EVALUATIONS OF FUNCTIONS OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONER

By

THOMAS HUDDLESTON, JR.

Bachelor of Science
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas
1962

Master of Science
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas
1965

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1972

EVALUATIONS OF FUNCTIONS OF THE

PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONER

Thesis Approved:

Harry E. Heath, Jr.

Thesis Adviser

R. T. Alciatore

Jim McNeely

Walter J. Ward

N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to all the individuals who contributed to the completion of this study. He is grateful to Dr. Robert T. Alciatore, chairman of the Advisory Committee, for his encouragement and promptness throughout this study. Appreciation is extended to Dr. Walter J. Ward for his assistance in securing the funding for this study, and for his help in the selection of the statistical techniques used. To Dr. James M. Seals, the writer expresses his appreciation for consistent encouragement and guidance. Appreciation, too, is extended to Dr. Harry E. Heath, Jr., for his helpful criticism and concern.

This study could not have been done without financing from the Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education, New York, New York. For this assistance I am indebted to Dr. Frederick H. Teahan, executive secretary of the Foundation, and to the board of directors of the Foundation. Their sincere interest in the state of the public relations profession is indicated by their generous support.

It is most difficult to express my appreciation to my wife and family for their unwavering support and interest during their years at Oklahoma State University, which were climaxed by the writing of this study. Hopefully, the shared disappointments and sacrifices will prove to be worthwhile in later years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Since Ivy Ledbetter Lee first came to the aid of the anthracite coal owners in 1906, the public relations profession has maintained a consistent, if disorderly, growth. The increased responsibilities of the public relations practitioner, the exasperating attempts to succinctly define the functions of public relations, and to measure the effect of these functions, and the misunderstanding of the practitioner's performance by various publics have given this field an enigmatic quality.

The individuals who project the image of public relations are the approximately 110,000 public relations practitioners within the United States. (19, p. 18) Their particular assignments or responsibilities involve a myriad of details drawing upon many segments of knowledge. Today, the public relations practitioner must be something more than a publicist, a journalist, or a spokesman with research know-how. He must also be a social scientist capable of advising management regarding the environment in which is it operating. (12, p. 54)

As suggested above, the requirements of the profession may have contributed to the confusion about public relations which exists today. Public relations activities have become more demanding and have increased greatly as a result of two world wars, a long and harsh depression, a burgeoning population, and a more technical society.

A special report in Business Week magazine stated that the activities of the public relations Practitioners may include:

> ...keeping management informed of changes in the opinions of its various publics--stockholders, employees, customers, suppliers, and government. It also means counseling management as to the impact its action or lack of action will have on the opinions of these publics. Once a corporate decision has been taken, PR's job is to communicate this information in the best and most favorable manner to the company's publics. (39, p. 41)

As one might expect, not all individuals who are employed under the public relations label perform all (or even part) of the above chores with adequate sophistication. Still, few publics make a real distinction between the numerous individuals who do a competent job and the people who are Practitioners in name only. As a result of the general public's naiveté about public relations, the field is damned at one moment and praised at another.

Regardless of range or quality of service rendered by the public relations Practitioner, he should be aware of the impression he has created with the publics on whom much of his success of failure rests.

From the beginning, public relations Practitioners have been concerned primarily with interpreting their clients to specific publics and vice versa. However, there has been little examination by Practitioners of what their profession signifies to the publics they are trying to influence.

This thought was emphasized during an interview between a Public Relations Journal writer and William A. Lydgate. The question-answer session was published in the March, 1970, issue of PRJ.

Lydgate, chairman of the Public Relations Program Committee of the

Public Relations Society of America (PRSA), agreed there should be a public relations program for public relations, aimed at selected publics. He said the program should not be directed at the general public, but rather among selected groups who have a specific relationship with the public relations profession.

Among the publics noted were individuals in education, business, the press, and public relations. He remarked, "...what these groups really think about it [public relations] has not been tested, as far as I know. We probably should get a reading on their reaction to public relations." (15, p. 12)

Lydgate's remarks have given impetus to this study, designed to provide information about public relations Practitioners' performance of certain functions as seen by special publics who are either directly or indirectly concerned.

Statement of the Problem

Because such vagueness regarding public relations exists, the researcher chose as his problem the development of an approach to PR research which might be more useful to the profession than earlier efforts--mostly descriptive--have been.

The problem, briefly stated, was to establish, based upon the existing literature in the field, a limited but vital set of PR functions, and to evaluate those functions in such a way that the Practitioner will know how his fellow professionals "see" the work they are doing and how various key publics relate to, e.g., react to, the public relations function.

If this two-fold purpose of the problem posed is achieved in this study, it should reduce ambiguity and set the stage for further research breaking away from the purely descriptive methods of the past. The professional society of public relations Practitioners, the Public Relations Society of America, has indicated a desire to start a public relations program for its profession. (15) It acknowledged, however, that before the program could be implemented, some research needed to be done to determine attitudes about the profession. This exploratory study, it is hoped, will be one part of that research effort.

Need for the Study

An admonition by Henry David Thoreau is applicable to this study: "Know your own bone; gnaw at it, bury it, unearth it, and gnaw at it still." (31, p. 3)

The PR profession has been primarily concerned with interpreting its clients to different publics who have a direct influence on the client's success and failure. There has been little effort by the PR profession to perform a similar service for itself. This has resulted in confusion and misunderstanding of the profession by people inside and outside its ranks, a fact which has existed for more than 35 years.

The data presented in this study may well provide a starting place for an organization such as the PRSA to evaluate further certain publics. On the other hand, the Practitioner may be more aware of the evaluations held by different publics about his work and profession. This awareness might enable the Practitioner to perform his functions more effectively.

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumption of the study was that Business Editors, Business Educators, Corporation Executives, and Practitioners, either directly or circuitously, affect the role of the public relations Practitioner and his profession. It was also assumed that these publics possess evaluations of the performances of the Press Relations, Community Relations, Employee Relations, Financial Relations, and Government Relations functions by the public relations Practitioner. Further, it was assumed that the measuring instrument and methodology were adequate to determine and interpret the evaluations.

Limitations of the Study

The study sought to involve Practitioners, Business Educators, Business Editors, and Corporate Executives throughout the United States as defined by the operational definitions on page 38. A summated scale was developed to reflect the four publics' evaluations of the performance of the Press Relations, Community Relations, Employee Relations, Financial Relations, and Government Relations functions of the public relations Practitioner.

Because of their poor response, Corporate Executives were deleted from the statistical analysis of the study. The remaining three publics, with number of responses: Practitioners, 64; Business Editors, 60; Business Deans, 50. These constituted the basis for the statistical treatments used in the study.

