five-point multiple item scale, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which each statement accurately describe their companies' public relations practices. The initial inventory of the items is presented in Table 3.

Top management's philosophy. Six items for management philosophy were developed based on the contents of interviews reported in Miles' (1987) qualitative research. Items were constructed on a five-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating greater social (institutional) orientation. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each of the statements on a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). The CFA for this construct showed that two items were not measuring the same underlying construct, thus only four items were used in the analysis ($\alpha = .84$). The specific items follow:

1. Society has the right to make certain demands from a private corporation.

2. Corporations should bring social responsibility into their day-to-day operations.

3. Corporations should make social responsibility a part of business decisions.

4. Corporations must set social goals just as they set business goals.

Environmental uncertainty. An organization's environmental uncertainty was measured in terms of environmental complexity and turbulence, utilizing the items from Meznar and Nigh (1995). Seven items with five-point bipolar items were originally utilized, but two items were dropped as a result of CFA. Five items showed the acceptable level of reliability, $\alpha = .82$. The specific items follow:

Table 3

Measures of Public Relations Model

Roles	Items
Dimension of Intention	
Symmetry	1. In my company, the purpose of public relations is to promote mutual understanding between the management of the company and its publics.
	2. We not only try to change the attitudes of members of the public, but also try to change our attitudes.
	3. We not only try to change the behaviors of members of the public, but also try to change our behaviors.
	4. Before making final decisions, we seek the opinions of those groups or individuals who will be affected by the decisions or policies.
	5. We try to change our company's policies considering the opinions of the public.
	6. In my company, public relations provide mediation to help the management and the public negotiate conflict.
Asymmetry	1. We do public relations in order to change the behaviors of publics.
	2. We do public relations in order to change the attitudes of publics.
	3. We do public relations programs to persuade publics to behave friendly to our company.
	4. The purpose of our public relations is to help the public to see our company more favorably.
	5. We do public relations programs to persuade publics to agree with the company's point of view.
Dimension of Direction	
Two-way	1. We promote communication from the publics to the management.
	2. We listen to the opinions of the publics.
	3. Obtaining information about publics is one of the primary activities of our public relations.
	4. We conduct research to understand how the publics feel about certain issues.
	5. We conduct research to understand how the publics think about our company.
	6. We conduct evaluative research after conducting public relations or communication activities.

Table 3 -- Continued

One-way	1. Our company's public relations activities primarily focus on disseminating information.
	2. Public relations programs in my company involve one-way communication from the company to the publics.
	3. The public relations department functions as more of a disseminator of information than a mediator between management and publics.
	4. The primary activity of our public relations is to disseminate information about the company.
	5. The purpose of our public relations is quite simply to get publicity for the company.
	6. In my company, public relations and publicity mean essentially the same thing.
	7. The success of our public relations is determined by the amount of publicity.

Dimension of Ethics	
	1. We disclose our purpose when conducting communication programs.
	2. The information we provide is factual.
	3. In our public relations activities, we disseminate accurate information, regardless of whether it is favorable or not.
	4. We define success of public relations not just by results but also the way that they are obtained.
	5. We examine any possibility of negative consequences of the company's public relations activities.

Dimension of Channel	
Interpersonal	1. We use face-to-face communication.
	2. We communicate in person with the public.
	3. We make informal contact with the public.
	4. We offer party favors or memorabilia

Mediated	1. We distribute news releases.
	2. We use mass media, such as television and radio broadcasts, newspapers, or magazines.
	3. We offer information and news briefings.
	4. We distribute flyers, pamphlets, magazines, or other printed materials that represent the company.

1. Social demands on our firm rarely change/Social demands on our firm change frequently (turbulence).

2. We face a low level of regulation/We face a high level of regulation (turbulence).

3. We deal with few regulatory agencies/We deal with many regulatory agencies (complexity).

4. We face low levels of social interest in our operation/We face high levels of social interest in our operations (turbulence).

5. We deal with few social advocacy groups/We deal with many social advocacy groups (complexity).

Prior crisis experience. In order to assess organizations' prior crisis experience, participants were asked to indicate if their organizations have gone through a crisis that affected the organization's reputation or public trust within the past three years (Yes = 1, No = 0).

Influence of public relations unit in decision making. The influence of the public relations unit in decision making was measured by adopting items provided by Broom and Dozier (1986). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they believe their public relations or communication function has influence in various decision making situations in their company, such as introducing new procedures or policies. A five point scale was used (1 = very little; 5 = a lot). One item asked the overall influence of the public relations unit in comparison to other work groups in the company. The five items showed a reliability of α = .92. The specific contents of the items follow:

1. Overall influence of public relations unit compared to other teams.

2. Influence of public relations unit in introducing new procedures.

3. Influence of public relations unit in decision making of strategic direction.

4. Influence of public relations unit in introducing new policies.

5. Influence of public relations unit in planning customer services/support.

Value of public relations unit to the company. The value of public relations was measured through respondants' self-assessment. Two measures were adopted from the excellence study (L. A. Grunig et al., 2002), which asks participants to estimate the value of the public relations department "in comparison with a typical other department in the organization" and "as a percentage of the department's budget." One additional item asked performance of public relations unit in comparison to public relations units in other companies. A five-point scale was used (1 =much below the average, 3 = about the average, 5 = much higher than average). The items showed a reliability of α = .79

1. Performance compared to PR in other companies in the industry.

2. Value of PR compared to other teams in the company.

3. Value of PR compared to PR budget.

Data Analysis

The research questions were explored employing various statistical techniques, such as confirmatory factor analysis using structural equation modeling, canonical correlation analysis, and multiple regressions.

Data Screening

Before conducting the main analysis, the missing data pattern and distribution of the data were examined in order to employ appropriate data analysis techniques. Only one missing data point was found for the responses on public relations roles and four

missing data points were found for the responses on public relations models. In using structural equation modeling, various techniques are available to deal with missing data, such as pairwise deletion, listwise deletion, the full information maximum likelihood (FIML) method, and data imputation. It is well known that FIML method yields consistent and efficient parameters (Enders & Bandalos, 2001) and listwise deletion is also deemed an acceptable method when the proportion of the cases containing missing data is less than 5.0% of the total cases. However, because the number of missing values was very small, mode replacement of the missing data was chosen.

Except for a few measurement items, most of the variables were normally distributed with skewness and kurtosis of less than one. Among the items for public relations roles, four items showed a slight departure from the univariate normality: one item for administrator, one item for technician, and two items for media relations role. Among the items for public relations models, two items for media relations role and one item for activist role indicated departure from the normality. While the value of skewness and kurtosis for these items were still less than the definite two, in conducting CFA, they were recoded using square transformation in order to prevent the potential influence of the nonnormality.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

For both public relations roles and public relations model, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted. The data was analyzed with a SEM software, Mplus 4 (Muthen & Muthen, 2006).

Model estimation. In order to choose the appropriate model estimation method, the multivariate normality of the data was examined. The maximum likelihood method

has been the predominant estimation method as it produces unbiased, consistent, and efficient estimation under the assumption of multivariate normality of the data (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). While parameter estimates with maximum likelihood are robust against a moderate violation of multivariate normality with a moderate sample size, ML estimate to violation of this assumption can inflate the chi-square statistic value and underestimate some fit indexes and standard errors of the parameter statistics (Nevitt & Hancock, 2001). Therefore, when the data shows a gross departure from the multivariate normality, other estimation techniques, such as bootstrapping, can assess the model fit more accurately (Bollen & Stine, 1992).

While all of the variables included did not depart far from the univariate normality, the multivariate normality test suggested that the data did not meet the multivariate normality (Mardia's multivariate normality test for items of public relations roles = 457.87, critical ratio = 39.26; Mardia's multivariate normality test for items of public relations model = 242.77, critical ratio = 33.97). In general, a critical ratio value of greater than three is considered an indication of multivariate non-normality. Therefore, the bootstrapping approach with the maximum-likelihood (ML) estimation was used to assess the model fit, which does not require a distributional assumption (Nevitt & Hancock, 2001). Bootstrapping provides adjusted parameter estimates, standard errors of parameter estimates, and significance tests for individual parameters (Nevitt & Hancock, 2001).

Assessment of global fit. Before assessing the model against the fit criteria, any sign for model specification errors or identification problems (e.g., negative error variances, correlations greater than one) was checked. When there was no such a sign,

joint cut-off criteria employing multiple fit indexes were applied in order to assess the global fit of the CFA models as suggested by Hu and Bentler (1999). Fit indexes, such as the chi-square statistic, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), were examined. A model has a satisfactory fit when p-value of the chi-square statistic is greater than .05; CFI exceeds .96; RMSEA is less than .06; and SRMR is less than .10 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Because the data did not meet the multivariate normality assumption, Bollen-Stine's adjusted p-value for chi-square statistic produced from bootstrapping was evaluated. The adjusted chi-square statistic has been shown to have more reliable standard errors when the distributional assumptions are not met (Hu & Bentler, 1995).

Assessment of local fit. Because the global fit measures assess the overall adequacy of the model, it does not provide information about the tenability of the internal structure of the model. It is possible that a certain part of the model is poorly modeled, even though the overall model is satisfactory. Therefore, it is essential to inspect the internal structure with several assessment criteria. The criteria that are commonly used are: indicator reliability (squared multiple correlations) greater than .30; standardized factor loading greater than .60 with significant t-value; average variance explained (AVE) greater than .50; composite construct reliability greater than .60, modification indices smaller than 10 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA)

Rationales for using CCA. Canonical correlation analysis is a statistical technique used to explore the relationships between two sets of variables. One advantage of

canonical correlation is that CCA makes it possible to examine the complex reality by allowing for simultaneous tests among the variables (Sherry & Henson, 2005). A phenomenon is usually expressed by a combination of complex multivariate relationships, rather than a univariate relationship between a single cause and an effect.

The other advantages of canonical correlation is that it can capture the dimensionality of variables while exploring the relationships between sets of variables taking into account the relationships among variables within a set. While multivariate multiple regression also allows examining multiple independent variables and dependent variables simultaneously, this approach does not provide information concerning dimensionality among variables. An organization's public relations behavior could be explained by complex relationships between and within an organization's public relations practices and public relations roles. Therefore, using CCA is deemed as an appropriate statistical analysis.

Assessment of CCA statistics. In order to assess the existence of relationship between public relations roles and public relations models, first, the statistical significance of the full canonical model and its effect size was examined with multiple index. In particular, Wilks' λ represents the amount of variance not shared between the variable set, thus by taking $1 - \lambda$ inform of an overall effect size for the full model (Sherry & Henson, 2005).

Second, canonical functions produced by CCA will be assessed. The canonical functions which explain a substantial amount of variance between the variable sets were retained for interpretation.

Next, in order to assess the contribution of each observed variables to canonical function, structure coefficients of observed variables was examined. Structure coefficient is a correlation between an observed variable and a canonical variate, which was extracted from the observed variables in a set. Structure coefficients shows which observed variable in a set is relevant to the canonical variate. When variables within a set are highly related, it is possible that their standardized coefficients for canonical function are small (Sherry & Henson, 2005). In such a case, a canonical function is better interpreted with structure coefficients. The structure coefficient has utility in informing which variables contribute to a canonical function.

In addition, squared structure coefficients and canonical communality coefficient (h^2) were reported. The squared structure coefficient (r_s^2) indicates the proportion of variance shared between an observed variable and a canonical variate. The communality coefficient reflects the amount of variance in each observed variable explained across canonical functions. It is computed by summing up r_s^2 across canonical functions retained for interpretation.

Univariate Multiple Regression

In order to further explore the relationship between public relations roles and public relations models, univariate multiple regressions was also conducted. While CCA shows the overall pattern of the relationship between two sets of variables, univariate multiple regression analyses allows for probing the effects of independent variables on each of the dependent variables. By employing the regression analysis, the relative effects of public relations roles on each dimension of a public relations model can be examined.

72

Running univariate multiple regression after canonical correlations analysis is a practice that is often recommended.

Research Ethics

An application for Michigan State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was submitted and an exemption for the IRB review was obtained before data collection. The protocol submitted to IRB was as follows.

First, on the cover letter of the survey, participants were informed of 1) the purpose of the study; 2) potential benefits and costs from participating in the study; 3) protection for confidentiality of their answers under the laws; 4) assurance that the participation is voluntary, and their right to skip any question or stop answering questions at any time; and 5) contact information for the researcher and the IRB office.

Second, in order to protect confidentiality of participants' responses, the questionnaires did not include any identifiable information about the participants, except for demographic information, such age, sex, and education level. The data file will be saved in the researcher's laptop computer locked with password protection for five years.

CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

Description of Sample

Description of Participating Companies

Among the 226 companies from which participants were drawn, 18 (8.0 %) were publicly owned and 21 (9.3 %) were foreign affiliated private companies. The rest of the companies (n = 187 or 82.7 %) were classified as domestic private companies. The majority of the companies (n = 102, 45.1 %) were in the service industry, which include hospitality, financial, medical, food, etc. Eighty eight (38.9 %) companies served in a variety of manufacturing businesses (e.g., electronics, furniture, clothes, pharmaceutical, etc.), and the remaining 36 (15.9 %) companies were in the construction, development, and engineering industries. Although the companies were all drawn from MK's top 1000 companies, the organization size in terms of the number of employees varied (Table 4). About 18% of the companies (n = 42) were small-sized companies with less than 300 employees. Ninety eight companies (43.4 %) were medium-sized with between 300 to 999 employees. The rest of the companies (n = 83, 36.8 %) were classified as large sized companies with over 1,000 employees.

Several characteristics of the participating companies' public relations function were examined, i.e., the size of public relations function, budget of public relations unit, and the job rank of the head of the public relations function. As shown in Table 5, about half of the participating companies (49.1 %) had less than five public relations practitioners, while 40 companies (17.7 %) had 10 or more practitioners.

Table 4

Company size in number of employees

Number of employees	Frequency	%
less than 300	42	18.6
300 - 499	41	18.1
500 - 999	57	25.3
1,000 -1,999	34	15.0
2,000 -2,999	23	10.2
3,000 -4,999	11	4.9
5,000 - 9,999	6	2.7
10,000 or above	9	4.0
No response	3	1.2
Total	226	100

Table 5

The size of public relations function in the number of public relations practitioners

Number of practitioners	Frequency	%
1 - 2	37	16.4
3	40	17.7
4	34	15.0
5	27	11.9
6	19	8.4
7 - 9	25	11.1
10 - 19	26	11.5
20 or above	14	6.2
No response	4	1.8
Total	226	100.0

In most of the participating companies, the head of the public relations unit was in a management position (Table 6). The most prominent job rank was director (Bu-Jang) (n = 90, 39.8%), followed by the executive position (n = 57, 25.2%). In about a third of participating companies, the public relations heads were associates (Gwa-Jang; n = 33, 14.6%) or senior level managers (Cha-Jang, n = 35, 15.5%).

75

About a half of the participants (n = 108) did not provide information on the budget of the public relations function (Table 7). For the majority of the companies whose public relations budget information is given (n = 76, 33.6%), the budget ranged between $100,000 to $5 million. Four participants answered that their company does not have any budget set aside for public relations. Finally, about a half of the participants (n = 109, 48.2%) reported their company experienced crises at least once during the recent three years, which adversely affected the corporate image or public trust.

Table 6

The job rank of the head of public relations function

Job Rank	Frequency	%
Assistant (Sa-Won)	4	1.8
Assistant manager (Dae-Ri)	2	.9
Associate manager (Gwa-Jang)	33	14.6
Senior manager (Cha-Jang)	35	15.5
Director (Bu-Jang)	90	39.8
Executive	57	25.2
Vice President	5	2.2
Total	226	100.0

Table 7

The 2006 budget of public relations unit (₩1K = ₩100,000,000)

Amount	Frequency	%
No budget	4	1.8
Less than $100,000 (₩ 1K)	14	6.2
$100,000 ~ $1 million (₩ 1 ~10K)	45	19.9
$1 ~ 5 million (₩ 10 ~50K)	31	13.7
$5 ~ 10 million (₩ 50 ~ 100K)	15	6.6
$10 million (₩ 100K) or above	9	4.0
Don't know/No response	108	47.7
Total	226	100.0

Description of Participants

Participants were asked to report their gender, age, job rank, experience in public relations, tenure with the company, work responsibility, the highest level of education, and education in public relations. The average age of the participants was 33.38 with a range from 24 to 50 (Table 8). Male was the dominant gender (female: $n = 71$, 31.4%; males: $n = 155$, 68.6%). The respondents were primarily drawn from assistant managers (Dae-Ri, $n = 79$, 35%), assistants (Sa-Won, $n = 66$, 29.2%), and associate managers (Gwa-Jang, $n = 48$, 21.2%). The rest of the participants were senior managers or above (Table 9).

Table 8

Age of the participants

Age	Frequency	%
20's	67	29.6
30's	124	54.9
40's	34	15.0
No response	1	.04
Total	226	100.0

Table 9

The job rank of the participants

Job Rank	Frequency	%
Assistants (Sa-Won)	66	29.2
Assistant manager (Dae-Ri)	79	35.0
Associate manager (Gwa-Jang)	48	21.2
Senior manager (Cha-Jang)	12	5.3
Director (Bu-Jang)	20	8.8
Executives	1	0.4
Total	226	100.0

On average, participants have worked for their company for 5.48 years and had

4.78 years of experience in public relations (Table 10). About 64.0% of the participants

had practiced public relations for more than three years. Approximately half of the

participants (n = 108, 47.8%) answered that they oversee the public relations function of

their companies. Most of the participants held at least a bachelor's degree (96.0%) and

25.0% of the participants earned or were pursuing graduate degrees. Among them 16.0%

of the participants (n = 36) had earned bachelor's degree in public relations and 87

participants had taken at least one undergraduate public relations class. A solid majority

of the participants (n = 138, 61.1%) have received public relations education from private

educational institutions or public relations associations. Thirty three participants were

members of professional public relations associations.

Table 10.

Respondents' experience in public relations

Years	Frequency	%
Less than 1 year	20	8.8
1~3 years	61	27.0
3~5 years	60	26.5
5~9 years	51	22.6
More than 5 years	33	14.6
No response	1	0.4
Total	226	100.0

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

This section reports the results of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for public relations roles and public relations model.

Roles of Public Relations Unit

The first research question was to explore the factor structure of public relations roles. In order to assess the factor structures, the measures were submitted to a CFA model.

Global fit. A CFA model was constructed with 63 items that tapped the nine theoretically drawn public relations roles and four administrative/technician roles. The initial model had identification problems indicated by non-positive factor covariance matrix. There was no sign of negative variance/residual variance, or a correlation greater or equal to one between the latent variables. Instead, a multicollinearity problem, a linear dependency among latent variables, was suspected involving the factors of planner, administrator, technician, and media relations roles. These factors were highly correlated ($r > .90$) with advocate role and expert prescriber role. For example, the administrator role was related to expert prescriber role, with $r = .98$. This indicates that the roles of planner, administrator, technician, and media relations are possibly redundant or subsumed under the advocate role and expert prescriber role. In other words, those four roles may possibly reflect the activities that could be entailed with the enactment of advocate role and expert prescriber role, rather than a distinct role that is equivalent to other roles in the conceptual hierarchy. Given the multicollinearity and conceptual issues, planner, administrator, technician, and media relations were dropped.

After dropping the roles, the model was converged without an identification problem, but showed a poor fit, χ^2 (998) = 2254.75, Bollen-Stine p < .001, CFI = .84, RMSEA = .075 [90% CI = .71 to .79], SRMR = .061. By examining modification indices, items which had factor loading smaller than .05 and were inconsistently loaded on several other factors or errors were identified. It was found that the items of internal communicator role were also highly loaded on the liaison role. Because it was theoretically plausible to see internal communicator role as an aspect of liaison role, those two factors were merged. Errors were allowed to be correlated among items for external liaison and internal liaison respectively. The modification indices also indicated that the items for the disturbance handler factor were inconsistently loaded on several other factors, including expert prescriber role and advisor role. This possibly indicates that the contents of issue handler role reflect a functional area of public relations, i.e., issue management, rather than a distinct role of a public relations unit. Therefore, the disturbance handler role was dropped. Through the modification procedure, seven role factors were retained with five items for advisor, four items for coordinator and liaison roles, and three items for expert, activist, advocate, and monitor roles. The final items are provided in Table 11. This modified model showed a satisfactory fit: χ^2 (231) = 374.18, Bollen-Stine p > .05, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .046 [90% CI = .036 to .056], SRMR = .04.

The seven-factor model was tested against the first-order one-factor model, which presumes all items in this study are measuring the same role, rather than measuring distinct roles respectively. A test for the first-order one-factor model showed a poor fit indicating that the items are not measuring the same construct, χ^2 (275) = 701, Bollen-Stine p < .001, CFI = .87, RMSEA = .083 [90% CI = .075 to .09], SRMR = .055. This

result again confirms that the measures in the model are indeed capturing distinct public relations roles.

Local fit. The local fit of the model was also satisfactory. Factor loadings were significant with values greater than .60 and showed individual item reliabilities (squared multiple correlations) greater than .30, except for one item for liaison. For most of the factors, the average variance explained (AVE) were acceptable (i.e., greater than .50), while AVE for liaison role (.40) was somewhat lower. Finally, all measures for each role demonstrated the acceptable level of composite reliability (CR) (i.e., greater than .60) and internal consistency i.e., (Cronbach's α > .70). The internal model fit is presented in Table 12.

In summary, the CFA results to answer the first research question suggest a seven-factor model of public relations.

Public Relations Model

The second research question explores the relationship between public relations roles and public relations model. Before examining the relationship, it is also necessary to assess the measure of a public relations model, thus a CFA was conducted.

Global fit. A CFA model was constructed with 37 items that measure the seven factors along four dimensions of public relations models. The initial model had an identification problem with non-positive latent factor covariance. A potential multicollinearity involving the symmetry dimension was suspected as factor correlations greater than one were found between the symmetry factor and the ethical factor and between the symmetry factor and the interpersonal communication factor. The symmetry

Table 11

Items retained from CFA of public relations roles

Roles	Items
Prescriber	[PS1] Diagnose public relations problems of the company. [PS2] Take responsibility for the success of the company's public relations programs. [PS3] Make the communication policy decisions of the company.
Advisor	[AV1] Advise management on a variety of important stakeholder issues. [AV2] Advise management on the PR/communication implications of any strategic decisions of the company. [AV3] Advise management on a regular basis about relevant communication issues and challenges of the company. [AV4] Operate as a catalyst in management's decision making. [AV5] Recommend top management courses of action for solving public relations problems.
Activist	[AC1] Persuade organization members to support a change in a company's practices in order to deal with an emerging public relations problem. [AC2] Challenge the company's practices in public relations that are no longer appropriate. [AC3] Advocate for the best interests of key publics within the company.
Coordinator	[CD1] Explain public relations problems to others in the company. [CD2] Collaborate with members in other work groups to diagnose public relations problems. [CD3] Resolve the organization's public relations problems in coordination with members in other work groups in the company. [CD4] Coordinate a variety of communication-related activities by other work groups for consistency.
Advocate	[AD1] Speak for corporate interests to multiple publics. [AD2] Deliver a favorable image of the company to the key publics. [AD3] Represent the company's economic or social perspectives to the publics.
Liaison	[LS1] Inform organization members of new developments (e.g., new business decisions, changes in policies) within the company. [LS2] Provide communication channels and programs that help communication among organization members. [LS3] Create opportunities for management to hear the views of the company's publics. [LS4] Diagnose communication problems between the organization and various publics.
Monitor	[MO1] Track social issues that may affect the company's political situation. [MO1] Monitor external trends that might affect the company. [MO1] Analyze external intelligence relevant to the company.

Table 12

Local fit index for public relations roles

Factor	Items	Factor Loading	Item Reliability	AVE	CR	Cronbach's α
Prescriber	PS1	.81	.66	.59	.81	.80
	PS2	.73	.53			
	PS3	.73	.54			
Advisor	AV1	.78	.61	.62	.89	.89
	AV2	.80	.64			
	AV3	.81	.66			
	AV4	.75	.57			
	AV5	.77	.59			
Activist	AC1	.68	.47	.48	.73	.73
	AC2	.69	.47			
	AC3	.70	.49			
Coordinator	CD1	.80	.64	.62	.87	.87
	CD2	.83	.69			
	CD3	.67	.45			
	CD4	.87	.75			
Advocate	AD1	.83	.69	.61	.82	.82
	AD2	.74	.55			
	AD3	.76	.58			
Liaison	LS1	.53	.28	.40	.73	.75
	LS2	.61	.37			
	LS3	.67	.45			
	LS4	.72	.51			
Monitor	MO1	.75	.56	.58	.81	.80
	MO2	.79	.63			
	MO3	.75	.56			

Note. AVE: Average Variance Explained; CR: Composite Reliability.

factor was also highly correlated with two-way communication (.95). In the current

sample, it seems that companies which do public relations with symmetric intention also

utilize ethical, two-way, and interpersonal communication. In this case, the symmetry

dimension would be captured by these three other dimensions, thus the symmetry

dimension was dropped in order to obtain the solution.

After dropping the symmetry dimension, the initial model converged without an

identification problem but the model fit was not satisfactory, χ^2 (419) = 985.89, Bollen-

Stine p < .001, CFI = .84, RMSEA = .077 [90% CI = .071 to .084], SRMR = .069. Thus,

by examining modification indices, items which were inconsistently loaded on several

other factors or errors were identified and dropped. Through the modification procedure,

three items were retained for asymmetry, ethical, one-way, interpersonal, and mediated

communication, while four items were retained for two-way communication. The final

items are provided in Table 13. This modified model showed a satisfactory fit: χ^2 (136) =

215.28, Bollen-Stine p > .05, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .05 [90% CI = .038 to .063], SRMR =

.047.

Local fit. The local fit of the model was assessed with the same criteria used for

the CFA model of the public relations role. Factor loadings were all significant and

satisfactory in general. Two items included in the ethical dimension and one-way

dimension had factor loadings slightly smaller than .60. All individual item reliabilities

(squared multiple correlations) were greater than .30. AVE was acceptable for the

dimensions of asymmetry, one-way, interpersonal, and mediated communication, while

the two-way and ethical dimension showed a relatively low AVE (.40). The composite

reliability and internal consistency was also generally adequate. The internal model fit is

presented in Table 14.

Table 13

Items retained from CFA of public relations model

Roles	Items
Asymmetry	[AS1] We do public relations in order to change the behaviors of publics.
	[AS2] We do public relations in order to change the attitudes of publics.
	[AS3] We do public relations programs to persuade publics to be friendly to our company.
Ethics	[ET1] We disclose our purpose when conducting communication programs.
	[ET2] In our public relations activities, we disseminate accurate information, regardless of whether it is favorable or not.
	[ET3] We examine any possibility of negative consequences of the company's public relations activities.
Two-way	[TW1] We promote communication from the publics to management.
	[TW2] Obtaining information about publics is one of the primary activities of our public relations.
	[TW3] We conduct research to understand how the publics feel about certain issues.
	[TW4] We conduct research to understand how the publics think about our company.
One-way	[OW1] Our company's public relations activities primarily focus on disseminating information.
	[OW2] The public relations department functions as more of a disseminator of information than a mediator between management and publics.
	[OW3] The primary activity of our public relations is to disseminate information about the company.
Interpersonal	[IP1] We use face-to-face communication.
	[IP2] We communicate in person with the public.
	[IP3] We make informal contact with the public.
Mediated	[ME1] We distribute news releases.
	[ME2] We use mass media, such as television and radio broadcasts, newspapers, or magazines.
	[ME3] We offer information and news briefings.

Table 14

Local fit index for public relations model

Factor	Items	Factor Loading	Item Reliability	AVE	CR	Cronbach's α
Asymmetry	AS1	.77	.59	.60	.82	.82
	AS2	.78	.57			
	AS3	.79	.62			
Ethic	ET1	.57	.32	.40	.66	.66
	ET2	.56	.31			
	ET3	.75	.56			
Two-way	TW1	.72	.52	.52	.81	.83
	TW2	.77	.59			
	TW3	.72	.52			
	TW4	.68	.46			
One-way	OW1	.72	.51	.40	.66	.71
	OW2	.57	.33			
	OW3	.59	.35			
Interpersonal	IP1	.65	.43	.49	.74	.74
	IP2	.70	.50			
	IP3	.73	.54			
Mediated	ME1	.80	.64	.57	.80	.79
	ME2	.75	.56			
	ME3	.71	.50			

Note. AVE = Average Variance Explained; CR = Composite Reliability

As the modified CFA model for public relations roles and public relations model showed acceptable global and local fits, the items for each construct were averaged to produce composite measures. The descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations among variables are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Asymmetry	3.46	.83												
2. Ethic	3.27	.75	.55											
3. One-way	3.55	.69	.55	.45										
4. Two-way	3.11	.80	.62	.63	.42									
5. Interpersonal	3.10	.81	.58	.60	.43	.71								
6. Mediated	3.85	.93	.62	.50	.57	.47	.52							
7. Activist	3.22	.72	.55	.60	.43	.61	.57	.46						
8. Advisor	3.32	.78	.48	.62	.38	.66	.58	.42	.72					
9. Prescriber	3.47	.81	.58	.64	.44	.61	.57	.57	.70	.73				
10. Coordinator	3.41	.80	.42	.56	.34	.56	.53	.39	.67	.69	.73			
11. Advocate	3.79	.82	.66	.55	.48	.58	.55	.67	.61	.61	.69	.53		
12. Liaison	3.35	.77	.50	.59	.39	.72	.65	.45	.68	.80	.71	.63	.62	
13. Monitor	3.64	.83	.53	.62	.41	.62	.52	.56	.63	.72	.66	.58	.64	.68

* All correlations are significant at the .01 level (two-tailed).

87

Testing the Construct Validity against the Nomological Network

In order to test the construct validity of the seven public relations roles against the nomological network, multivariate and univariate multiple regressions were conducted controlling for other organizational characteristics. A multivariate multiple regression was conducted with seven public relations roles as dependent variables and organizational characteristics as independent variables, which include experience of organizational crisis, management philosophy, and perceived uncertainty of an organization's environment along with control variables such as organizational culture, company types, organization size, number of public relations practitioners in the organizations, job rank of the head of the public relations unit.

The multivariate statistics suggested that control variables that include organizational demographic variables, i.e., company types [Wilks's λ = .922, $F(14, 404)$ = 1.19, p = n.s.]; organization size [Wilks's λ = .983, $F(7, 202)$ = 2.50, p = n.s.]; number of public relations practitioners in the organizations [Wilks's λ = .974, $F(7, 202)$ = .78, p = n.s.]; job rank of the head of the public relations function [Wilks's λ = .972, $F(7, 202)$ = .83, p = n.s.], do not significantly influence enactment of seven public relations roles. Only participative organizational culture had significant influence on enactment of public relations roles [Wilks's λ = .897, $F(7, 202)$ = 3.31, p < .01]. Participative organizational culture had a positive effect on most of the roles of the public relations units, with a marginal effect on advocate role, $F(1, 208)$ = 3.67, p = .057.

The second research question (RQ2) asked the relationship between uncertainty of companies' environment and enactment of public relations roles. Significant multivariate effects of uncertainty of companies' environment were found, Wilks's λ = .902, $F(7, 202)$

= 3.128, $p < .01$. As expected, companies' environments influenced public relations roles such that the more uncertain a company's environment the more likely that boundary spanning roles were enacted: advocate, $F(1, 208) = 10.11$, $p < .01$; liaison, $F(1, 208) = 6$, $p < .05$; monitor, $F(1, 208) = 10.12$, $p < .01$. The rest of the roles did not show any significant relationship with crisis experience.