Any generalization of the results of the study beyond the three publics or 174 respondents and the five functions operationally defined in Chapter II should be made with caution.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature, upon which the functions to be evaluated by the three publics were chosen.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviewing the literature will be somewhat unorthodox for two reasons: (1) the use of the semantic differential as an "image" evaluation tool for publics and public relations functions is new, and (2) one of the two aspects of the problem is to establish salient basic functions for application of the tool.

Because the researcher was unable to discover, in a careful and exhaustive search of the literature, any study which impinged upon the methodology chosen, the review serves the primary purpose of backing up the choice of salient functions. The review also identifies four publics which have an important relationship to the Practitioner and whose evaluations of the Practitioner's efforts are important for the public relations profession.

Functions of Public Relations

Public relations is a term that is not always understood. This is indicative of the fact that public relations is still trying to define itself. (10, p. 1) PR embraces whatever it is assigned by management to do, and this varies widely. The variance is a result of management's predisposition toward public relations and the job desired. One result of this is a wide variety of functions which parade under the banner of PR.

There are probably as many definitions of public relations as the thousands who practice under its label. Most of the Practitioners are on corporate PR staffs ranging in size from one-man departments to the several-hundred-man PR corps General Motors has spread around the world. (50, p. 23; 19) The remaining Practitioners are with PR counseling firms, trade, professional associations, and education.

Although the field began with a one-way emphasis, publicity, it has developed to include a great many other functions besides merely telling about someone or some entity. Today, it also tells the entity what other publics think of it; it helps the corporation determine what it must do to get the good will of others; it plans ways and means of winning that good will; and it carries on activities designed to win it. In the process of doing these things, it encompasses a great many functions, concepts, and techniques. (28, p. 3) In short, it now is a two-way street.

Many of the functions lend themselves to a common definition of PR, which is to keep management informed of changes in the opinions of its various publics. (50, p. 23) If the changes in opinions are becoming negative or detrimental to the organization or to its publics, the entity has the responsibility to try and alter the opinions. The responsibility is given to public relations Practitioners because one of the basic objectives of public relations is the molding or influencing of public opinion. (8, p. 27)

Idealistically, the Practitioner tries to present all the relevant information on a particular issue, without distortion, so that public opinion evolves as the result of knowledge and choice, based upon a rational consideration of the issue. (8, p. 43) He seeks through honest persuasion to influence and to improve public opinion.

Through the Practitioner's efforts, favorable public opinion in the form of votes, increased production, and employee satisfaction may become obvious. The Practitioner may strive to give employees accurate information about their employer so they will hold rational opinions about their place of work. The PR man may inform a community of the taxes and charitable and cultural contributions made by a local corporation. Such work may result in citizens having a better understanding and knowledge of the part played by the business in their community.

The Practitioner's responsibility to various publics is of large concern. Although the Practitioner's relations with each public will have similar considerations--such as research, planning, evaluation, and communications--each different public requires that the Practitioner execute a special duty or performance or function. For example, the Practitioner's program will have specific policies dealing with employees, stockholders, government officials, members of the press, community, etc.

The Practitioner may work with many publics, each one signifying a specific function. The public relations literature indicates many important functions of the Practitioner. Five of the more frequently mentioned are relations with the press, community, financial, government, and employee. (5, 8, 10, 26, 28, 30, 41, 42, 43, 50) Certainly, each of the five functions is relevant to most corporations and, therefore, to most Practitioners who are employed more by corporations than any other entity.

The importance of the functions is easily justified. One of the functions, Press Relations, is usually considered a major part of most

PR programs. (41, p. 220) The Practitioner is aware that newspapers are a key medium of public communication, read and believed by a large readership, and one of the influential forces on public opinion. (8, p. 446) Harlow points out that the Practitioner depends on the press to accomplish a large part of his program. He acknowledges that the Practitioner's relations with editors, publishers, and reporters is difficult at best, and a headache at worst. (5, p. 301) It is important that the Practitioner have the full confidence of the press.

Another salient function, Community Relations, is meaningful because of the crucial interdependency of community and industry. (10, p. 303) Every corporation has Community Relations, whether good or bad. It is impossible to exist without Community Relations and doing little about them is most undesirable. (37, p. 149) Every business has a responsibility to inform the community of its activities, its objectives, and contributions to the community. At the same time, the business should know the community in which it resides. Without such knowledge, no PR program can be as effective as it should be.

Many times, a large part of the existence of a corporation in a community is dependent upon its Financial Relations. To advance and remain secure financially, many corporations depend upon and take pride in the ranks of their shareholders and their reputation with banks, investment houses, and security analysts. Primary responsibility for Financial Relations, with the exception of direct contact with key analysts, is the responsibility of the PR department or an outside PR counsel. (41, p. 53) He is more important today than at any other time because never before in U. S. business history have so many well-trained individuals spent so much time probing the financial statements of corporations. (41, p. 47)

A fourth function of the Practitioner was recognized during the rapid economic growth of America, the disastrous upheaval of the depression, and the subsequent emphasis upon corporate responsibility. The significant periods of American business crystallized the movement toward more and more government intervention. (3, p. 220) As a result, there became real need for adequate communication between public official and the citizen. (10, p. 373) The Practitioner was charged with the responsibility of dealing with those groups of persons whose attitudes often have a very direct effect upon the fortunes of many businesses. (27, p. 59)

As business became larger, its work force expanded. Concomitant with the employee expansion were serious problems in employee communication and personal relationships. PR was added as a way of improving management communication to employees and creating mutual understanding. (29, p. 91) The Practitioner's function is to know what constitutes a workable philosophy and then to devise a practical program and put it into effect. He is a catalyst, representing both management and employee. (32, p. 37) His work constitutes the foundation on which the good will, morale, cooperation, and motivation of the work force may become established or lost. (54, p. 105)

In summary, then, it is obvious that PR is concerned with the opinion of various publics deemed important by the Practitioner's client or employer. Each of the publics signifies a specific function, or principal act or duty to be performed by the Practitioner. Five of the more important functions of the Practitioner are Press Relations, Community Relations, Financial Relations, Government Relations, and

Employee Relations. Each of the functions involves different activities and requires particular performances by the Practitioner.

Press Relations

American newspapers, because of their convenience and universality, provide probably the best way of reaching large numbers of people. Because the newspaper is an important channel to be used by the Practitioner in the transmission of a message to a certain public(s), Press Relations is an important function of the Practitioner.