The third research question (RQ3) explored the relationship between management philosophy and public relations roles. Overall, top management's management philosophy had significant effects on enactment of public relations roles, Wilks's λ = .926, $F(7, 202) = 2.32$, $p < .01$. Public relations units whose top management had an institution-oriented management philosophy (i.e., those who are socially oriented or low enterprise-oriented) were more likely to function as an activist, $F(1, 208) = 5.28$, $p < .05$. The influence of management philosophy on the liaison role also approached significance, $F(1, 208) = 3.56$, $p = .061$. Furthermore, the management philosophy was also positively related to the rest of the roles, i.e., advisor, expert prescriber, coordinator, and monitor (See Table 16). It seems that top management's philosophy nurtures all seven roles of public relations.

The fourth research question (RQ4) asked the relationship between companies' prior crisis experience and public relations role enactment. Significant multivariate effects were found for experience of organizational crisis, Wilks's λ = .92, $F(7, 202)$ = 2.50, $p < .05$. In companies that had experienced organizational crisis at least once in last three years, the public relations unit was more likely to play a role as an expert prescriber, $F(1, 208) = 8.50$, $p < .01$, and as an advocate for the company, $F(1, 208) = 8.91$, $p < .01$.

However, the advisor, coordinator, monitor, and activist roles were not related to crisis experience. The results are summarized in Table 16.

Next, the relationships between public relations roles and outcome variables, i.e., the public relation unit's influence in a company's decision making (RQ5) and self-assessment of public relations' value to the company as criterion variables (RQ6), were explored. A correlational analysis showed that all public relations roles are positively related to public relation units' influence in the decision making process and the value of the public relations unit to the company. In order to explore the relative effect of each public relations role, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted with organizational demographics, i.e., organization size, crisis experience, job rank of the public relations head, and number of public relations practitioners, as control variables.

The results showed that, controlling for the covariates and other public relations roles, the advisor role had a positive effect on the public relations unit's influence in the company's decision making process, $\beta = .28$, $t = 2.48$, $p < .05$. Rest of public relations roles did not significantly contribute to the public relations unit's influence in the company's decision making process.

Multiple regression using the value of public relations to organizations suggested that the advocate role had the strongest effect, $\beta = .35$, $t = 4.13$, $p < .001$, followed by the activist role, $\beta = .18$, $t = 2.03$, $p < .05$. The results with two outcome variables are summarized in Table 17.

Table 16

Influence of organizational characteristics on the roles of public relations function

IVs	Multivariate F	DVs	F*
Company types (Public vs. Domestic private vs. Foreign affiliated private)	Wilks' Lamda = .922, $F(14,404) = 1.191$, $p = .278$	Activist [a]	1.65
		Advisor [b]	4.05*
		Expert [c]	4.93**
		Coordinator [d]	3.11*
		Advocate [e]	1.19
		Liaison [f]	1.52
		Monitor [g]	1.45
Organization size (Number of employees)	Wilks' Lamda =.983, $F(7,202) =.504$, $p = .831$	Activist	0.94
		Advisor	0.81
		Expert	1.13
		Coordinator	0.14
		Advocate	0.17
		Liaison	0.00
		Monitor	0.45
Job rank of the head of public relations practitioners	Wilks' Lamda =.972, $F(7,202) =.833$, $p = .561$	Activist	0.62
		Advisor	1.67
		Expert	2.28
		Coordinator	0.56
		Advocate	0.40
		Liaison	1.06
		Monitor	4.72*
Participative organizational culture	Wilks' Lamda =.897, $F(7,202) = 3.312$, $p = .002$	Activist	9.70**
		Advisor	14.07***
		Expert	15.07***
		Coordinator	19.43***
		Advocate	3.67
		Liaison	11.40**
		Monitor	11.50**
Number of public relations practitioners	Wilks' Lamda =.974, $F(7,202) =.782$, $p = .603$	Activist	0.00
		Advisor	0.82
		Expert	0.32
		Coordinator	0.21
		Advocate	0.75
		Liaison	0.15
		Monitor	0.04

Table 16 – Continued

IVs	F(7,202)	DVs	F^h
Crisis experience (Yes/No)	Wilks' Lamda = .920, F(7,202) = 2.501, p = .017	Activist	0.43
		Advisor	1.06
		Expert	8.50**
		Coordinator	0.92
		Advocate	8.91**
		Liaison	0.16
		Monitor	1.14
Management philosophy	Wilks' Lamda =.926, F(7,202) = 2.316, p = .027	Activist	5.28*
		Advisor	6.93**
		Expert	7.89**
		Coordinator	8.39**
		Advocate	12.32**
		Liaison	3.56
		Monitor	4.49*
Environmental uncertainty of a company	Wilks' Lamda =.902, F(7,202) = 3.128, p = .001	Activist	2.61
		Advisor	2.28
		Expert	0.19
		Coordinator	0.18
		Advocate	10.11**
		Liaison	6.00*
		Monitor	10.12**

* Significant at the level of .05.
** Significant at the level of .01.
*** Significant at the level of .001.

a. R Squared = .220 (Adjusted R Squared = .187).
b. R Squared = .307 (Adjusted R Squared = .277).
c. R Squared = .313 (Adjusted R Squared = .283).
d. R Squared = .268 (Adjusted R Squared = .236).
e. R Squared = .338 (Adjusted R Squared = .309).
f. R Squared = .234 (Adjusted R Squared = .200).
g. R Squared = .294 (Adjusted R Squared = .263).
h. The degree of freedom for F statistics is $df = (1, 208)$ except for organization type $df = (2, 208)$.

Table 17

The effect of public relations roles on outcome variables

	Influence of PR function in decision making				Value of public relations to the company			
	Zero-order correlation	β	t-value	p	Zero-order correlation	β	t-value	p
Block1								
Organization size (Number of employees)		-.03	-.36	.721		-.04	-.56	.577
Number of public relations practitioners		.12	1.60	.112		.11	1.50	.134
Crisis experience in last 3 years (Yes/No)		.13	1.85	.066		.09	1.39	.166
Experience of negative media coverage in the last year (Yes/No)		-.18	-2.60	.010		-.04	-.60	.547
Job rank of the head of public relations practitioners		-.03	-.44	.660		.05	.96	.339
Block2								
Activist	.49	.12	1.31	.190	.51	.18	2.03	.044
Advisor	.55	.28	2.48	.014	.49	.09	.87	.387
Expert	.44	-.06	-.59	.557	.53	.17	1.64	.102
Coordinator	.44	.08	.90	.370	.38	-.10	-1.21	.229
Advocate	.42	.12	1.32	.189	.58	.35	4.13	.000
Liaison	.50	.16	1.57	.118	.48	.06	.66	.511
Monitor	.39	-.09	-.99	.323	.41	-.13	-1.48	.142

Note. All zero-order correlations are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Canonical Correlations

In order to explore the relationship between public relations roles and public relations models (RQ7), a canonical correlation was conducted using six dimensions of public relations and seven public relations roles. It is possible that several organizational characteristics, such as management philosophy, participative organizational culture, crisis experience, top management's support for public relations, and an organization's environment uncertainty, have an influence on both public relations roles and public relations models, thus producing spurious relationships between them. In order to control these covariates, the variables of public relations roles and public relations models were regressed on the covariates, and the residuals obtained from this procedure were used in the analysis.

The analysis yielded six canonical functions with squared canonical correlation (R_c^2) of .532, .261, .073, .034, 006, and .001, respectively. The full model across all functions was statistically significant, Wilks's λ = .307, $F(42, 983.75)$ = 6.71, $p < .001$. The full model effect size yielded from taking $1 - \lambda$ was .693, indicating that 69.3% of the variance was shared between the variable sets. According to the report of dimension reduction analysis, which tests the hierarchical cumulative effect of functions for statistical significance, the cumulative effect of Function 2 to 6 was also significant, $F(30, 842)$ = 3.12, $p < .001$. Given the squared canonical correlation of the functions and their cumulative effects, the first two canonical functions were retained for further analysis.

In order to interpret the canonical functions, standardized canonical function coefficients and structure coefficients (r_s) were examined. Table 18 provides the statistics along with the squared structure coefficients (r_s^2) and the communalities (h^2)

94

across the two functions for each variable. Looking at the structure coefficients for the

first function, all dimensions of public relations model were highly related to the first

canonical variate of public relations models: asymmetry (r_s = .71), ethical (r_s = .76),

two-way (r_s = .82), one-way (r_s = .57), interpersonal (r_s = .68), and mediated (r_s

= .63). Therefore, the first canonical variate produced reflects a two-way mixed-motive

public relations model.

Examining the side of the public relations roles, a similar pattern was found. The

structure coefficients for all seven public relations roles were greater than .70: activist

(r_s = .75), advisor (r_s = .71), expert prescriber (r_s = .81), coordinator (r_s = .61),

advocate (r_s = .74), liaison (r_s = .81), and monitor (r_s = .79). Therefore, the first

canonical variate reflects balanced enactment across all public relations roles. Because

the sign of the structure coefficient for public relations roles were all positive, they were

all positively related to the first canonical variate of public relations model.

Taken together the structure coefficients for the first canonical function from both

variable sets, the first canonical function reflects a positive relationship between high

level of enactment across seven roles and two-way mixed-motive public relations models.

In other words, in companies practicing two-way mixed-motive public relations models

(i.e., higher level of activities across all the dimensions of the public relations models),

the public relations units were more likely to enact all seven roles.

The second canonical function provides a more interesting picture about the

relationship between public relations roles and public relations model. From the side of

public relations model, the dimensions that were highly relevant to the second canonical

variate: asymmetric (r_s = .37), two-way (r_s = −.41), interpersonal (r_s = −.32) and

95

mediated (r_s = .61). The sign of the coefficient provides an insight to the nature of the second canonical variate of the public relations model. Asymmetric, one-way, and mediated communication dimensions were positively related to the second variate, while ethical, two-way, and interpersonal communication were negatively related. This finding suggests that the second canonical variate of the public relations model reflects the one-way asymmetric public relations model.

From the side of public relations roles, the second canonical variate were highly related to liaison (r_s = −.49), advocate (r_s = .46), and advisor (r_s = −.43). The structure coefficients were positive only for expert prescriber and advocate roles. Therefore, this second canonical covariate of public relations roles seems to reflect advocate-oriented role enactment.

When the structure coefficients from both variable sets are taken together, the second canonical function suggests that companies practicing the one-way asymmetric public relations model are more likely to have public relations units that play a role as an advocate for the companies, but are less likely to act as an advisor, coordinator, liaison, or activist.

Table 18

Canonical correlation between public relations roles and public relations model

Variable	Function 1			Function 2			h^2 (%)
	Coef	r_s	r_s^2 (%)	*Coef*	r_s	r_s^2 (%)	
Public Relations Model							
Asymmetric	.170	.713	.508	.584	.374	.140	.648
Ethical	.333	.761	.579	−.066	−.101	.010	.589
Two-way	.429	.818	.669	−.579	−.413	.171	.840
One-way	.083	.569	.324	−.070	.161	.026	.350
Interpersonal	.087	.675	.456	−.423	−.315	.099	.555
Mediated	.266	.633	.401	.683	.605	.366	.767
Public Relations Roles							
Activist	.224	.753	.567	.030	−.117	.014	.581
Advisor	−.096	.706	.498	−.459	−.430	.185	.683
Prescriber	.235	.814	.663	.387	.048	.002	.665
Coordinator	.017	.607	.368	−.286	−.287	.082	.451
Advocate	.261	.740	.548	.687	.456	.208	.756
Liaison	.328	.809	.654	−.753	−.491	.241	.896
Monitor	.304	.787	.619	.331	−.067	.004	.624
r_c^2			.532			.261	

Note. Coef = standardized canonical function coefficient; r_s = structure coefficient; r_s^2 = squared structure coefficient; h^2 = communality coefficient.

Univariate Multiple Regression Analysis

As CCA showed the overall pattern of the relationship between public relations roles and public relations models, univariate multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to further probe the relationships. From the CCA reported above, it became clear how the roles of the public relations function differently for companies practicing the two-way mixed-motive model and those practicing the one-way asymmetry model. On the other hand, CCA failed to produce a canonical function that captured the two-way asymmetry model. The one-way asymmetry model also could be either the press agentry model or the public information model depending on practices of ethical communication. A canonical function, which distinguishes two different one-way models, however, was not produced. Examining the public relations roles with respect to each dimension of the public relations models will allow for making inferences for other public relations models, which did not emerge in CCA.

A series of hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with each public relations dimension as a dependent variable. Control variables included were organization size, job rank of public relations head, management philosophy, participative organizational culture, crisis experience, top management's support for public relations, and an organization's environmental uncertainty. There was no serious multicollinearity as VIF values among seven public relations roles were smaller than four. The results are summarized in Table 19.

After controlling for the control variables, the public relations role which had the strongest effect on the asymmetry dimension was the advocate role ($\beta = .39, p < .001$), followed by the activist role ($\beta = .18, p < .05$). The effect of the expert prescriber role

also approached significance ($\beta = .18, p = .056$). Enactment of advocate, activist, and expert prescriber role were positively related to asymmetric communication practices.

As for the ethical communication practice, the roles of monitor, expert activist, and activist contributed. The more activist ($\beta = .18, p < .05$), monitor ($\beta = .21, p < .01$), expert prescriber ($\beta = .18, p < .05$) roles public relations units played, the more likely their organizations were to practice ethical communications.

Two-way communication dimension was only related to enactment of the liaison role. Enactment of the liaison role was the strongest predictor of a companies' two-way communication practices ($\beta = .37, p < .001$) controlling for enactment of other roles.

As for the one-way communication dimension, the advocate role was the sole predictor. When public relations units were more likely to act as an advocate for the company, their company was more likely to practice one-way communication ($\beta = .23, p < .015$).

The practice of mediated communication was strongly and positively related to the advocate role ($\beta = -.26, p < .01$) and the monitor role ($\beta = .39, p < .001$). Acting as an expert prescriber also had a positive effect on a company's practice of mediated communication ($\beta = .19, p < .05$). Meanwhile, advisor role enactment was negatively related to the practice of mediated communication ($\beta = -.26, p < .01$).

Finally, the interpersonal communication dimension was strongly related to liaison role enactment such that the greater liaison role enactment by public relation units, the greater the company's interpersonal communication practices ($\beta = .36, p < .001$).

Acting as an activist was also positively related to interpersonal communication ($\beta = .36$, $p = .05$).

Table 19

Univariate Regression Analysis

IVs	Asymmetry		Ethical		Two-way	
	β	p	β	p	β	p
Activist	.18*	.026	.18*	.029	.12	.093
Advisor	−.17	.089	.11	.276	.04	.638
Prescriber	.18	.056	.22*	.017	.01	.940
Coordinator	−.02	.793	.01	.917	.04	.536
Advocate	.39***	.000	.01	.992	.06	.432
Liaison	.02	.796	.02	.793	.37***	.000
Monitor	.12	.111	.21**	.008	.12	.082
R^2 change	.240 (p <.001)		.258 (p <.001)		.276 (p <.001)	

IVs	One-way		Mediated		Interpersonal	
	β	p	β	p	β	p
Activist	.17	.077	.07	.346	.16*	.050
Advisor	−.06	.612	−.26**	.006	−.06	.548
Prescriber	.12	.289	.19*	.031	.01	.876
Coordinator	.02	.796	−.05	.524	.06	.416
Advocate	.23*	.015	.39***	.000	.09	.232
Liaison	.01	.930	−.02	.851	.36***	.000
Monitor	.12	.217	.24**	.001	.01	.963
R^2 change	.158 (p <.001)		.204 (p <.001)		.187 (p <.001)	

Note. Variables in the first block include: organization size, job rank of public relations head, management philosophy, participative organizational culture, crisis experience, top management's support for public relations, and organization environmental uncertainty.