The extent of Press Relations may vary according to such factors as the number of new products or services a company introduces in a year, the willingness or interest corporate executives have in speaking out on public issues, corporate interest in informing the financial press of corporate developments, and overall corporate interest in the press. (41, pp. 17-22)

The Practitioner is the primary force behind effective Press Relations. He must be honest with members of the press, convey accurate information, be prompt, have writing ability, and be aware of what a newspaper wants in a story. His specific avenues of Press Relations may include personal contact, the press conference, distribution of news releases, and the construction or formation of the releases.

A key method of communicating with the press is through personal contact. If the personal contact is done properly, the Practitioner can find out what the editor wants, learn his views and editorial policies, and secure his cooperation. One author suggested that the Practitioner tell the editor what he has on his mind, how he proposes to slant it, and the illustrations he will use. Then, get the editor's suggestions and tailor the article to his needs. (1, p. 458) Of course, personal contact with the press may not always be sound if the Practitioner is not honest, begs for space or asks for "kills," and does not provide service.

The Practitioner is a primary source of service. Many times, day or night, the newspaper will actively seek and request information from the Practitioner. When this happens, the PR man must be prepared to give the press what it wants, the way the press wants it. Newsmen lean on and cooperate with the Practitioner who gives such service. (10, p. 307)

There may be no better way to disseminate information to the press and to create good Press Relations than through the press conference. However, many times a Practitioner has lost credibility as a result of a press conference which transferred little or no news of value to the reporters in attendance.

Generally, important matters such as labor-management disputes, employee policy changes, corporate expansion, etc., suggest a press conference because a discussion, rather than a one-sided pronouncement, would be of more interest to the press.

A press conference is called to inform members of the press about an event or news subject, and to provide the press with an opportunity to ask questions and explore their areas of interest in the subject. (28, p. 886; 30, p. 127)

If the Practitioner has an important item which is not suitable for a press conference or personal distribution, he has two principal choices left for dissemination, the mail or the PR wire service.

A basic tool or any PR department is a master mailing list of newsmen or newspapers to whom are sent news releases. One of the prime considerations before sending out any releases is the relevance of the information to the publication to which it is being sent.

During the early days of public relations, there were few attempts to identify publics specifically relevant to management's objectives. The result was common mass dissemination of press releases. The gauge of success was the number of times a particular release appeared in print. Either because of management's insistence or because of the Practitioner's lack of knowledge or care, many PR departments still continue to send out press releases on a "shotgun" basis. (42, p. 39)

It is not difficult to imagine that the careless distribution of press releases is one factor in questionable Press Relations which exist between some editors and Practitioners. (41, p. 221; 47, p. 82; 17, p. 69) Although the Press Relations of some Practitioners may not be considered very worthwhile by some editors, the work is still regarded as one of the Practitioner's most important functions. Another of his important acts or duties is Employee Relations.

Employee Relations

Employee Relations is usually a part of the Practitioner's responsibility because he is familiar with communications techniques. Some corporations may choose to place Employee Relations under the labor relations department, rather than the PR department. Regardless of the department which handles Employee Relations, Practitioners nearly always are employed because of their expertise in communications. (8, p. 89)

Employee communications is important because workers want to know about economic conditions, company policies, planned expansions, plant closings, and any existing problems which are hindering their work. The employee would like to have an "open door" to tell what he would like to know about his job and the company. He would also like management to know about himself and the things that are bothering him. (10, p. 232) If such two-way communication is not encouraged by management, employee misunderstanding is likely, rumors may become rampant, and a high level of employee dissonance may become obvious. Such employee disenchantment quickly spills into their homes and communities. Also, the labor force may cause trouble and loss of time for the company before satisfactory relationships can be reestablished--if ever.

In addition to trying to keep a two-way communications process alive in management's mind, the Practitioner's task in Employee Relations is to provide persuasive, informative auxiliary communications to support interpersonal line communications. Employee publications, letters, bulletin boards, and suggestion systems <u>supplement</u>, but do not <u>supplant</u>, the employees' interpersonal communications system. (10, p. 223)

Additionally, the Practitioner may also set meetings between management and employees, create and direct television and radio programs for employee consumption, sponsor open houses for employees and families, sponsor visits by key executives to lines or departments, develop motion pictures and slides, and write employee handbooks and manuals. (8, pp. 97-102)

The Practitioner also assists in educating workers to the end that production is satisfactory and management-Employee Relations are harmonious; in measuring employee morale, reaction, and opinion; in sharing information with and sometimes counseling employees; in operating bulletin boards and suggestion systems; and in editing employee publications. (5, p. 40)

In 1948, a fledgling medium of Employee Relations, the plant newspaper or magazine, was forecast to become a communications tool of much prestige and influence. (22, p. 83) Today, within the potentially vast network of communications which link employee to employer, the major vehicle has become the plant newspaper or magazine. (42, p. 115) The Practitioner has the job of developing magazine and newspaper content that might make the employee feel more a part of the corporation.

The Practitioner prints articles about the company's employee policy and new company developments. Such information was deemed important by employees as indicated by surveys conducted by Hill and Knowlton. The surveys showed increasing employee interest in getting substantive information in their communications. (25, p. 233) Identification in an internal magazine enables the employee to think of his leaders as individuals rather than authoritarian symbols. Also, the employee sees his fellow workers in a more compact, more easily digestible presentation through various feature and news stories. The employee also has the opportunity for feedback as provided by letters to the editor, sound-off columns, and gripe session in print. Such employee feedback may serve to alert management to any problems of which they may not be aware.

Management wants to be alerted of employee problems, because of its responsibility for its workers. Employees are not the only responsibility of management, but one of major importance. Another important responsibility of management is Community Relations. (28,

p. 144)

Community Relations

Community Relations has evolved as an important public relations function because any entity exists within a network or interdependence among itself, its internal publics, and its external publics. (10, p. 303) Each of the three variables exists because of the other. Anything that can be done to enhance the interdependence is to an institution's advantage.

Albeit Community Relations is strengthened or defeated by the internal public within an organization, the public relations department is usually assigned the responsibility of molding and projecting the company's attitude into the community in which it resides.

Before the Practitioner can begin his Community Relations function on an orderly, planned basis, he must first understand the community. One of the most relevant areas for understanding the community may lie in the determination of the make-up of the community opinion.