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION

The purposes of this study were to elaborate the concepts of public relations roles at the level of public relations unit and to test the utility of the elaborated concepts of public relations roles. Survey research was conducted with public relations practitioners at 226 companies that are among South Korea's top 1,000 companies.

To assess the factor structure of public relations roles drawn from the literature, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted. After obtaining a satisfactory factor model of public relations roles, the relationships of public relations role enactment with several antecedent and outcome variables were explored in order to test the utility of the new conceptualization of public relations roles in explaining the public relations process in organizations. Additionally, a canonical correlation analysis (CCA) and a series of univariate multiple regression was conducted to explore the relationship between public relations roles and public relations models.

This chapter first summarizes the important findings of this study and interprets the findings in a broader context of public relations research. Next, the theoretical and practical implications of the study are provided. Finally, limitations of the study and directions for future research are discussed.

Discussion

Factor Structure of Public Relations Roles

This study identified seven roles of public relations units in South Korean companies. Originally, nine roles, which were deemed to represent an aspect of the public

relations manager role, were proposed. The factor structure of nine public relations roles was assessed along with four additional roles concerning administrative and technical activities. CFA, however, did not identify administrative and technician roles as distinct public relations roles, and the Mplus output signified linear dependency of those roles on the advocate and expert prescriber roles. Two of the nine roles proposed, i.e., disturbance handler and internal communicator roles, did not emerge as distinct roles. The items for internal communicator roles were also loaded to liaison roles, suggesting that the internal communicator role, in fact, should be seen as a special case of the liaison role, i.e., liaison role between top management and employees. The disturbance handler role also did not emerge as a distinct factor, implying that the content of the disturbance handler role may reflect a specific domain of the public relations function rather than a role itself. As a result, seven public relations roles were retained as distinct roles that occur in public relations units. The seven roles included: activist, advocate, advisor, expert prescriber, liaison, monitor, and coordinator. The seven-role model provided an acceptable level of global and internal fit.

In addition, four roles concerning the administrative and technician roles did not emerge as unique public relations roles. The results of CFA suggest that technician and administrative roles are not located in the same conceptual hierarchy with the other roles, as they showed linear dependency with other public relations roles. This finding supports the argument that task activities that do not reflect public relations purposes should not be treated the same as other public relations roles. As Bivins (1989) argued, a role should be conceptualized in light of the purposes of activities. I argued earlier that the concept of technician and administrative roles does not directly connote purposes of the role

activities for an organization's public relations, whereas role activities of other roles, such as advisor, expert prescriber, and advocate roles, manifest purposes for an organization's public relations. To any public relations practitioner (or public relations unit), producing brochures or pamphlets or editing written materials itself would not be a purpose, while it could be so for a professional graphic designer. For a public relations practitioner, the technical activities are the means to reach the end results, rather than the end results themselves. Depending on the purpose of their roles, public relations practitioners could be involved in such tasks in order to achieve the purposes of their roles. For example, if a public relations practitioner's role is to advocate for the organization, he/she may write a news release in order to advocate the organization's behaviors. Similarly, if a practitioner acts like an activist for the organization's publics, he/she still may engage in technical writing in order to inform the publics of potential risks involving the company's products and to protect consumers' rights. Similar logic applies to the administrative and planner roles. These roles would be better positioned as activities that are basic to running a public relations unit and are accompanied by enactment of any type of public relations role. In summary, the present study suggests that the concept of public relations roles should be distinguished from the task activities that are accompanied by enactment of public relations roles.

Antecedents and Outcomes of Public Relations Role Enactment

The present study revealed a strong influence of organizational characteristics and contexts on the types of public relations roles enacted by public relations units. The relationships of role enactment with antecedent variables, such as experience with organizational crisis, environmental uncertainty, and top management's philosophy were

mostly consistent with the literature. Previous experience of organizational crisis led companies' public relations units to play the roles of advocate and expert prescriber more frequently, compared to the other roles. Companies' environmental uncertainty was also likely to stimulate roles concerning boundary spanning, such as advocate, liaison, and monitor. Meanwhile, top mangement's philosophy and organizational culture had an influence across most of the public relations roles. Public relations units were more likely to play a role as activist, advisor, expert prescriber, coordinator, and monitor, when their top management exhibited an institution-oriented management philosophy and encouraged participative organizational cultures. The results suggest that, depending on organizational characteristics and contexts, different types of public relations roles would be demanded by organizations. Meanwhile, most of the organizational demographic factors, i.e., size of the company, number of public relations practitioners in the company, job rank of the top public relations manager, and company types, were not related to enactment of public relations roles.

The seven public relations roles also contributed differentially to the outcome variables, i.e., public relations units' influence in the organizational decision making process and evaluation of the performance of public relations units. Although the correlational analysis showed that all seven roles are positively associated with these criterion variables, the regression analyses showed their relative contribution: controlling for the effect of other public relations roles, enacting the advisor role had a positive effect on public relations units' influence in the decision making process, and enacting the activist and advocate role was positively related to the self-assessed value of public

relations units to companies. These findings suggest that, depending on which roles are enacted, different outcomes could be obtained.

The Relationship between Public Relations Roles and Public Relations Models

CCA revealed the critical role of public relations units in an organization's public relations practices. The results suggest that, depending on the type of public relations roles enacted, an organization's public relations model would differ. Specifically, as public relations units enact all seven public relations roles, their companies also were more likely to practice all dimensions of public relations model (i.e., two-way mixed-motive model). On the other hand, when public relations units have more focus on the advocate role while having less focus on the liaison, coordinator, and advisor roles, companies' public relations practices were more likely to be oriented toward asymmetric, one-way, and mediated communication compared with two-way, interpersonal, and ethical communication (i.e., one-way asymmetric public relations model).

In this study, only two canonical functions that captured the two-way and one-way public relations model were produced. Therefore, the difference in public relations roles between two-way mixed motive model vs. two-way asymmetry model, and between press agentry model vs. public information model could not be inferred. It might be because the companies in the sample are not diverse enough to capture such subtle difference in their public relations practices. However, from the results of regression analysis, it was possible to infer which roles would be critical in distinguishing the two-way asymmetric model from the two-way symmetric or mixed-motive model, and the press agentry model from the public information model.

The regression analysis provided information about the relative contribution of each public relations role to each public relations model dimension. Controlling for organizational characteristics, the asymmetry dimension was most strongly related to advocate role enactment, followed by the activist role. Ethical dimension was significantly related to monitor, expert prescriber, and activist roles. Liaison role enactment was the sole predictor of two-way communication, as was advocate role enactment for one-way communication. Mediated communication was negatively related to advisor role while being positively related to monitor, advocate, and expert prescriber role. Finally, enactment of the liaison and advocate roles contributed to the use of interpersonal communication.

The difference in public relations roles between the two-way symmetric model and the two-way asymmetric model seems likely to arise from activist and monitor role enactments. Although J. E. Grunig and L. A. Grunig (1996) and J. E. Grunig and White (1992) stated that the asymmetric public relations model could be either ethical or unethical, they also argued symmetric communication is inherently ethical. In fact, the data in this study suggests that symmetry dimension is highly correlated to the ethical dimension. Therefore, if a company's public relations practices are low on the symmetry dimension while high on the asymmetric dimension, the company will be rated low on the ethical dimension as well. The activist and monitor roles were positively related to the ethical dimension, thus we could expect that the asymmetric public relations model would be negatively related to the activist and monitor role enactments. The public information model and the press agentry model are also primarily distinguished by the ethical dimension: organizations practicing the public information model disseminate

factual information but, with the press agentry model, organizations try to get their publics' attention by any means. Therefore, it is expected that the difference in public relations roles between those who practice the press agentry model and those who practice the public information model would be found in the activist and monitor role enactment.

Summary

The results concerning the antecedent and outcome variables revealed the utility of the elaborated concept of public relations roles as well as suggesting the criterion validity of the constructs. This study showed that the antecedents and consequences for a particular public relations role are different, thus using the elaborated concept of public relations roles would have better exploratory and predictive power in explaining phenomena in public relations management than using the broad concept of manager role.

This study suggests that the advocate role is an important and critical public relations role. Regardless of a company's public relations model, two-way mixed motive model or one-way asymmetric model, the advocate role seemed an essential element of public relations units' activities. Enactment of the advocate role was also the strongest predictor of the value of public relations units to their companies.

On the other hand, this study suggests that the other six public relations roles also play a distinctive part in the organization's public relations process. Enacting the advocate role alone was not sufficient to practice excellent public relations, as suggested by those public relations units whose companies practicing two-way mixed-motive model actively pursued other roles, such as activist, advisor, expert prescriber, coordinator, liaison, and monitor. While the advocate roles had a positive effect on both the two-way

mixed motive model and the one-way asymmetric model, the patterns of association of activist, advisor, coordinator, liaison, and monitor roles with those public relation models were different. That is, the activist and coordinator roles positively contributed to the two-way mixed-motive model, but contributed little to the one-way asymmetric model. The liaison, advisor, and monitor roles were most often enacted in companies that practiced the two-way mixed-motive model, but were negatively related to the practice of the one-way asymmetry model. Furthermore, the activist role was an important contributor to the value of a public relations unit to companies, while the advisor role was critical for public relations units' influence in organizational decision making processes. These findings suggest that the advocate role alone is not enough and the roles, such as the activist or liaison, would have more significance to an organization's ethical and excellent public relations.

Implications

Theoretical Implications

The present study has several theoretical implications for public relations research. First, by elaborating the concepts of public relations roles, the present study is expected to facilitate public relations role research. By examining the relationships between the elaborated concept of public relations with other antecedents and outcomes, the present study showed the utility of the proposed concept of public relations roles. The role research has been dominated by the manager-technician dichotomy. The contents of manager roles have been limited to advisor role, expert prescriber, and liaison. These three roles were combined into the manager role, thus, their unique aspect in an

108

organization's public relations process has not been fully explored. Rather than drawing conclusions that playing a manager role contributes to excellence in public relations, this present study provides a foundation for sophisticated theorization of public relations roles. This study showed how organizational contexts would interact with the roles played by public relations unit and the relative contribution of each role in regard to several public relations outcome and process variables. As such, future studies will benefit by incorporating the concepts of public relations roles proposed in this study.

Second, this study conceptualized public relations roles at the work unit level rather than at the individual level, thus allowing for an exploration of the relationships between public relations roles and organization level constructs. This approach prevents potential confounding of the effects of public relations roles with the effects of practitioner characteristics, such as practitioners' job rank, public relations education, and tenure with the organization. As public relations evolves as a management function, major companies have public relations units that comprise a number of practitioners. Therefore, exploring the role of public relations units as a whole is necessary in order to understand how public relations influences an organization's management practices.

Third, this study contributes to public relations theory building by probing the relationship between public relations roles and public relations models. This study showed that the types of public relations roles enacted are different when comparing the two-way mixed-motive model and the one-way asymmetric model. While previous research argued that manager role enactment is more closely related to the two-way model than the one-way model, this study suggests that considering certain aspects of the manager role is beneficial. For example, previous studies failed to identify the differences

109

in public relations roles between the two-way symmetric model and the two-way asymmetric model (Fabiszak, 1985; McMillan, 1984; Pollack, 1986, as cited in Lauzen & Dozier, 1992), but this study suggests that roles such as activist and monitor would be critical aspects of public relations roles in differentiating the symmetric model from the asymmetric model.

Finally, the study provides insight into the evolving roles and practices of public relations in South Korea. While Kim and Hon's (1999) study reported that Korean public relations practitioners primarily play a role as a communication technician, the present study showed that public relations in South Korea is indeed evolving into a management function and as a profession with status, showing that public relations units in Korean companies are playing a role well beyond communication technician. Additionally, in contrast to Kim and Hon's report that most of Korean public relations practitioners aspire to practicing two-way (symmetrical) communication but usually practice one-way communication, this study showed that many companies, in fact, are practicing two-way symmetrical public relations practices. While many theorists (e.g., Leitch & Neilson, 2001; L'Etang, 1996) have argued that the two-way symmetric public relations model might exist as a norm, this study confirmed Grunig's arguments that public relations models are positive as well as normative (J. E. Grunig, & L. A. Grunig, 1989; L. A. Grunig et al., 2002).

Practical Implications

This study provides several practical implications for public relations practitioners and organizations. First, this study informs public relations practitioners of the types of

public relations roles their unit should perform. It is important that practitioners have a clear idea about public relations roles because professionalism greatly depends on the way practitioners view themselves and define their profession (Cameron et al., 1996; Sallot et al., 1997). By specifying public relations roles at the department level, the study will help develop public relations role description in organizations.

Second, the study also has practical implications for public relations educators and students. It has been argued that public relations education does not follow the definition of public relations as a managerial function (J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig, 1992). Public relations education focuses primarily on media relations and campaigns, with little focus on the managerial aspects of public relations. Because education has a great impact on students' aspirations for public relations roles as a management function (Berkowitz & Hristodoulakis, 1999), teaching future practitioners the normative model of public relations roles will lead to the advancement of public relations practices.

The roles identified here can serve as a framework for public relations practitioner job descriptions. In fact, public relations jobs often have been defined and segmented by publics, such as community relations, investor relations, employee relations, and consumer relations. This approach to describe public relations jobs is commonly shown in most public relations textbooks. Although identifying the domain of public relations is also important in developing job descriptions, it does not tell about the organizational roles that public relations practitioners should perform. As this study showed the unique effects of proposed public relations roles, formalizing job descriptions based on this study and educating practitioners and students in this regard brings significant changes to an organization's public relations practices.

Finally, by showing the relationships between public relations roles and various processes and outcome variables vital in an organization's public relations processes, this study can provide a guide to public relations practitioners. For example, top public relations managers could focus on activities advising top management in order to increase the influence of public relations units in organizations, because the advisor role was far more important than other types of roles. Practitioners whose companies heavily focus on one-way asymmetric public relations should attempt to enact advisor, activist, and liaison roles more frequently, in order to move their public relations units toward the normative model, symmetric or mixed-motive public relations model.

Limitations

Notwithstanding the contribution of this study to public relations scholarship and practices, there are several limitations.

Potential Cultural Influences on the Factor Models

Public relations practices could differ by nations, as could public relations roles. Practitioners in South Korea may have cognitive schema about the roles of public relations that are different from practitioners in other countries. If this is the case, the factors which did not emerged as distinct public relations roles in this study may emerge, or the factors that emerged as distinct roles in this study could be merged. Meanwhile, the roles were driven from the Western literature and applied in South Korea, thus the majority of the factors obtained in this study still could be valid. A replication of the factor model in other nations is necessary in order to assess its external validity.

The factor model of the public relations model was also somewhat different from the previous studies. In this study, the dimension of symmetry was highly correlated with ethical, two-way, and interpersonal communication, thus the two-way asymmetry public relations model was not observed. To obtain the CFA solution, the symmetry dimension had to be dropped. Because none of the previous studies in South Korea conducted CFA with public relations models, it is unclear whether this result is an artifact of the sample or the social context. Because the construct of public relations models lies at the center of public relations literature, further sophistication and replicated tests of the measurement are deemed necessary.

Limited Generalization of the Findings to Non-Profit Organizations

The study sample consisted of for-profit organizations only, thus the findings of this study may not apply to non-profit organizations such as civic groups or government agencies. For example, top administrators in government agencies may practice a more socially-oriented management philosophy than that practiced by top executives in private companies. Consequently, public relations/communication units in government agencies may play more of a liaison role, and their value to agencies might be more strongly related to enactment of the liaison role rather than the advocate role. Meanwhile, the conceptualization of all seven roles is not specific to organization type. Therefore, only the antecedents and outcomes of enactment of each role may differ depending on the type of organizations, while the factor structure may remain constant.