Community opinion is mired in a complexity of variables. Although there are many conflicting self interests and a "norm" of public opinion is usually difficult to ascertain, one of the first steps of identifying community opinion is to ascertain who the decision makers are. (10, p. 253)

Each city has a relatively few individuals who make the major decisions on crucial community issues. Such a group is of concern to the Practitioner, but he cannot forget the vast numbers of other people who collectively are responsible for the mood of the community on specific issues. In many cases the smaller group of decision makers are influenced by the climate of the larger public. Within the larger public may be found employees and their families, relatives and friends, members of the communications media, members of influential organizations, thought leaders, and crusaders. (10, p. 254)

As the Practitioner is able to identify the various groups or social systems and the people within them, he becomes more secure about how members of the social systems will behave in a given communications situation. (4, p. 125) If the Practitioner can perceive the expectations which go with a role in a social system or sub-system, he can predict with some accuracy the behaviors of the people who perform the role. Also, if he knows what expectations go with a specific position within a group, he can make predictions about the people who occupy the position. (4, p. 149)

When the PR man has gained some idea of the decision makers and the populace responsible for the climate of opinion, he can begin to determine some of the general interests of the community and its attitude toward his company or institution. As the community profile becomes more clear, he and management begin to make plans toward positive Community Relations.

The methods by which corporations implement Community Relations can be seen every day. Participation in various civic endeavors, openness and honesty in Press Relations, plant tours, institutional advertising, speakers bureaus, and good Employee Relations are just a few of the more common means used to produce and nurture good Community Relations.

One cannot conclude that the corporation establishes Community Relations only for the community. Community Relations is calculated to benefit the company also. A favorable atmosphere in the community makes it easier for the personnel department to find good employees, allows for an exchange with the community which may result in favorable tax and legal concessions for itself, and provides a sound base on which public and private disputes with the community may be resolved efficiently and fairly. (41, p. 15)

The public relations Practitioner is the latent force behind most Community Relations programs. His role is not unlike a doctor keeping a finger on his patient's pulse. If, at any time, the Practitioner detects a significant deviation of concern or attitude by the community toward his company or toward a new social or political issue, he must carefully weigh his company's position and react in a manner acceptable to the company and its community. The final decision may rest on the question of profits versus social responsibility.

In the early part of 1970, Fortune magazine surveyed 500 key business executives on the basic questions of a corporation's profit motive and its social responsibilities. The magazine concluded that there has been no serious conflict between the two issues, but that was because the social issues had not yet been strongly felt by industry. The magazine predicted that the pressures would increase. In the end, Fortune reported, business would either emerge as a stronger, more vital part of society or weakened and somewhat discredited. (44, p. 102)

The favorable image an entity conveys to the community may be a result of the Practitioner's Community Relations function. At the same time, the corporation's actual existence in the community may be partially due to the Practitioner's Financial Relations function.

Financial Relations

The Practitioner's Financial Relations function is important to the financial reputation of a corporation because it involves the propagation of two-way communication between a corporation and the financial press, financial analysts, bankers, major lending institutions, and its stockholders.

Approximately 20,000,000 Americans own stock today, up from 6,500,000 in 1952. (11, p. 156) Such a large number implies that stockholders or shareowners must be positively considered by the management of a large corporation. Usually, the public relations department of the public corporation is assigned the task of trying to convert the stockholders into customers for the company's products, salesmen for its stock and products, and advocates of management's position in times of difficulty.

Good stockholder relations are based on sound financial policies which try to maintain stockholder interest, establish two-way communication about the company's progress, and reinforce whatever positive attitudes of ownership a stockholder may possess.

Because most publicly owned corporations have stockholders scattered throughout the world, it is impractical to believe that most stockholder relations can be done on an interpersonal basis. Regional and national stockholder meetings are satisfactory for the small number who attend, but the larger job of reaching the stockholder family must be via the printed word. For years the mainstay of the printed word has been the annual report. (8, p. 122; 46, p. 58)

In past years, the annual report fulfilled only the bare legal requirements of audited income statements, balance sheets, and notice of upcoming annual and regional meetings. Today, most annual reports resemble the most polished, expensive reports which a company can produce. The slick reproductions are filled with numerous pieces of information from management, and its financial tables are accompanied by simple explanations of complex financial data. (30, p. 48)

While the annual report is to many corporations the highlight of the printed word to stockholders, its date of mailing leaves much to be desired.

Because most corporations are on a January-to-January financial year, audited fiscal statements are usually not available until sometime in February and not ready to be printed and mailed until March. (46, p. 59) Stockholders who own shares in several companies find their mail boxes bulging with annual reports during March. The lengthy reports and the usual assortment of magazines, newspapers, and other printed media create enough "noise" to significantly lessen the corporation's communications effort.

To offset the problem, some Practitioners have added a "flash" report and/or an interim report to shareowners. The flash report of company progress is compiled at the end of a fiscal year and issued early the next year. It is compiled and mailed quickly to stockholders and financial trade papers and magazines. Because the first of the year is not cluttered with annual reports and company progress reports, the acceptance of the flash reports by trade papers and stockholders has been good. (46, pp. 56-60)

A more common method of reaching financial papers and stockholders is the interim report. The interim report may be mailed during different times of the year between annual report releases. (46, p. 60)

Other techniques of Practitioners include dividend checks which are accompanied by "riders" which relate the latest news of the corporation. Also, the issuance of welcoming letters to new stockholders and letters of regret to former stockholders are other common methods used to project the attitude of a corporation toward past and present stockholders. (46, pp. 63-65)

Stockholder relations is only a part of Financial Relations, because cash may come from many other places. (30, p. 63)

During the mid-1960s the impact of the financial analyst was felt. The financial analyst's responsibility is to determine if a company's stock is underpriced. He accomplishes the feat by visiting a plant, meeting and sizing up the management, and comparing it to the rest of the industry. His recommendation to buy might be expressed to his clients, a large brokerage house, or other outlets. (43, pp. 103-104)

Many financial analysts may be found influencing mutual fund managers or bank trust officers, or in the position of fund managers. The analysts are not unlike a large number of American stockholders who are reducing individual investment considerations while increasing interest in various investment pools such as mutual funds. Stockholders are investing their money in various pools of capital or they are turning over the management of their money to investment counselors, bank trust officers, or others. Thus, fewer and fewer individuals are actually making investment decisions. (23, p. 65)

Because the financial power is being concentrated in a smaller group than ever before, a corporation can only count on minimum exposure on Wall Street in a given period of time. Annual reports, security analysts meetings, and other forms of communication must be strong enough to make a difference. It is the important task of the Practitioner to see that the inputs go to the right places. Once done, the fundamental reasons for Financial Relations are more nearly realized.

The reasons for Financial Relations are not complex, but are important for the financial security of a corporation. Financial Relations helps broaden the base of public ownership, satisfy stockholders with management, and increase the price of stock in relation to its per-share earnings. At the same time, this function enables the company to be recognized as a sound financial entity, capable of buying other businesses. (43, pp. 104-106; 41, p. 17)

The economic growth of American corporations is constantly under the critical eye of government. Many of the laws and regulations of government directly affect the daily existence of corporations. The increasing impact of government on business has given impetus to the rise of Government Relations programs by many corporations. (8, p. 290)

Government Relations

While government surveillance, authority, and red tape are irritable to many corporations, there are many government programs which offer new and profitable considerations for business. Government appropriations are underwriting numerous programs in many and varied fields, including medical research, space, underseas technology, environmental control, recreational development, and human resources salvaging. (41, p. 173) Thus, government can be a signigicant plus, at least part of the time, for any corporation.

Obviously, government should be watched and monitored by most businesses. The development of a program to do the job is the responsibility of the public relations department. (8, p. 295)

The Practitioner looks for the best way to bring corporate interests to the attention of government officials involved. He continually concentrates on reliable dissemination of information to the appropriate government agencies and legislatures while advising management of government developments. (16, pp. 27-28)

Other authors have suggested that most of the Practitioner's governmental relations activities are to find and present accurate information, interpret government actions to his management, influence and disseminate publicity, and discover valuable marketing information and clients. (41, p. 175; 8, pp. 293, 297; 30, pp. 60-63)

An informal Washington poll of public relations Practitioners specializing in relations with the federal government revealed that the most important factors in such contacts were attitude and "knowledge of the situation." (28, p. 221) Attitude may be reflected in the defensive, uncompromising predisposition toward a particular matter under consideration by the government employee and the Practitioner. The government employee, the Practitioner, or both may be at fault. "Knowledge of the situation" refers to the Practitioner who possesses little or no idea of the scope of the agency with which he intends to deal, has incomplete or erroneous information, and is poorly informed with respect to his own case. (3, p. 222)

Washington is not the only place of interest for a Government Relations program. According to the issue, concern and interest may be evidenced at the city, county, and state levels. Relations with the different levels of government follow much the same pattern as those with the federal offices.

Although somewhat risky, some corporations become actively involved in political issues which are to be eventually decided by the voters. Activities such as the dissemination of information to prospective voters, television and newspaper advertising, and public speeches are used to try to let the voting public know the viewpoints and problems of business.

Business hopes to influence voters, so that their ballots will alter the unfavorable attitudes of some legislators. The views of legislators on legislative matters are affected by public opinion, which must be shaped, in part, by public relations Practitioners. (8, p. 305)

The Practitioner, then, has a major responsibility for Government Relations, Press Relations, Employee Relations, Community Relations, and Financial Relations. Each of these important functions requires special effort.

Although the Practitioner regularly performs the five functions, there has been little attempt to evaluate his work. There has been only a modicum of evidence which would indicate different publics' attitudes about his functions. An evaluation of his work by several publics who have a direct relationship to the PR man would give the Practitioner and the public relations profession an idea of how well they are performing some of their basic functions.

Publics

There are different groups of people who directly affect the work of the public relations profession. Four such groups include Business Editors, Corporate Executives, Business Educators, and Practitioners.

Each group has a direct bearing on the functions of the PR worker.

Only a few isolated remarks and studies indicate any evaluations of the four groups about the work of the public relations Practitioner. Information is available, however, which reflects the important relationship of each group to the Practitioner's work and profession. Because of this information, it will be the purpose of the following pages to identify each of the four influential publics and to describe their relationship to the PR Practitioner. Their importance to the Practitioner and to the PR profession is cause for their inclusion in the study.

Business Editors

A large part of any public relations effort involves dissemination of the written word; thus, the relationship of the PR Practitioner to the press is extremely important if he is to have successful Press Relations, including the acceptance of his copy for publication by an editor of a newspaper. An important person to the Practitioner is the Business Editor, whose section is filled with stories that companies would not have dreamed of discussing publicly fifty years ago. (50, p. 26)

Whenever a Practitioner is preparing a news release, he must always consider whether the editor will accept it for publication. A Practitioner can believe he has employed all the skills necessary to write a news release and then hear an editor say he cannot use it. No doubt, some editors believe that the most useful feature of a PR news release is the paper clips which hold the story together. A few studies seem to corroborate this conclusion.

One study indicated that a sample group of editors used only six per cent of all public relations material received. (12, p. 541) Opinion Research Corporation showed that on an average day, a newspaper business or financial editor discards more than 100 releases--90 per cent of all he receives. (48, pp. 22-24) Neither of the studies indicated why PR releases were not often used. Faulty construction of the news release could have been one reason, but weak content seems more likely. Several studies have suggested that there are certain news elements and combinations which editors favor for publication. (53; 6, pp. 349-351; 9; 40)

Not all newspapers, however, use a negligible amount of PR-originated copy. One study, involving two Milwaukee newspapers, found that one-fourth of the non-news service, non-wire, non-syndicated news content was public relations-originated news in the Journal; the content was almost one-third for the Sentinel. (47, p. 82) Although the two Milwaukee papers used a lot of PR-originated news during one week, the editors rejected 1,789 releases.

Editors often use more PR material than they realize. One study asked editors what per cent of PR releases received was used. These newspaper editors said they used 10 per cent, yet it was found they used 38 per cent. (15, pp. 68-69) Other findings noted that business was the most frequently used subject category and public relations departments of corporations the most frequently used source. The study suggested that editors were not fully aware of the role and influence of public relations news sources.

Other editors have voiced criticism of the Practitioners' efforts to gain newspaper space. Some editors complain they are flooded with stories of little substance. (45, p. 14) The press criticizes the Practitioner for too much copy; later he is criticized for obstructing the press' effort to gather news. (33, p. 11)

Criticism from the press is a major obstacle for the Practitioner. He needs to be aware of this problem, then take positive steps to reduce the criticism. One of the steps toward minimizing press criticism would be a determination of the Business Editors' perception of the Practitioner's functions. Such an action would be only the first of many steps down a long and difficult road to win the respect and cooperation of the press. (18, p. 252; 48, pp. 22-24)

It seems obvious that editors of newspapers usually are important to any function the Practitioner may be trying to perform. If editors consider the Practitioner's work unsatisfactory, the PR man may find himself in disfavor with the management of his corporation. On the other hand, if corporate executives projected only scant interest in his work, he would still be severely handicapped.

Corporate Executives

If top management does not show sufficient interest in its program of public relations, the chances for a successful program are limited. This correctly implies the necessity of a close relationship between the Practitioner and top management before a successful public relations program is possible. Therefore, the Practitioner and management are dependent on one another. Each is important to the other.