Low Construct Validity of Some Latent Variables

The construct validity of some latent variables in this study was relatively low. Three constructs, i.e., liaison role, ethical communication, and one-way communication,

113

showed AVE of .40, which were below the recommended level. In particular, the low construct validity of the measures was not expected for the public relations model factors, because the measurement items were primarily drawn from previous research (i.e., Huang, 2001; Yun, 2005; Rhee, 2002, L. A. Grunig et al. 2002). It seems that there is still a lot to be done to enhance the public relations model measures.

Limitations with Criterion Variables

This study explored the relationship between role enactment and several criterion variables concerning public relations processes and outcomes. These criterion variables were also measured by practitioners themselves, but it might have been better if the measures were obtained from a third person, such as the companies' chief executive officers. Specifically, the value of public relations to organizations and influence of public relations units in decision making were self-assessed, rather than assessed by top management or other organizational members. Also, the top management's philosophy was measured based on practitioners' perceptions rather than top management members themselves. Assessment of such criterion variables from multiple sources is more desirable.

In addition, none of the criterion variables captured the perspectives of publics, thus providing limited understanding about the effect of public relations roles' enactment. Public relations scholars (e.g., Simões, 1992; J. E. Grunig, 2000; Molleda & Ferguson, 2004) are increasingly calling for attention to the social roles of public relations. Public relations roles in organizations would ultimately have effects on their publics outside the organizations, and ultimately society at large. The effect of public relations roles on publics could be explored using other important criterion variables, such as organization-

public relationship or perceived reputation by primary publics. Exploring the effects of public relations roles in light of these variables that reflect publics' perspectives would help provide support for the bottom-line effects of public relations as well as help toward understanding the social roles of public relations.

Future Studies

Future public relations research will be benefited further by pursuing the following endeavors. First, public relations research will benefit from exploring the complex relationship among organizational characteristics, public relations role enactment, and outcome variables. For example, while advocate and activist roles were strong predictor of perceived value of public relations units to organizations, the relationship may depend on the management philosophy and environmental complexity. Individual practitioners' behaviors that contribute to public relations units' enactment of the public relations roles could be further explored. Exploring such moderating and mediating relationships among variables will add another level of sophistication to public relations role theories.

Second, other outcome variables are worthy of further exploration in conjunction with public relations roles. Another prominent area concerns public relations managers' leadership. Whether the public relations unit can play a particular role may depend on its leadership in the organization. For example, whether the public relations unit can function as an internal activist for their external publics or coordinator of organization's communication activities may depend on the extent to which the top public relations managers can exert leadership in their organizations. While public relations research

generally agrees that top management has the strongest effect on an organization's public relation practices, the scholarship of public relations leadership takes the opposite view. Rather than positioning public relations managers as passive subordinates to top management, leadership studies focus on the active behaviors of public relations managers (e.g., Aldoory & Toth, 2004; J. Choi & Y. Choi, 2007). By exploring the relationship between public relations roles and public relations leadership behaviors, the public relations academy would be able to provide practitioners with practical advice for their behaviors.

Furthermore, as an outcome variable of public relations role enactment, a variable from the perspective of primary publics should be explored. It is important to show how the roles of public relations make a difference in an organization's behavior and in turn contribute to the organization's reputation and performance. The roles of public relations are expected to be expressed in the organization's behaviors and ultimately affect publics' perceptions and attitudes toward the organizations. By taking into account the outcome variables from the perspective of publics, such as organization-public relationship (OPR), perceived responsibility of organizations, or perceived reputation of organizations, it would be possible to show how public relations roles influence the bottom line of the organizations.

Finally, in order to overcome the limitations of the study, replication studies with different contexts are strongly recommended. Future studies may take into account the social and cultural factors that influence the types of public relations roles and the level of role enactment. Cross-national comparison will help to build a theory that can be applied generally.

Concluding Remarks

Organizations are members of societies and they should behave as members of societies. As they have rights to pursue organizational goals, they also should take responsibility for their behaviors. Public relations *should* be deemed as a unique profession and it really *is*, because it allows an organization to become a real member of societies by developing and maintaining relationships with social constituents. While other organizational functions primarily focus on achieving organizational goals, it is the unique function of public relations to make organizations respectful members of societies. Notwithstanding the short history of public relations research, empirical evidence continues to grow that supports the view that public relations has a significant influence on organization behaviors.

This study, in line with the previous research, suggests that depending on the types of public relations roles enacted, organization behaviors differ. Public relations is defined as "the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the public on whom its success or failure depends" (Cutlip, Center, & Broom, 1994, p.2). For public relations to serve as a management function, an organization's public relations unit should be able to perform specific roles that are required for management of organizations. As organizations are members of social systems and their behaviors would likely be influenced by public relations roles, the enactment of certain public relations roles would also have significance in society at large. Because of their social implications, we should pay more attention to the roles of public relations.

한국기업 내 홍보(Public Relations) 조직의 역할에 관한 연구

연구 동의서

안녕하십니까? 저는 미시간 주립대 광고홍보학과 박사과정에 재학중인 최정화라고
합니다.
본 연구는 본인의 박사학위 과정의 일환으로, Dr. Teresa Mastin 의 지도 아래 진행되는
연구이며, The Graduate School of Michigan State University 의 지원을 받아
이루어지고 있습니다. 본 연구의 주요 목적은 국내 기업에서 홍보(혹은 커뮤니케이션)
조직의 역할을 알아보고자 하는 것으로, 귀하의 의견은 매우 소중한 자료로 사용될
것입니다.

본 조사를 위해 수집된 정보는 절대로 타인에게 누출되지 않을 것입니다. 귀하의 응답은
통계수치로만 이용될 것이며 결코 개별적으로 귀하나 귀하의 재직회사가 본인의 논문에
언급되는 일은 없을 것입니다

본 설문 조사는 귀하의 자발적인 참여에 의한 것으로, 귀하는 언제든지 어떠한 불이익
없이 참여를 중단할 수 있으며, 이전에 수집된 개인 정보에 대한 파기를 요구할 수
있습니다. 수집된 정보는 연구목적 이외에는 어떠한 용도로도 사용되지 않을 것입니다.

본 조사는 일상생활에서 겪을 수 있는 것 이상의 어떠한 위험요소도 내포하고
있지않으며, 오히려 귀하의 홍보의 역할에 대한 이해를 도울 수 있을 것입니다. 귀하가
설문지를 작성함으로써 본 연구에 자발적 참여의사를 표시한 것으로 간주되며, 본
조사는 약 30 분 정도 소요될 것입니다.

본 연구에 대한 문의사항이 있을 경우 다음 연락처로 연락해 주시길 바랍니다.
최정화 (Jounghwa Choi)
전화: (미국) 1-517-432-9959
전자메일: choijoun@msu.edu
우편주소: Department of Advertising, Public Relations, & Retailing,
579 Comm Arts & Sci, East Lansing, MI 48824

본 연구는 미시간 주립대 Institutional Review Boards(IRB)의 승인을 받은 연구이며
연구 참여자로서의 귀하의 권리에 대한 문의가 있을 경우, 다음 연락처로 연락하실 수
있습니다.
Dr. Peter Vasilenko
Michigan State University's director of Human Research Protection Programs
전화: 1-517-355-2180, 팩스: 1-517-432-4503, 전자메일: irb@msu.edu
우편주소: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824

조사에 협조해 주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다.

※ 참고: 이 설문에서 "**공중(Publics)**"이란 조직과 관계를 맺고 있는 언론, 고객, 종업원, 주주, 정부기관, 사회단체, 지역사회 등을 모두 포함하는 개념입니다.

※ 참고: 이 설문에서 "**PR**"이란 "공중관계"를 뜻하는 "Public Relations"의 축약어로 국내에서는 흔히 "홍보"로 지칭됩니다.

*************************** PART I ***************************

다음은 기업의 홍보(혹은 커뮤니케이션) 조직이 할 수 있는 활동에 대한 기술입니다. 각각의 문장을 읽고 귀사의 홍보(혹은 커뮤니케이션) 조직이 얼마만큼 각각의 활동을 하고 있는지 표시해 주십시오.

"우리 홍보(커뮤니케이션) 조직은 _____."

	거의 하지 않음	1	2	3	4	5	매우 많이 함
A1. 경영진이 회사 공중(Publics)의 견해를 들을 수 있는 기회를 만든다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A2. 다른 임직원들에게 회사 및 회사와 관련된 주요 이슈에 관한 뉴스보도를 알린다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A3. 언론이 관심 있을 만한 회사의 뉴스거리를 찾아낸다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A4. 회사의 다양한 커뮤니케이션 관련 활동에 대한 전반적인 방향을 제시한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A5. 회사의 이익을 여러 공중(Publics)에게 대변한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A6. 회사에 위협이 될 수 있는 외부의 추이(Trends)를 모니터 한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A7. 회사의 전략적 결정이 회사의 PR 측면에서 갖는 의미에 대해 경영진에게 조언한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A8. 회사의 정치적 입장에 영향을 미칠 수 있는 사회적 이슈를 모니터한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A9. 다른 부서 직원들과의 협조아래 회사의 PR 문제를 해결한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A10. 다른 임직원들에게 회사의 PR 관련 문제를 설명한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A11. 회사의 PR 관련 문제를 진단하기 위해 다른 부서의 직원들과 협력한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A12. 회사 PR 프로그램의 성공에 책임을 진다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A13. 회사 내 다른 임직원들이 작성한 홍보물의 문법이나 철자를 편집하고 수정한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A14. 회사 내에서 주요 공중(Publics)의 이익을 옹호한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A15. 회사가 공중(Publics)의 요구에 부응하기 위해 필요한 변화를 활성화시키는 데 역할 한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A16. 회사에 위협이 되는, 예기치 않은 사건들에 대한 대외적 반응을 처리한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A17. 회사의 커뮤니케이션 관련 이슈와 잠재적 문제에 대해 정기적으로 경영진에게 조언한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
A18. 회사와 관련된 외부 정보를 분석한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B1. 회사의 주요 공중(Publics)에게 우호적인 회사의 이미지를 전달한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B2. 회사이해관계자와 관련된 중요한 이슈에 대해 경영진에게 조언한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B3. 책정된 예산 내에서 홍보(커뮤니케이션)팀이 운영되도록 한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B4. PR 관련 문제를 해결하는데 있어서 회사의 전문가로서 역할 한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B5. 회사를 위해 언론과의 접촉을 유지한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B6. PR 관련 문제를 해결하기 위한 전략을 개발한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B7. 회사 PR 프로그램의 실패에 책임을 진다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B8. 경영진에게 PR 문제를 해결하기 위한 행동지침을 권고한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B9. 경영진에게 다양한 공중(Publics)의 의견을 알린다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B11. 새로이 부상하는 PR 문제를 처리하기 위해, 회사구성원들을 설득하여 회사의 관행에 있어서 변화를 지지하도록 한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
B12. 경영진의 의사결정에 촉매로서 역할 한다.		1	2	3	4	5	

(계속) 귀사의 홍보(혹은 커뮤니케이션) 조직이 얼마만큼 각각의 활동을 하고 있는지 표시해 주십시오.

"우리 홍보(커뮤니케이션) 조직은 _____."

거의 하지 않음   1   2   3   4   5   매우 많이 함

항목					
B13. 회사가 외부 이해관계자와의 갈등에서 빚어지는 이슈를 관리하는 것을 돕는다.	1	2	3	4	5
B14. 회사에 영향을 미치는 위기상황을 다루는데 있어서 전문가로서 역할을 한다.	1	2	3	4	5
B15. 회사의 중요한 이슈에 대해 정보를 제공하는 홍보물을 작성한다.	1	2	3	4	5
B16. 더 이상 적절하지 않은 회사의 PR 관행에 대해 도전한다.	1	2	3	4	5
B17. 회사의 주요 결정에 대한 주요 공중(Publics)의 반응을 회사 경영진에게 알린다.	1	2	3	4	5
B18. 보도자료를 낸다.	1	2	3	4	5
B19. 경영진에게 홍보(커뮤니케이션) 조직 운영에 관해 정기적으로 보고한다.	1	2	3	4	5
B20. 주요 이슈로부터의 위협에 대해 회사가 어떻게 대응해야 할지 권고한다.	1	2	3	4	5
B21. 홍보(커뮤니케이션)조직의 자원과 업무부담을 운영/조절한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C1. 다른 임직원들에게 회사내의 새로운 소식(예: 새로운 사업결정, 정책변화를 알린다.	1	2	3	4	5
C2. 공중(Publics)에게 부정적인 영향을 끼칠 수 있는 회사의 관행에 도전한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C3. 회사 내 커뮤니케이션의 문제점을 진단한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C4. 회사의 커뮤니케이션 관련 정책을 결정한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C5. PR 프로그램을 개발하고 계획한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C6. 브로셔, 팜플렛, 및 다른 출판물을 제작한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C7. 회사의 경제적 혹은 사회적 관점을 공중(Publics)에게 대변한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C8. 회사의 전략에 영향을 미칠 수 있는, 주요 공중(Publics)에게 일어나는 변화를 감시한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C9. 주요 공중(Publics)이 회사에 대해 갖는 기대에 대해 경영진에게 알린다.	1	2	3	4	5
C10. 회사와 다양한 공중(Publics) 사이의 커뮤니케이션 문제를 진단한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C11. 회사 내 다른 부서와 협력하여 회사의 커뮤니케이션 관련 활동을 운영한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C12. 회사임직원들간 커뮤니케이션을 돕기 위한 프로그램과 커뮤니케이션 채널을 제공한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C13. 회사의 입장에 대한 공중(Publics)의 이해를 증진시킨다.	1	2	3	4	5
C14. 회사 내 다른 관리자들이 PR 관련 문제를 해결하거나 피하는 데 필요한 기술을 향상시킬 수 있도록 돕는다.	1	2	3	4	5
C15. 경영진과 직원들간의 커뮤니케이션을 촉진시킨다.	1	2	3	4	5
C16. 다양한 이슈에 대한 회사의 반응을 관리한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C17. 회사 내 여러 부서의 다양한 커뮤니케이션 활동이 일관성 있게 운영되도록 조율한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C18. PR 관련 자료를 생산하는 기술적 측면을 담당한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C19. 홍보(커뮤니케이션)조직의 기본적이고 세부적인 목표(즉 Goals 과 Objectives)를 개발한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C20. 회사가 목표를 달성하는데 방해가 될 수 있는 환경적 제약요건들을 감시한다.	1	2	3	4	5
C21. 홍보(커뮤니케이션) 조직의 목표대비 성과를 모니터한다.	1	2	3	4	5

다음은 귀사의 홍보활동 전반에 대한 질문입니다.
각각의 문장이 귀사의 PR활동을 얼마나 정확히 묘사하고 있는지 응답해 주십시오.

전혀 동의하지 않음 1 2 3 4 5 매우 동의함					
D1. 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)의 의견을 고려하여 회사의 정책을 바꾸려고 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
D2. 마지막 결정을 내리기 전에, 우리 회사는 회사의 결정 및 정책에 영향을 받을 수 있는 그룹이나 개인들의 의견을 구한다.	1	2	3	4	5
D3. 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)의 의견을 구한다.	1	2	3	4	5
D4. 공중(Publics)에 대한 정보를 얻는 것은 우리 회사의 주요 PR 활동 중 하나이다.	1	2	3	4	5
D5. PR 활동의 성공을 평가하는데 있어서 우리 회사는 결과뿐만 아니라 수단 또한 고려한다.	1	2	3	4	5
D6. 우리회사 PR 활동의 목적은 회사경영진과 공중(Publics)간의 상호이해를 증진시키는 것이다.	1	2	3	4	5
D7. 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)이 여러 쟁점사안에 대해 어떻게 느끼는지 이해하기 위해 조사를 한다.	1	2	3	4	5
D8. 우리 회사는 회사에 대한 공중(Publics)의 태도를 바꾸기 위해 PR활동을 한다	1	2	3	4	5
D9. 우리 회사에서 PR은 기본적으로 언론홍보를 의미한다.	1	2	3	4	5
D10. 우리 회사에서 PR의 목적은 회사를 널리 알리는 것이다.	1	2	3	4	5
D11. 우리 회사는 텔레비전, 라디오 방송, 신문 혹은 잡지 등 매체를 이용한다.	1	2	3	4	5
D12. 우리 회사가 제공하는 정보는 사실에 근거한다.	1	2	3	4	5
D13. 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)으로부터 경영진으로의 커뮤니케이션을 장려한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E1. 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)과 비공식적인 접촉을 한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E2. 우리회사는 공중(Publics)의 행동뿐만 아니라 우리 자신의 행동 또한 바꾸고자 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E3. 우리 회사 PR 활동의 목적은 공중(Publics)이 우리 회사를 보다 우호적으로 보게끔 돕는데 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
E4. 우리 회사의 주요 PR활동은 회사에 대한 정보를 내보내는 것이다.	1	2	3	4	5
E5. 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)이 우리 회사에 대해 어떻게 느끼는지 이해하기 위해 조사를 실시한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E6. 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)의 태도뿐만 아니라 우리 자신의 태도 또한 바꾸고자 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E7. 우리 회사는 전단지, 팜플렛, 잡지 혹은 기타 회사를 소개하는 인쇄물을 배포한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E8. PR 활동에 있어서 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)과 직접 만나서 대화한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E9. 우리 회사는 공중(Publics)이 회사의 입장에 동의하도록 하기 위해 PR 프로그램을 실행한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E10. PR 활동에 있어서 우리 회사는 회사에게 유리하든 불리하든지에 상관없이 정확한 정보를 내보낸다.	1	2	3	4	5
E11. 우리 회사는 회사에 대한 공중(Publics)의 행동을 바꾸기 위해 홍보활동을 한다.	1	2	3	4	5
E12. 우리 회사는 회사의 PR 활동이 가져올 수 있는 부정적 결과에 대해 검토한다.	1	2	3	4	5

(계속) 각각의 문장이 귀사의 PR 활동을 얼마나 정확히 묘사하고 있는지 응답해 주십시오.

	전혀 동의하지 않음	1	2	3	4	5	매우 동의함
F1. 우리 회사의 PR 프로그램은 대체로 회사로부터 공중(Publics)으로 가는 일방향 커뮤니케이션이 중심이다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F2. 우리 회사는 보도자료를 배포한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F3. 우리 회사에서 PR의 성공은 언론보도의 양에 의해 결정된다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F4. 우리 회사는 커뮤니케이션 프로그램을 시행할 때 우리의 목적을 공개한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F5. 우리 회사는 정보와 뉴스 브리핑을 제공한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F6. 우리는 PR 프로그램을 진행한 후 평가 조사를 실시한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F7. 우리 회사는 면대면(face-to-face) 커뮤니케이션을 이용한다		1	2	3	4	5	
F8. 우리 회사의 PR 활동은 경영진과 공중(Publics)이 갈등을 타협하는 것을 돕는 매개를 제공한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F9. 우리 회사 PR 프로그램의 목적은 공중(Publics)이 회사에 대해 우호적으로 행동하도록 설득하는 것이다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F10. 우리 회사에서 홍보(커뮤니케이션) 조직은 경영진과 공중(Publics)간의 중개자라기 보다는 정보제공자로서 기능한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F11. 우리 회사는 PR 활동의 일환으로 향응 혹은 선물을 제공한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
F12. 우리 회사 PR 활동의 대부분은 공중(Publics)에게 정보를 제공하는 일이다.		1	2	3	4	5	

**************************** PART III ****************************

※ 다음 질문은 귀사의 홍보 (혹은 커뮤니케이션) 조직이 귀사 내에서 얼마만큼 영향력이 있는가에 대한 것입니다. 다음 척도를 이용해 숫자를 빈칸에 기입해 주세요.

1	2	3	4	5
매우 적음	약간 적음	보통	약간 많음	매우 많음

1) 귀사 내 다른 부서(혹은 팀)과 비교 했을 때 귀사 홍보조직의 영향력은 어느 정도 입니까? _____

2) 새로운 절차의 도입에 관한 의사결정에 있어서 귀사 홍보조직의 영향력은 어느 정도 입니까? _____

3) 회사의 전략적 방향에 관한 의사결정에 있어서 귀사 홍보조직의 영향력은 어느 정도 입니까? _____

4) 새로운 정책의 도입에 있어서 귀사 홍보조직의 영향력은 어느 정도 입니까? _____

5) 고객 서비스 및 지원의 기획에 있어서 귀사 홍보조직의 영향력은 어느 정도 입니까? _____

6) 다음 문장에 대해 대답해 주십시오.

	전혀 동의하지 않음	1	2	3	4	5	매우 동의함
우리 회사 고위 경영진은 의사결정시 홍보부서의 의견을 구한다.		1	2	3	4	5	
우리 회사 홍보조직의 리더(팀장, 본부장 등)는 회사의 고위 경영진에 속한다.		1	2	3	4	5	

※ 다음 질문은 귀사의 홍보 (혹은 커뮤니케이션) 조직에 대한 평가에 관한 것입니다.

1) 최근 3 년 동안, 귀하의 홍보부서는 얼마만큼 목표를 달성했다고 생각하십니까? (초과달성 시 구체적 숫자기입)

0······10······20······30······40······50······60······70······80······90······100%······초과달성_____%

2) 다음 척도를 사용하여 답하여 주십시오

1	2	3	4	5
평균보다 매우 낮음	평균보다 약간 낮음	평균 정도	평균보다 약간 높음	평균보다 매우 높음

　　2-1) 동종업계 다른 회사의 홍보부서와 비교했을 때, 귀사 홍보부서의 전반적 실적은 어떻다고
　　　　생각하십니까? _____

　　2-2) 귀사의 다른 부서와 비교했을 때, 귀사에게 홍보부서의 가치는 어느 정도라고 생각하십니까?
　　　　_____

3) 홍보부서의 예산을 기준으로, 귀사에게 홍보부서의 가치는 어느 정도라고 생각하십니까? _____

1	2	3	4	5
예산보다 매우 낮음	예산보다 약간 낮음	예산 정도	예산보다 약간 높음	예산보다 매우 높음

**× 다음 질문은 귀사의 최고경영진이 귀사의 홍보 (혹은 커뮤니케이션) 조직을 얼마만큼 지원하고 있는지에
　 대한 것입니다. 다음 척도를 이용해 숫자를 빈칸에 기입해 주세요.**

1	2	3	4	5
평균보다 매우 적게	평균보다 약간 적게	평균 정도	평균보다 약간 많이	평균보다 매우 많이

1) 귀사 내 다른 부서(혹은 팀)들과 비교 했을 때, 귀사 최고경영진의 홍보조직에 대한 지원 정도는 어느
　 정도라고 생각하십니까? _____

2) 동종업계 다른 회사와 비교 했을 때, 귀사 최고경영진의 홍보조직에 대한 지원 정도는 어느 정도라고
　 생각하십니까? _____

**× 다음은 귀하가 귀사의 환경에 대해 어떻게 인식하고 있는지에 대한 질문입니다.
　 각각의 질문에 대해 귀하가 인식하는 귀사의 환경을 표시해 주십시오.**

	1	2	3	4	5	
우리 회사는 천천히 변하는 규제환경에 처해있다.	1	2	3	4	5	우리 회사는 급속히 변하는 규제환경에 처해있다.
우리 회사에 대한 사회적 요구는 거의 변하지 않는다.	1	2	3	4	5	우리 회사에 대한 사회적 요구는 자주 변한다.
우리 회사에 대해 사회적 우려를 표시하는 단체들은 항상 거의 비슷하다.	1	2	3	4	5	우리 회사에 대해 사회적 우려를 표시하는 단체들은 자주 바뀐다.
우리 회사가 처한 규제 정도는 약하다.	1	2	3	4	5	우리 회사가 처한 규제 정도는 강하다.
우리가 상대하는 규제기관은 얼마되지 않는다.	1	2	3	4	5	우리는 매우 많은 규제기관을 상대한다.
우리 회사의 운영을 둘러싼 사회적 이해관계는 참여하지 않는다.	1	2	3	4	5	우리 회사의 운영을 둘러싼 사회적 이해관계는 참여한다.
우리가 상대하는 사회이익단체는 얼마되지 않는다.	1	2	3	4	5	우리는 많은 사회이익단체를 상대한다.

※ 다음은 귀사의 최고경영진에 대한 귀하의 인식에 관한 것입니다. 각각의 문장에 대해 귀하가 얼마나 동의하는지 표시해 주십시오.

"우리회사 최고 경영진은 _____."

전혀 동의하지 않음 1 2 3 4 5 매우 동의함					
사회가 사기업에 대해 어떠한 요구를 할 권리가 있다고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
기업이 사회 변화에 부응해야 할 의무가 있다고 생각한다.	1	2	3	4	5
사회적 기대에 부응해 기업의 정책과 관행을 조절하기 위해 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
기업의 일상적 운영에 사회적 책임을 끌어 들이기 위해 노력한다.	1	2	3	4	5
사회적 책임을 기업 의사결정의 한 부분으로 통합시킨다.	1	2	3	4	5
사업목표를 세우듯이 기업의 사회적 목표도 세운다.	1	2	3	4	5

※ 각각의 문장이 얼마만큼 귀사를 정확히 묘사하고 있는지 표시해 주십시오.

매우 부정확한 묘사 1 2 3 4 5 매우 정확한 묘사					
대부분의 우리회사 직원들은 직원 대부분이 성취하기 위해 노력할 만한 가치가 있다고 생각하는 회사의 사명에 대한 공감대를 가지고 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
우리회사에서 대부분의 결정은 그 결정에 영향을 받을 수 있는 사람들간의 토론을 거쳐서 결정된다.	1	2	3	4	5
우리회사의 경영진은 다른 직원들에 대해 깊이 배려한다.	1	2	3	4	5
우리 회사의 경영진은 낮은 직급의 직원들과 책임과 권한을 나누는 것이 좋다고 믿는다.	1	2	3	4	5

***************************** **PART IV** *****************************

※ 다음 문항에 대답해 주십시오.

1. 성별: ☐ (0) 여성　☐ (1) 남성

2. 나이: _____세

3. 응답자 직급: ☐ (1) 사원　☐ (2) 대리　☐ (3) 과장　☐ (4) 차장　☐ (5) 부장
　　　　　　　☐ (6) 임원급　☐ (7) 부사장
　　　　　　　☐ (7) 기타 (적어주세요) _____

4. 응답자 직책명: _____
　　　　　　　(예: 홍보팀장, 홍보팀원, 기업홍보부장, 기업커뮤니케이션 부서장 등)

5. 귀하 자신이 귀사 홍보(커뮤니케이션)조직의 리더(즉 팀장이나 본부장)가 아닐 경우 다음 질문에 대답해 주십시오.

　　5-1. 귀사 홍보조직 리더의 직책명은 무엇입니까? _____

　　5-2. 귀사 홍보조직 리더의 직급은 무엇입니까?
　　　　☐ (1) 사원　☐ (2) 대리　☐ (3) 과장　☐ (4) 차장　☐ (5) 부장　☐ (6) 임원급　☐ (6) 부사장
　　　　☐ (7) 기타 (적어주세요) _____

6. 귀하의 홍보관련 업무 경력: _____년 _____개월

7. 귀하의 현 회사에서 재직기간: _____년 _____개월

8. 현재 귀하의 업무분장 (해당사항 모두 표시):

☐ (1) 홍보업무 총괄 ☐ (2) 언론홍보 ☐ (3) 사내커뮤니케이션 ☐ (4) 투자자 관계(IR)
☐ (5) 사회공헌활동 ☐ (6) 기타 (적어주세요) _____

9. 최종학력

☐ (1) 고등학교 졸업 혹은 그 이하
☐ (2) 전문대 졸업
☐ (3) 4년제 학사학위
☐ (4) 석사학위
☐ (5) 석사학위 이수 중
☐ (6) 박사학위
☐ (7) 박사학위 이수 중

10. 홍보관련 교육: 해당 사항에 모두 표시해 주십시오.

☐ (1) 커뮤니케이션 관련 학부 수업을 들은 적이 있음
☐ (2) 홍보관련 학부 수업을 들은 적이 있음
☐ (3) 학부에서 커뮤니케이션 관련 분야를 전공했음
☐ (4) 학부에서 홍보를 전공했음
☐ (5) 대학원에서 홍보관련 수업을 들은 적이 있음
☐ (6) 대학원에서 홍보를 전공했음
☐ (7) 각종 협회/학회/사교육기관에서 주최하는 홍보세미나 혹은 교육을 수강한 적 있음

11. 귀하는 현재 국내외 홍보관련 단체의 회원이십니까?

☐ (0) 아니오   ☐ (1) 예: 단체 이름을 적어주세요. _____

12. 귀하는 한국 PR 협회 혹은 미국 PR 협회에서 인증받은 PR 전문가입니까?
☐ (1) 예: 한국 PR 협회에서 인증 (KAPR)
☐ (2) 예: 미국 PR 협회에서 인증 (APR)
☐ (3) 아니오, 그러나 향후 인증을 위한 자격시험을 받을 계획이 있음
☐ (3) 아니오, 아직 향후 인증을 위한 자격시험을 받을 계획이 없음

13. 귀사의 정규직 직원의 숫자: _____

14. 귀사의 홍보(커뮤니케이션) 조직의 직원 숫자 (본인포함): _____

15. 귀사의 홍보(커뮤니케이션) 조직의 2007년도 예산: _____

16. 귀사는 최근 3년 이내에 기업이미지 및 신뢰도에 부정적인 영향을 끼친 위기상황을 경험한 적이 있습니까?

☐ (1) 아니오   ☐ (1) 예: (있다면 횟수를 적어주세요) _____ 번

17. 귀사는 최근 1년이내에 부정적인 언론보도를 경험한 적이 있습니까?

☐ (0) 아니오   ☐ (1) 예: (있다면 횟수를 적어주세요) _____ 번

18. 다음 분류 중 귀사에 해당하는 사항을 표시해 주십시오.   ☐ (1) 공기업   ☐ (2) 외국계기업

19. 귀사의 사업영역은 무엇입니까? _____

설문에 응해주셔서 대단히 감사합니다

APPENDIX B: Questionnaire in English

The Roles of Public Relations

Informed Consent Form

You are asked to participate in a doctoral dissertation research by Jounghwa Choi, under the guidance of Dr. Teresa Mastin at Department of Advertising, Public Relations and Retailing at Michigan State University. The goal of the research is to identify public relations roles in organization. Your opinion is very important to the present study.

Your participation is voluntary and you do not have to answer any of the questions. You are free to withdraw your participation in the research at any time. If you do not volunteer or if your participation is ended for any reason, you will not be penalized in anyway. Your identity will be kept confidential and your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.

There is no more risk involved in participating in this study than you would encounter in everyday life, and this study might benefit you by providing better understanding of the dimensions of public relations roles. **You consent to participate in this study by completing the survey.** The survey will take approximately 30 minutes.

If you have questions about the study, please contact Dr. Teresa Mastin at (517) 432-8377 or mastinte@msu.edu, 576 Comm Arts & Sci, East Lansing, MI 48824; Jounghwa Choi at phone: (517) 432-9959, email: choijoun@msu.edu, 579 Comm Arts & Sci, East Lansing, MI 48824. In case you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please feel free to contact Dr. Peter Vasilenko, Michigan State University's director of Human Research Protection Programs, by phone: (517) 355-2180, fax: (517) 432-4503, email: irb@msu.edu, or regular mail: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.

Thank you for your participation!

※ In this survey, **"Publics"** may include the media, clients, customers, employees, stakeholders, regulatory agencies, civic groups, and local communities, who have relationship with an organization.