Today, most businessmen are sensitive to the impact public opinion can have on the various aspects of their business and on the final factor, the balance sheet. (50, pp. 24-25) As a result of this sensitivity, the Practitioner has assumed the role of an important middleman. His role consists of being sensitive to public opinion, deciphering it for management, and being the company's expert communicator to the various publics. In essence, the Practitioner speaks for and to management about public opinion. (50, p. 26)

Public opinion may be found within different internal publics, just as it is found amidst external publics. The Practitioner helps secure public approval according to the latitude afforded him by management. (8, p. 51)

The Practitioner's task is not easy. Everyone to whom management has something to say may say something in return. Employees may say something in return. Employees may want to alter company policy; government officials may require lower prices and different designs; community leaders may want to sway management toward a different point of view about a matter of local interest; or organized groups following the Nader pattern may threaten to boycott or create distrust unless new suggestions are fulfilled. If the suggestions or objectives are rejected by management, the Practitioner must make management seem reasonable. If the suggestions are accepted, the Practitioner must make the public aware that management has altered its course in deference to public interest. (16, pp. 104-105)

Whether the Practitioner is helping shape management's answer or trying to project its public relations attitude, management must understand the Practitioner's purpose and take part in establishing policy to guide the public relations activities with different publics. (42, p. 53)

Relations with all kinds of groups are intended by the Practitioner to flow in two directions. According to management's sanction, the Practitioner should lead the total company to draw information about needs and rights of the affected "others," evaluate the information in light of its own needs and rights to determine company conduct, and then use every part of the corporate body to sell, argue, plead, persuade, affect, and convince. (43, p. 72)

The organization of the public relations department is influenced by top management's attitude toward public relations, the over-all organizational structure of the company, and past practices. (50, p. 127) If top management has a high regard for public relations, the activity is a direct responsibility of the president's or chairman's office. The executive in charge may be given vice-presidential status. If top management does not "believe" in public relations, the activity may be under the direction of middle management or may not even be recognized as a formal department. (50, p. 128) But, whether the Practitioner's level is high, middle, or low, it is important that he have direct and easy access to top management. (38, p. 25)

Although corporate management has hired a large number of Practitioners, there seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding between corporate management and its PR employees. The misunderstanding is not something that has just developed. In a speech before the American Public Relations Association in 1948, one Practitioner conceded that the biggest problem facing PR is convincing business management of the value of public relations work. (38, p. 26)

In 1951, the Public Relations Journal asked 100 PRSA members, "What is the greatest obstacle in the path to greater acceptance of public relations by business and industry?" One of the most frequent answers was: "Management is ignorant of what public relations is, how it works." (51, p. 13) In another article two years later, one writer considered the misunderstanding between management and PR as a challenge and great opportunity to indoctrinate management with the broader meanings of PR. (21, p. 5)

In 1961, the publisher of Printer's Ink said that one of the basic troubles in public relations communication is the failure of top management to allow PR people the time for personal field experience so they would know the obstacles their copy had to overcome. (49, p. 73) A later article on management-practitioner relations indicated that PR had still failed to win the confidence of much of the business community. (7, p. 18)

Few studies are available which reflect management's attitude toward public relations Practitioners. John W. Hill has briefly referred to one poll on the ethical behavior of public relations Practitioners and said that Corporation Executives gave their own public relations officials a rating better than many others in their official family. (23, p. 13) A more recent study, however, indicates within its preliminary findings that a number of the chief executives are critical of their PR people. The executives feel the Practitioners do a good job with mechanics [publicity], but are less able to assume a policy counseling role. In management's view, some PR people are still "press room types." (14, p. 191)

One of the Practitioner's standard criticisms of management is that management does not have any concept of Press Relations or what constitutes an acceptable news story. Another frequently heard complaint is that management often fails to let PR know what is going on.

(50, p. 41)

Thus, Practitioners and Corporate Executives project disagreement about public relations work. A study which would reflect management's evaluations of some of the major functions of the Practitioner would be of benefit to the PR problem and to management itself.

Business Educators

A president of one of America's largest corporations has said, "We never do anything of importance without first considering in great detail the public relations aspect." (10, p. 325) Such concern is indicative of industry's awareness of public relations. This awareness, coupled with the realization that public relations Practitioners are employed more by corporations than by any other employer and that PR is considered "one of the fastest-growing phases of corporate activity," (10, p. 324) is sufficient cause for the PR profession to want to know Business Educators' perceptions of functions of the Practitioner. (52)

Business Educators are responsible for teaching students, the potential leaders in the business world, the aims, methods, and needs of business. If the Business Educators are unfamiliar with the functions of the Practitioner, or possess unfavorable perceptions of his functions, their students may assume similar attitudes and carry these into their chosen area of corporate employment.

If misunderstanding does exist between Business Educators and the PR profession, it possibly has arisen as a result of inadequate communications between the PR profession, industry, and Business Educators. (8, p. 256) Research of the attitudes of educators and students toward a corporation and its policies, products, services, and practices is one of the objectives of a corporate PR department. (8, p. 263) A similar research of attitudes of Business Educators toward one of the major interests of industry, public relations, should be initiated.

The regard of business for education arises from mutual needs. Both industry and schools are expanding, seeking new ideas and a favorable climate of opinion in which to operate. (8, p. 257) Business must have trained specialists, and education can supply the demand. A potential specialist with an accurate conception of effective corporate PR would more accurately perceive the total corporate picture. He would realize that PR contributes to the improvement of an organization's conduct, serves the public interest by making all points of view known, and promotes communication and mediation rather than fostering misinformation with information, and discord with rapport. (10, p. 481)

Thus, Business Educators are another type of people whom together with Business Editors and Corporate Executives, possess a strong relationship to the public relations profession. Their evaluations of the functions of public relations would be of value to the profession and its Practitioners.

The Practitioners, the final group to be included in the study, may have the strongest influence on their profession. A self evaluation of their functions would be of value to each Practitioner and to the total PR profession. Additionally, the Practitioner can compare his evaluations to the other three groups who influence his functions.

Practitioners

Public relations is an occupation which has had substantial growth.

In 1960, in the top 300 companies in the United States, three out of four maintained complete public relations departments, compared to only one out of fifty in 1936. (50, p. 42) In 1963, one author concluded that corporations were starting new public relations departments at the rate of 100 a year. He added that more than 5,000 corporations had departments or counsel. (30, p. 6)

Although there has been substantial growth in programs and personnel, public relations growth has not assured an adequate understanding of the profession. Much of the confusion which exists may be a result of the activity's rapid growth, the heterogeneous training of its Practitioners, undesirable heritages or forerunners of today's Practitioner, and the varied responsibilities of the Practitioner.