※ In this survey, **"PR"** indicates "Public Relations," which is commonly referred to as "Hong-Bo."

***************************** **PART I** *****************************

DIRECTION: The following statements describe the activities that a public relations department may engage in. Please indicate the extent to which your public relation (communication) department engages in each of the following activities.

"Our public relations(communication) unit _____."

	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	To a great extent
A1. Create opportunities for management to hear the views of the company's publics.		1	2	3	4	5	
A2. Keep others in the organization informed of what the media report about our organization and important issues related to the company		1	2	3	4	5	
A3. Figure out what the media will consider newsworthy about the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A4. Provide an overall direction concerning diverse communication-related activities of the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A5. Speak for corporate interests to multiple publics.		1	2	3	4	5	
A6. Monitor external trends that might affect the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A7. Advise the management on the PR/communication implications of any strategic decisions of the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A8. Track social issues that may affect the company's political situation.		1	2	3	4	5	
A9. Resolve organization's public relations problems in coordination with members in other work groups in the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A10. Explain public relations problems to others in the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A11. Collaborate with members in other work groups to diagnose public relations problems.		1	2	3	4	5	
A12. Take responsibility for the success of the company's public relations programs.		1	2	3	4	5	
A13. Edit and/or rewrite for grammatical and spelling errors of the materials written by others in the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A14. Advocate for the best interests of key publics within the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A15. Play a role in activating changes in the company in response to publics' demands.		1	2	3	4	5	
A16. Is responsible for dealing with any unexpected events that threaten the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A17. Advise the management on a regular basis about relevant communication issues and challenges of the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
A18. Analyze external intelligence relevant to the company.		1	2	3	4	5	

(Continued) Please indicate the extent to which your public relation (communication) department engages in each of the following activities.

"Our public relations (communication) unit _____."

	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	To a great extent

	1	2	3	4	5
B1. Deliver a favorable image of the company to the key publics.	1	2	3	4	5
B2. Advise the management on a variety of important stakeholder issues.	1	2	3	4	5
B3. Ensure that the PR/Communication division/team operates within the agreed budgets.	1	2	3	4	5
B4. Play a role as the company's expert in solving public relations problems.	1	2	3	4	5
B5. Maintain media contacts for the company.	1	2	3	4	5
B6. Develop strategies to solve PR problems.	1	2	3	4	5
B7. Take responsibility for the failure of the company's public relations programs.	1	2	3	4	5
B8. Recommend top management courses of action for solving public relations problems.	1	2	3	4	5
B9. Keep the management informed of the opinions of various publics.	1	2	3	4	5
B11. Persuade organization members to support a change in company's practices in order to deal with an emerging public relations problem.	1	2	3	4	5
B12. Operate as a catalyst in management's decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
B13. Help the company to manage issues arising from conflicts with external stakeholder groups.	1	2	3	4	5
B14. Play a role as an expert in dealing with crises affecting the company.	1	2	3	4	5
B15. Writes public relations materials presenting information on issues important to the company.	1	2	3	4	5
B16. Challenge the company's practices in public relations that are no longer appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
B17. Keep management informed of key publics' reaction to the company's decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
B18. Be responsible for placing news release.	1	2	3	4	5
B19. Regularly reports about the operation of PR/Communication division/team to senior management.	1	2	3	4	5
B20. Recommend how the company should respond to the threat from major issues.	1	2	3	4	5
B21. Manage resources and workloads for the PR/Communication division/team.	1	2	3	4	5

(Continued) Please indicate the extent to which your public relation (communication) department engages in each of the following activities.

"Our public relations (communication) unit _____."

	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	To a great extent
C1. Inform organization members of new developments (e.g., new business decisions, changes in policies) within the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
C2. Challenge the company's practices that could adversely affect publics.		1	2	3	4	5	
C3. Diagnose problems with internal communication.		1	2	3	4	5	
C4. Make the communication policy decisions of the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
C5. Develop and plan public relations programs.		1	2	3	4	5	
C6. Produce brochures, pamphlets, and other publications.		1	2	3	4	5	
C7. Represent the company's economic or social perspectives to the publics.		1	2	3	4	5	
C8. Track changes in key publics that may affect the company's strategies.		1	2	3	4	5	
C9. Keep top management informed of key publics' expectations.		1	2	3	4	5	
C10. Diagnose communication problems between the organization and various publics.		1	2	3	4	5	
C11. Coordinate communication-related activities with other work groups within the company.		1	2	3	4	5	
C12. Provide communication channels and programs that help communication among organization members.		1	2	3	4	5	
C13. Promote publics' understanding about the company's position.		1	2	3	4	5	
C14. Help other managers to increase their skills in solving and/or avoiding public relations problems		1	2	3	4	5	
C15. Facilitate communication between top management and employees.		1	2	3	4	5	
C16. Manage the company's responses to a range of issues.		1	2	3	4	5	
C17. Coordinate a variety of communication-related activities by other work groups for consistency.		1	2	3	4	5	
C18. Handle the technical aspects of producing public relations materials.		1	2	3	4	5	
C19. Develop goals and objectives for the PR/Communication division/team.		1	2	3	4	5	
C20. Monitor constraints in the company's environment that may stand in the way of achieving the company's objectives.		1	2	3	4	5	
C21. Monitor performance of the PR/Communication division/team against targets.		1	2	3	4	5	

DIRECTION: Please indicate the extent to which each of the following statements accurately describes your company's public relations practices.

	Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree					
D1. We try to change our company's policies considering the opinions of the public.	1	2	3	4	5	
D2. Before making final decisions, we seek the opinions of those groups or individuals who will be affected by the decisions or policies.	1	2	3	4	5	
D3. We listen to the opinions of the publics..	1	2	3	4	5	
D4. Obtaining information about publics is one of the primary activities of our public relations.	1	2	3	4	5	
D5. We define success of public relations not just by results but also the way that they are obtained.	1	2	3	4	5	
D6. In my company, the purpose of public relations is to promote mutual understanding between the management of the company and its publics.	1	2	3	4	5	
D7. We conduct research to understand how the publics feel about certain issues.	1	2	3	4	5	
D8. We do public relations in order to change the attitudes of publics.	1	2	3	4	5	
D9. In my company, public relations and publicity mean essentially the same thing.	1	2	3	4	5	
D10. The purpose of our public relations is quite simply to getting publicity for the company.	1	2	3	4	5	
D11. We use mass media, such as television and radio broadcasts, newspapers, or magazines.	1	2	3	4	5	
D12. The information we provide is factual.	1	2	3	4	5	
D13. We promote communication from the publics to the management.	1	2	3	4	5	
E1. We make informal contact with the public.	1	2	3	4	5	
E2. We not only try to change the behaviors of members of the public, but also try to change our behaviors.	1	2	3	4	5	
E3. The purpose of our public relations is to help the public to see our company more favorably.	1	2	3	4	5	
E4. The primary activity of our public relations is to disseminate information about the company.	1	2	3	4	5	
E5. We conduct research to understand how the publics think about our company.	1	2	3	4	5	
E6. We not only try to change the attitudes of members of the public, but also try to change our attitudes.	1	2	3	4	5	
E7. We distribute flyers, pamphlets, magazines, or other printed materials that represent the company.	1	2	3	4	5	
E8. We communicate in person with the public.	1	2	3	4	5	
E9. We do public relations programs to persuade publics to agree with the company's point of view.	1	2	3	4	5	

(Continued) Please indicate the extent to which each of the following statements accurately describes your company's public relations practices.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree		
E10. In our public relations activities, we disseminate accurate information, regardless of whether it is favorable or not.	1 2 3 4 5
E11. We do public relations in order to change the behaviors of publics.	1 2 3 4 5
E12. We examine any possibility of negative consequences of the company's public relations activities.	1 2 3 4 5
F1. Public relations programs in my company involve one-way communication from the company to the publics.	1 2 3 4 5
F2. We distribute news releases.	1 2 3 4 5
F3. The success of our public relations is determined by the amount of publicity.	1 2 3 4 5
F4. We disclose our purpose when conducting communication programs.	1 2 3 4 5
F5. We offer information and news briefing.	1 2 3 4 5
F6. We conduct evaluative research after conducting public relations or communication activities.	1 2 3 4 5
F7. We use face-to-face communication.	1 2 3 4 5
F8. In my company, public relations provide mediation to help the management and the public negotiate conflict.	1 2 3 4 5
F9. We do public relations programs to persuade publics to behave to be friendly to our company.	1 2 3 4 5
F10. The public relations department functions as more of a disseminator of information than a mediator between management and publics.	1 2 3 4 5
F11. We offer party favors or memorabilia.	1 2 3 4 5
F12. Our company's public relations activities primarily focus on disseminating information.	1 2 3 4 5

******************************* PART III *******************************

✕ Following Questions ask how much influence your public relations units have influence in your organization. Please answer the questions using the scale below.

1...............2.................3.................4....................5				
Very little	A little	Moderate	To some extent	To a great extent

1) In general, how much influence would you say your PR function has had in your company's decision making over the past three years? _____

2) In general, how much influence would you say your PR function has influence on the company's decision making concerning the following issues?
   2-1) Adoption of new organizational procedures. _____%.
   2-2) Strategic direction of the company. _____%
   2-3) Adoption of new policies. _____%
   2-4) Design of customer services or support. _____%

3) Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement.

When making decisions, senior management seek for input from the public relation unit.	1	2	3	4	5
The head of our public relations unit is a part of senior management in my company.	1	2	3	4	5

DIRECTION: Please answer each of the following questions.

1) In the past 3 years, to what extent do you feel your public relations/communication department has achieved its objectives?

<div align="center">0.....10.....20.....30.....40.....50.....60.....70.....80.....90.....100%</div>

2) Answer using the following scale.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Much poorer than average	Somewhat poorer than average	About average	Somewhat greater than average	Much greater than average

2-1) The overall performance of our public relations/communication department is _____ when compared to the ones in other firms in our industry.

2-2) The value of our public relations/communication department has in comparison with a typical other departments in my organization is _____.

3) Estimate the value of your public relations/communication department to your company as a percentage of the department's budget.

0........25.........50.........75.......100......150.........200............_____?

| No value At all | Half the budget | Equal to the cost department | Twice the budget | As high as you want to go |

Please indicate the extent to which you believe your top management supports the public relations or communication function in your company.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Much less than average	Somewhat less than average	About average	Somewhat greater than average	Much greater than average

1) When compared to the other departments in my company, the level of support to our PR function by top management is _____.

2) When compared to the PR function in other firms in our industry, the level of support to our PR function by top management is _____.

DIRECTION: Please indicate how you perceive the environment of your organization.

We face a slowly changing regulatory environment	1	2	3	4	5	We face a rapidly changing regulatory environment.
Social demands on our firm rarely change	1	2	3	4	5	Social demands on our firm change frequently.
The groups representing social concerns to us are the same over time	1	2	3	4	5	The groups we deal with on social concerns change frequently.
We face a low level of regulation	1	2	3	4	5	We face a high level of regulation.
We deal with few regulatory agencies	1	2	3	4	5	We deal with many regulatory agencies.
We face low levels of social interest in our operation	1	2	3	4	5	We face high levels of social interest in our operations.
We deal with few social advocacy groups	1	2	3	4	5	We deal with many social advocacy groups.

DIRECTION: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly Agree |

Our top management thinks that society has the right to make certain demands from a private corporation.	1	2	3	4	5
Our top management thinks that a corporation has a responsibility to respond to social change.	1	2	3	4	5
Our top management thinks that a corporation has a duty to adapt its policies and practices in response to social expectation.	1	2	3	4	5
Our top management thinks that corporations should bring social responsibility into their day-to-day operations.	1	2	3	4	5
Our top management thinks that corporations should make social responsibility a part of business decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
Our top management thinks that corporations must set social goals just as they set business goals.	1	2	3	4	5

DIRECTION: Please indicate the extent to which following statements describe your company.

| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly Agree |

Most employees in my company share a common sense of the company's mission that most think is worth striving to achieve.	1	2	3	4	5
Most decisions in my company are made after discussion between all people who will be affected in a major way.	1	2	3	4	5
Senior managers in this organization care deeply about other employees.	1	2	3	4	5
Senior managers here believe in the sharing of power and responsibility with lower-level employees.	1	2	3	4	5

*************************** **PART IV** ***************************

※ Please answer to each of following questions.

1. Gender: ☐ (0)Female   ☐ (1) Male
2. Age: _____
3. Job Rank: ☐ (1) Staffs   ☐ (2) Assistant Manager   ☐ (3) Associate Manager
   ☐ (4) Senior Manager ☐ (5) Director ☐ (6) Executives ☐ (6) Vice President
   ☐ (7) Others (Please specify) _____
4. Job Title: _____
5. If you are not the leader of your public relations or communication unit, please answer to the questions below:

   5-1) What is the title of the leader of your public relations or communication unit?
   _____

   5-2) What is the job rank of the leader of your public relations or communication unit?
   ☐ (1) Staffs   ☐ (2) Assistant Manager   ☐ (3) Associate Manager
   ☐ (4) Senior Manager ☐ (5) Director ☐ (6) Executives ☐ (6) Vice President
   ☐ (7) Others (Please specify) _____

6. Years of tenure in the company: _____ Year _____ Months

7. Work experience in PR   _____ Year _____ Months

8. What is your current responsibility? Please check all that apply.

   ☐ (1) Oversee all PR activities   ☐ (2) Media Relations
   ☐ (3) Internal Communication   ☐ (4) Investor Relations
   ☐ (5) Social Responsibility   ☐ (6) Others (Please specify) _____

9. Education ☐ (1) High school graduate or below
   ☐ (2) Junior/community college graduate
   ☐ (3) Bachelor's degree
   ☐ (4) Master's degree
   ☐ (5) Enrolled for the master's degree
   ☐ (5) Ph.D.
   ☐ (6) Enrolled for the Ph.D. degree

*Please check all that apply to you.

10. Education in PR   ☐ (1) Have taken a communication course in undergraduate
   ☐ (2) Have taken a PR course in undergraduate
   ☐ (3) BA in Communication related field
   ☐ (4) BA in Public Relations
   ☐ (5) Have taken a PR course in the graduate school
   ☐ (6) Majored in Public Relations in the graduate school
   ☐ (7) Have taken public relations related courses or participated in
      seminars provided by industry associations or private
      educational institution.

11 Are you a member of any professional public relations associations?

☐ No   ☐ Yes

If yes, which association are you affiliated with? _____

12. Are you an accredited as an APR or KAPR?
  ☐ Yes, Accredited as KAPR
  ☐ Yes, Accredited as APR
  ☐ No, but plan to apply for accreditation
  ☐ No, and do not have a plan to apply for accreditation

13. Numbers of full time employees in your company: _____

14. The numbers PR practitioners in your company including yourself: _____

15. The 2007 budget of public relations (communication) unit: _____

16. Have your organization gone through a crisis within the past three years?

☐ No   ☐ Yes: if yes, how many times? _____

17. Have your organization gone through a negative publicity situation in the past year?

☐ No   ☐ Yes: if yes, how many times? _____

18. What is your organization's business area?

☐ Public   ☐ Foreign affiliated private

19. What is the business area of your company? _____

Thank you so much for your participation!

REFERENCES

Acharya, L. (1983). *Practitioner representations of environmental uncertainty: An application of discriminant analysis*. Paper presented at the Public Relations Division, Associate for Education in Journalism.

Aldoory, L., & Toth, E. L. (2004). Leadership and Gender in Public Relations: Perceived Effectiveness of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 16*(2), 157-183.

Aldrich, H., & Herker, D. (1977). Boundary spanning roles and organization structure. *Academy of Management Review, 2*, 217-230.

Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*(4), 634-665.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411-423.