Just as there is no common agreement regarding public relations activity by laymen, there is a similar haziness among public relations Practitioners. A major problem of public relations is lack of common agreement among Practitioners and organizations using public relations about its functions and objectives. (8, p. 23) One author has stated that most of the misunderstanding about what PR is, and what a PR Practitioner does, is that, as a group, the public relations Practitioners themselves do not know. (42, p. 6) He asks, "If the Practitioners cannot agree, how can anyone expect to understand and respect the Practitioners?"

Obviously then, a self evaluation of his functions by the Practitioner would be of value to the total profession. It would not be a final step toward common understanding, but would be the beginning of a foundation on which to build. It is evident that public relations cannot attain its full stature until there is common understanding by those who use it concerning its functions and objectives. (8, p. 22)

Summary

The preceding review of the literature indicated the varied responsibilities of the public relations Practitioner. A large part of the Practitioner's duties revolve around his interaction with various publics. Each may require that the Practitioner use different skills or the same skills in varying combinations.

Five different functions were suggested as being among the important duties of the Practitioner. Each of the functions was considered to be a major part of most Practitioners' work and was examined in some detail based upon the published views of leaders in public relations and related fields.

The Practitioner's execution of his functions comprises the work of the public relations profession. The public relations profession affects and is influenced by different publics. Each of the different groups has an important relationship to the public relations profession. Four of the more salient publics are Business Editors, Business Educators, Corporate Executives, and public relations Practitioners.

There has been limited comment to date about the four publics' evaluations of the work of the public relations Practitioner. An exhaustive review of the literature failed to reveal a single study directed to the measurement and comparison of different publics' evaluations of the work of the public relations Practitioner.

Chapter III, Methodology and Design, will present the research questions and operational definitions, and will discuss the populations and samples of the four publics, and the development and analysis of the measuring instrument. Chapter III will also discuss the three mailing procedures which gathered the data used in the study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

Research Questions

To carry out the objectives of this study, five primary questions were formulated to test the mean score differences on the bi-polar adjective scales of the semantic differential between the publics and functions selected for study. The research questions are stated below.

1. Are there significant differences among Business Editors, Business Educators, and Practitioners in their evaluations of the performance of the combined five functions by the public relations Practitioner?
2. Are there significant differences among Press Relations, Employee Relations, Community Relations, Financial Relations, and Government Relations performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner as evaluated by the combined three publics?
3. Are there significant differences among the results of the interaction effects of PUBLICS and FUNCTIONS?
4. Do any two or more performances of functions by the Practitioner have similar "semantic meaning space" among the three groups of PUBLICS?
5. Is there a similarity of semantic structures of three publics as they perceive the performance of FUNCTIONS

by the public relations Practitioner?

Definitions

The following definitions are offered for a more precise understanding of this study. The definitions of the selected publics indicate the populations that were surveyed; the definitions of the selected functions were used in the survey to seek evaluations of functions by the four publics. All function definitions below are listed as they appeared in the survey instrument, which appears as Appendix A.

1. Press Relations Function. A function of the public relations Practitioner includes seeking goodwill and cooperation of editors and reporters, organizing press conferences, determining the news value of a news release, writing the press release, and distributing the news release to interested media.
2. Employee Relations Function. A function of the public relations Practitioner includes advising and counseling management; setting meetings between management and employees; editing employee publications; creating and directing films, radio, and television programs for employee consumption; and measuring employee attitudes and morale.
3. Financial Relations Function. A function of the public relations Practitioner includes editing the annual report; sending financial messages to stockholders; disseminating information to the financial press, analysts, bankers, and major lending insti-

tutions; and organizing stockholder meetings.

4. Community Relations Function. A function of the public relations Practitioner includes understanding community opinion; participating in civic endeavors; sponsoring plant tours; creating institutional advertising; employee relations; press relations; and responding to relevant issues of the community.

5. Government Relations Function. A function of the public relations Practitioner includes understanding and monitoring city, state, and national government agencies; interpreting government actions to management; interpreting management's attitudes to government agencies and officials, and discovering marketing information.

6. Business Editor. Any person listed as business editor, business-financial editor, business-financial-labor editor, business-news editor, business-building editor, or financial editor, in "Surveys of Daily Newspapers Published in the United States," pages 35-300, *1970 Editor and Publisher International Yearbook*.

7. Practitioner. Any person listed in "Alphabetical Listing of Members," pages 34-208, Public Relations Society of America, Inc., *Public Relations Register, Twenty-first Edition/1970*.

8. Corporation Executive. Any person who has the title of president of any corporation which is listed among the "Fortune Directory of the 500 Largest Industrial

Corporations," pages 184-200, Fortune, May, 1970.

9. Business Educators. Any person listed as dean, pages 9-24, 1970-1971 Accredited Schools, American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, Inc.

10. Evaluation. The responses given by respondent groups to a specific function on the seven-point bi-polar adjective scales of the semantic differential. A public's maximum mean score of seven constitutes an extremely favorable evaluation of the performance of the function. A minimum mean factor score of one constitutes an extremely unfavorable perception of the function. A mean factor score of four indicates a neutral evaluation of the function.

As indicated earlier, it was the intent of the study to seek four publics' evaluations of the performance of the public relations Practitioner. Each of the four publics had a particular population from which a representative sample of 400, or 100 from each population, was drawn. The subjects selected were mailed a formulated measuring instrument designed to determine their evaluations of the performance of five functions by the public relations Practitioner. The sources for the four publics' populations differed widely.

Populations and Samples

To insure a random selection, a table of random numbers was used to draw the sample from each population. The population of 147 Business Educators was found in 1970-1971 Accredited Schools, American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, Inc.; the population of

500 Corporate Executives was found on pages 184-200, Fortune, May, 1970; 6,939 Practitioners were found in the Public Relations Society of America, Inc., Public Relations Register Twenty-first Edition/1970; approximately 250 Business Editors were found in the 1970 Editor and Publisher International Yearbook, "Surveys of Daily Newspapers Published in the United States," pages 35-300.

Mailing Procedures

Each mailing packet contained an eight-page, 8 3/4" x 5 3/4" booklet and an addressed, postage-paid return envelope. Each packet was mailed air mail. An example of the questionnaire booklet is found in Appendix A.

The first mailing to selected samples was on May 5, 1971. At the end of two weeks, a second mailing was sent to those members of the publics who had not responded. On June 4, 1971, the final follow-up was initiated to seek responses from those persons who had not returned their questionnaires. The close spacing of follow-up activities was in accord with the theory that the stimuli to strengthen recall should come soon after the original impression and be repeated thereafter at gradually increasing intervals. (36, p. 399) Finally, on June 24, 49 days after the first mailing, the researcher concluded his efforts to get responses and began analyzing the booklets which had been returned.