Ansoff, I. (1979). The changing shape of the strategic problem. In D. Schendel & C. Hofer (Eds.), *Strategic management: A new view of business policy and planning* (pp. 30-44). Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J. A., & Drasgow, F. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: the construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(3), 249-269.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. . *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*(1), 74-94.

Berger, B. K. (2005). Power over, power with, and power to relations: Critical reflections on public relations, the dominant coalition, and activism. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*(1), 5-28.

Berger, B. K., & Reber, B. H. (2006). Gaining influence in public relations: The role of resistance in practice. In. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berkowitz, D., & Hristodoulakis, I. (1999). Practitioner Roles, Public Relations Education, and Professional Socialization: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 11*(1), 91-103.

Bivins, T. H. (1989). Ethical implications of the relationship of purpose to role and function in public relations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 8*(1), 65-73.

Bollen, K. A., & Stine, R. A. (1992). Bootstrapping goodness-of-fit measures in structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research, 21*, 205-229.

136

Bowen, S. (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*(1), 65–92.

Brønn, P. S., Roberts, H., & Breunig, K. J. (2004). *Intangible assets, communication and relationships*: International Association of Business Communication Research Foundation.

Broom, G. M. (1982). A comparison of sex roles in public relations. *Public Relations Review, 8*(3), 17-22.

Broom, G. M., & Dozier, D. M. (1986). Advancement for public relations role models. *Public Relations Review, 12*(1), 37-56.

Broom, G. M., & Smith, G. D. (1979). Testing the practitioner's impact on clients. *Public Relations Review, 5*(3), 47-59.

Cameron, G. T., Sallot, L. M., & Lariscy, R. A. W. (1996). Developing standards of professional performance in public relations. *Public Relations Review, 22*, 43–61.

Campbell, D. T. & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*, 81-105

Cancel, A. E., Cameron, G. T., Sallot, L. M., & Mitrook, M. A. (1997). It depends: A contingency theory of accommodation in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 9*(1), 31-63.

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

Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review, 4*, 497-505.

Choi, J., & Choi, Y. (2007). *Dimensions of leadership in public relations: Exploring an organization-wide perspective*. Unpublished manuscript.

Choi, Y., & Cameron, G. T. (2005). Overcoming Ethnocentrism: The Role of Identity in Contingent Practice of International Public Relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*(2), 171-189.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(5), 439-452.

Coombs, W. T. (2000). Crisis management: Advantages of a relational perspective. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 73-93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coombs, W. T., Holladay, S., Hasenauer, G., & Signitzer, B. (1994). A Comparative analysis of international public relations: Identification and interpretation of similarities and differences between professionalization in Austria, Norway, and the United States *Journal of Public Relations Research, 6*(1), 23-39.

Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2001). An extended examination of the crisis situations: A fusion of the relational management and symbolic approaches. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 13*(4), 321-340.

Cornelissen, J. P., & Thorpe, R. (2001). The organisation of external communication disciplines in UK companies: A conceptual and empirical analysis of dimensions and determinants. *Journal of Business Communication, 38*, 413-438.

Culbertson, H. M. (1991). Role taking and sensitivity: Keys to playing and making public relations roles. In J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig (Eds.), *Public relations research annual* (Vol. 3, pp. 37-65). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cutlip, S. M., Center, A. H., & Broom, G. M. (1985). *Effective Public Relations* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Cutlip, S. M., Center, A. H., & Broom, G. M. (1994). *Effective Public Relations* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

D'aprix, R. (1984). Employee Communication. In B. Cantor (Ed.), *Experts in Action: Inside Public Relations* (pp. 102-110). New York: Longman.

del Rey-Morató, J. M. (2000). *Códigos supranacionales de relaciones públicas* [Supranational codes of public elections]. [Catalog]

DeSanto, B., & Moss, D. (2004). Rediscovering what PR managers do: Rethinking the measurement of managerial behaviour in the public relations context. *Journal of Communication Management, 9*(2), 179-196.

Dozier, D. M. (1984). Program evaluation and roles of practitioners. *Public Relations Review, 10*(2), 13-21.

Dozier, D. M. (1990). The innovation of research in public relations practice: Review of a program of studies. In J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig (Eds.), *Public relations research annual* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-28). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dozier, D. M. (1992). The organizational roles of communications and public relations practitioners. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 327-355). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Dozier, D. M., & Broom, G. M. (1995). Evolution of the managerial role in public relations practice. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 7*, 3-26.

Dozier, D. M., & Grunig, J. E. (1992). The organization of the public relations function. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 395-417). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Dozier, D. M., Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1995). *Manager's Guide to Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Duncan, R. B. (1972). Characteristics of organizational environments and perceived environmental uncertainty *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*(3), 313-327.

Ehling, W. P. (1992). Public relations education and professionalism. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 439-464). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. .

Ekachai, D. G. (1995). Applying Broom's role scales to Thai public relations practitioners. *Public Relations Review, 21*(4), 325-226.

Emery, F. E., & Trist, E. L. (1965). The causal texture of organizational environments. *Human Relations, 18*(1), 21-32.

Enders, C. K., & Bandalos, D. L. (2001). The Relative Performance of Full Information Maximum Likelihood Estimation for Missing Data in Structural Equation Models. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 8*(3), 430-457.

Fitzpatrick, K. R., & Rubin, M. S. (1995). Public relations vs legal strategies in organizational crisis decisions. *Public Relations Review, 21*(1), 21-33.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*, 39-50.

Freeman, L. C. (1979). Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Social Networks, 1*, 215-239.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Boston: Pitman.

Freeman, R. E., & Gilbert, D. R. (1988). *Corporate strategy and the search for ethics.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gordon, C. G., & Kelly, K. S. (1999). Public Relations Expertise and Organizational Effectiveness: A Study of US Hospitals. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 11*(2), 143-165.

Graen, G. (1976). Role making processes within complex organizations. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1201-1245). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Grunig, J. E. (1989). Teaching public relations in the future. *Public Relations Review,* *15*(1), 35-38.

Grunig, J. E. (2000). Collectivism, collaboration, and societal corporatism as core professional values in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research,* *12*(1), 23-48.

Grunig, J. E. (2006). Furnishing the edifice: Ongoing research on public relations as a strategic management function. *Journal of Public Relations Research,* *18*(2), 151-176.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1992). 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.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 285-325). 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 at the Public Relations Interest Group, International Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

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

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, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hage, J. (1972). *Techniques and problems of theory construction in sociology.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Heath, R. L. (1994). *Management of corporate communication: From interpersonal contacts to external affairs.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Holtzhausen, D. R. (2000). Postmodern values in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research,* *12*, 93-114.

Holtzhausen, D. R., & Voto, R. (2002). Resistance From the Margins: The Postmodern Public Relations Practitioner as Organizational Activist. *Journal of Public Relations Research,* *14*(1), 57-84.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues and Applications.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55.

Huang, Y.-H. (2001). Values of public relations: Effects on organization-public relationships mediating conflict resolution. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 13*(4), 265-301.

Jackson, P. (1988). Demonstrating professionalism. *Public Relations Journal, 44*(10), 27-31.

Jo, S., & Kim, Y. (2004). Media or personal relations? Exploring media relations dimensions in South Korea. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly 81*(2), 292–306.

Johnson, D. J., & Acharya, L. (1982). *Organizational decision-making and public relations roles*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism, Athens, OH.

Judd, C. M., Smith, E. R., & Kidder, L. H. (1991). *Research methods in social relations* (6th ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (Rev. ed.). New York: Wiley.

Kelleher, T. (2001). Public Relations Roles and Media Choice. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 13*(4), 303-320.

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

Kim, Y., & Hon, L. C. (2002). Public relations in South Korea: Applying theories and exploring opportunities *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 11*(2), 263-286.

Lauzen, M. M. (1992a). Public relations roles, intraorganizational power, and encroachment. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 4*, 61-80.

Lauzen, M. M. (1992b). Supervisor versus practitioner perceptions: When expectations and reality meet. *Management Communication Quarterly, 6*, 85-102.

Lauzen, M. M. (1993). When marketing involvement matters at the manager level. *Public Relations Review, 19*(3), 247-259.

Lauzen, M. M. (1994). Public relations practitioners role enactment in issues management. *Journalism Quarterly, 71*(2), 356-369.

Lauzen, M. M. (1997). Understanding the relation between public relations and issues management. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 9,* 65-82.

Lauzen, M. M., & Dozier, D. M. (1992). The missing link: The public relations manager role as mediator of organizational environments 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 linkages between environmental complexity and management of the public relations function. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 6*(3), 163-184.

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.

Leichty, G. & Springston, J. (1993). Reconsidering public relations models. *Public Relations Review, 19,* 327-340.

Leichty, G., & Springston, J. (1996). Elaborating public relations roles. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 73*(2), 467-477.

Leslie, J. B., Dalton, M., Ernst, C., & Deal, J. (2002). *Managerial effectiveness in a global context.* Greensboro, North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership.

L'Etang, J. (1996). Corporate responsibility and public relations ethics. In J. L'Etang & M. Pieczka, (Eds.), *Critical perspectives in public relations* (pp. 82-105). Boston: International Thomson Business Press

Leuven, J. V. (1991). Public relations and marketing: An overview. *Public Relations Review, 17*(3), 215-217.

Marston, J. (1968). Hallmarks of a profession. *Public Relations Journal, 24,* 22-27.

Meznar, M. B., Chrisman, J. J., & Carroll, A. B. (1991). Social responsibility and strategic management: Toward an enterprise strategy classification. *Business and Professional Ethics, 10*(1), 47-66.

Meznar, M. B., & Nigh, D. (1995). Buffer or bridge: Environmental and organizational determinants of public affairs activities in American firms. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(4), 975-996.

Miles, R. H. (1987). Managing the corporate social environment: A grounded theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Miller, G. R. (1989). Persuasion and public relations: Two "Ps" in a pod. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazleton, Jr. (Eds.), *Public Relations Theory* (pp. 45-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Molleda, J. C., & Ferguson, M. A. (2004). Public Relations Roles in Brazil: Hierarchy Eclipses Gender Differences. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 16*(4), 327-351.

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.

Moss, D., Newman, A., & DeSanto, B. (2005). What do communication managers do? Defining and refining the core elements of management in a public relations/corporate communication context. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 82*(4), 873-890.

Moss, D., Warnaby, G., & Newman, A. (2000). Public relations practitioners role enactment at the senior management level within UK companies. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 12*(4), 277-307.

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

Muthen, L. K., & Muthen, B. (2006). *Mplus user's guide (Version 4)*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthen & Muthen.

Nevitt, J., & Hancock, G. R. (2001). Performance of bootstrapping approaches to model test statistics and parameter standard error estimation in structural equation modelling. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 8*, 353-377.

Oh, D.-B. (1991). *PR Communication Ron [Theories of PR communication]*. Seoul, Korea: Nanam.

Paluszek, J. (1989). Public relations and ethical leadership. *Vital Speeches of the Day, 55*, 747-750.

Park, H. S., Dailey, R., & Lemus, D. (2002). The Use of Exploratory Factor Analysis and Principal Components Analysis in Communication Research. *Human Communication Research, 28*(4), 562-577.

Park, J. (2005). Professional standards in Korean public relations: A comparative approach between corporate practitioners and public relations agency practitioners. *Korean Journal of Advertising & Public Relations, 7*(5), 42-56.

Park, J., Cameron, G. T., & Cropp, F. (2000, June). *Developing standards of professional performance in public relations: Korean practitioners' perception.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

Pasadeos, Y., Renfro, R. B., & Hanily, M. L. (1999). Influential authors and works of the public relations scholarly literature: A network of recent research. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 11*, 29-51.

Pérez-Senac, R. (1998). Relaciones públicas, agente de transformación social [Public relations, agent of social transformation]. *Proceedings of the second Ibero-American Forum of Public Relations.* Lima, Peru: Universidad de San Martín de Porres.

Piekos, J. M., & Einsiedel, E. F. (1990). Roles and program evaluation techniques among Canadian public relations practitioners. In L. A. Grunig & J. E. Grunig (Eds.), *Public Relations Research Annual* (Vol. 2, pp. 95-113). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Porter, L. V., & Sallot, L. M. (2003). The Internet and public relations: Investigating practitioners' roles and World Wide Web use. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 80*(3), 603–622.

Pratt, C. B. (1991). Public relations: The empirical research on practitioner ethics *Journal of Business Ethics, 10*(3), 229-236.

Reagan, J., Anderson, R., Sumner, J., & Hill, S. (1990). A factor analysis of Broom and Smith's public relations roles scale. *Journalism Quarterly, 67*(1), 177-183.

Rhee, Y. (2002). Global public relations: A cross-cultural study of the excellence theory in South Korea. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 14*(3), 159-184.

Ryan, M. (2003). Public relations and the web: Organizational problems, gender, and institutional type. *Public Relations Review, 29*(3), 335–349.

Ryan, M., & Martinson, D. L. (1983). The PR officer as corporate conscience. *Public Relations Quarterly 28*(2), 20–23.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). Social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23*(2), 224-253.

Sallot, L. M., Cameron, G. T., & Lariscy, R. A. W. (1997). Professional standards in public relations: A survey of educators. Public Relations Review. *23*, 197–216.

Sherry, A., & Henson, R. K. (2005). Conducting and interpreting canonical correlation analysis in personality research: A user-friendly primer. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 84*(1), 37-48.

Shin, J.-H., Park, J., & Cameron, G. T. (2006). Contingent factors: Modeling generic public relations practice in South Korea. *Public Relations Review, 32*, 184-185.

Simões, R. P. (1992). Public relations as a political function: A Latin American view. *Public Relations Review, 18*(2), 189–200.

Springston, J. K., & Leichty, G. (1994). Boundary spanning activities in public relations. *Journalism Quarterly, 71*(3), 697-708.

Sriramesh, K., Kim, Y., & Takasaki, M. (1999). Public relations in three Asian cultures: An analysis. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 11*(4), 271-292.

Thomas, E. J., & Biddle, B. J. (1966a). The nature and history of role theory. In B. J. Biddle & E. J. Thomas (Ed.), *Role Theory: Concepts and Research* (pp. 3-19). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Thomas, E. J., & Biddle, B. J. (1966b). Basic concepts for classifying the phenomena of role. In B. J. Biddle & E. J. Thomas (Ed.), *Role Theory: Concepts and Research* (pp. 23-45). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Toth, E. L., & Cline, C. G. (1989). *Beyond the velvet ghetto*. San Francisco: IABC Research Foundation.

Toth, E. L., & Grunig, L. A. (1993). The missing story of women in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 5*, 153-175.

Toth, E. L., Serini, S. A., Wright, D. K., & Emig, A. G. (1998). Trends in public relations roles: 1990-1995. *Public Relations Review, 24*(2), 145-163.

Tushman, M. L., & Scanlan, T. J. (1981). Boundary spanning individuals: Their role in information transfer and their antecedents. *Academy of Management Journal, 24*(2), 289-305.

Van der Meiden, A. (1993). Public relations and "other" modalities of professional communication: Asymmetric presuppositions for a new theoretical discussion. *International Public Relations Review, 16*(3), 8-11.

van Ruler, B., Vercic, D., & Butschi, G. (2004). A first look for parameters of public relations in Europe. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 16*(1), 35-63.

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.

Wright, D. K. (1978). Professionalism and the public relations counselor: An empirical analysis. *Public Relations Quarterly, 23*, 26-27.

Wright, D. K. (1995). The role of corporate public relations executives in the future of employee communications. *Public Relations Review, 21*(3), 181-198.

Wright, D. K. (1996). Communication ethics. In M. B. Salwen & D. W. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (pp. 519–535). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Wright, D. K., Grunig, L. A., Springston, J. K., & Toth, E. L. (1991). *Under the glass ceiling: An analysis of gender issues in American public relations* (Vol. 1). New York: Public Relations Society of America.

Yun, S.-H. (2006). Toward public relations theory-based study of public diplomacy: Testing the applicability of the excellence study. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 18*(4), 287-312.