The Instrument

The semantic differential (SD), a method of observing and measuring the psychological meaning of things, usually concepts, was the measuring instrument used in this study. The semantic differential is considered to be an accurate instrument for recording affective associations of stimuli. (20, p. 1) The instrument has been used to predict a number of behaviors, some of which include images of persons and occupations. (4, pp. 296-298; 34) It has often been used as a generalized attitude measuring instrument.

Osgood developed the SD method to measure the connotative meaning of concepts as points in what he has called "semantic space." (35) The method consists of a number of scales, each having a bi-polar adjective pair chosen from a large number of such scales for a particular research purpose, together with the concepts to be rated with the scales.

While developing the SD, Osgood assembled a large group of "polar adjective pairs" such as good-bad, strong-weak, etc. He placed each element of a pair at one end of a seven-point continuum and asked people to place a check mark somewhere along each scale, given a particular term. The answers were submitted to statistical analysis and three major dimensions of connotative meaning were determined.

Each of the three dimensions--evaluation, activity, and potency--can be strongly indexed by certain polar adjectives. As an example, the evaluative dimension is indicated by such scales as good-bad or valuable-worthless.

For purposes of this study, the writer chose the bi-polar adjectives of the evaluative dimension to be used in the measuring instrument. Kerlinger has said that in studies of attitudes and values, an investigator may often need only the scales of the evaluative factor. (24, p. 569) Another author has noted that the most powerful dimension of connotation is the evaluative dimension, relating to a person's tendency to judge something to be good or bad. He concluded that:

> This dimension /evaluative/ accounts for the largest part of variability in meanings which we have, and is used increasingly as an operational definition of people's attitudes. (4, p. 298)

Kerlinger, in his review of the SD, has made the following observations:

> The semantic differential can be applied to a variety of research problems. It has been shown to be sufficiently reliable and valid for many research purposes. It is also flexible and relatively easy to adapt to varying research demands, quick and economical to administer and to score. The main problems are to select appropriate and relevant concepts or other cognitive objects to be judged, and appropriate and relevant analyses. In both cases the researcher is faced with a plethora of possibilities. Selection and choise, as usual, are determined by the nature of the problems explored and the hypotheses tested. (24, p. 578)

The construction of the SD scales is left to the individual, although Osgood has given examples of two forms used most widely. (35, p. 81) The form used in this study not only has the advantage of being easy to score, but permits greater consistency of meaning in the thing being judged, and is considered to be more satisfying to the subjects of the study. (35, pp. 81-82) To prevent bias, the researcher alternated the polarity direction of the bi-polar adjectives used in the study.

Each subject was asked to rate a given concept (e.g., "Press Relations") on a series of seven-point, bi-polar adjective rating scales. The rating was made according to the subject's evaluation of the relatedness or association of the adjectives to the given concept. The concepts judged were the five functions of the public relations Practitioner as defined in Chapter III in operational definitions. Because the scale is a continuous measure, it allowed for the intensity of attitude expression.

An example of the SD scale indicates the various degrees of attitude expression, although only the words "good" and "bad" appeared in the instrument.

	Very Closely Related	Closely Related	Slightly Related	Neutral	Slightly Related	Closely Related	Very Closely Related	
good								bad
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

Analysis

This study is composed of two major independent variables, FUNCTIONS and PUBLICS. The FUNCTIONS variable is separated into Press Relations, Community Relations, Employee Relations, Financial Relations, and Government Relations. The PUBLICS variable is divided into Business Editors, Business Educators, and Practitioners. The FUNCTIONS and PUBLICS variables were selected so that mean scores represent EVALUATIONS, which is the study's dependent variable.

The author interpreted the data received from the measuring instrument by using a Two-Factor Mixed Design: Repeated Measures on One Factor factorial analysis of variance (2, pp. 54-61), t-Test for Differences Among Several Means (2, pp. 112-115), Distance-Cluster analysis of variance (24, pp. 573-576), and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. (24, p. 90)

By using factorial analysis of variance the writer was able to study the significance of differences among the three segments of PUBLICS, the five areas of FUNCTIONS, and the significance of interaction or mutual interplay of FUNCTIONS and PUBLICS on the dependent variable, EVALUATIONS.

As the variables are built into the design, the factorial analysis of variance permits the controlling of independent variables. All of the variables that are expected to influence EVALUATIONS of FUNCTIONS of the public relations Practitioner will be equally controlled for analysis.

One of the most important assets of the factorial analysis is that is allows the researcher to study the interactive effects of independent variables--FUNCTIONS, PUBLICS--on the dependent variable, EVALUATIONS. For example, the main effects of FUNCTIONS and the main effects of PUBLICS may not be statistically significant, or the results may be no greater than a person would ordinarily expect by chance. However, interaction could be significant. Membership in a particular public may affect a person's perception of FUNCTIONS of the public relations Practitioner. The two independent variables, FUNCTIONS and PUBLICS, through their interaction, mutually affect the dependent variable, mean scores or EVALUATIONS.

In essence, factorial analysis allowed the author to be precise, to study any interactive effects, and to have control of independent variables.

In setting up the design, the researcher used a two-dimensional crossbreak. A crossbreak represents a numerical tabular presentation of data in which variables are juxtaposed to allow study of the relations between them. (24, p. 625)

The study resulted in a 3 x 5 two-dimensional crossbreak.

The second analysis, the Distance-Cluster Analysis, allowed the writer to see if any one group of PUBLICS view any of the areas of FUNCTIONS in a similar manner. In other words, if any two or more concepts are close together in "meaning space," they are alike in meaning for the group making the EVALUATIONS. What is needed then, is a measure of the meaning space or a measure of the way a group evaluated the concepts of FUNCTIONS.

PUBLICS - A

Practitioners A 1	Business Editors A 2	Business Educators A 3

FUNCTIONS - B

Press Relations B 1

Financial Relations B 2

Community Relations B 3

Employee Relations B 4

Government Relations B 5

Scores on Scales Measuring EVALUATIONS of FUNCTIONS of the Public Relations Practitioner

Main Effects:

Between PUBLICS
Between FUNCTIONS

Interaction:

PUBLICS x FUNCTIONS

Figure 1. Factorial Analysis Paradigm Illustrating How Variables are Juxtaposed

The results of the cluster analysis for each group were compared by computing a product-moment correlation coefficient. Such a computation correlates the similarity of semantic structures for different groups, in this study, the three groups of PUBLICS. In other words, the researcher determined if PUBLICS perceive concepts of FUNCTIONS in a like manner.

Chapter IV, Results of the Study, will discuss the responses to the survey, and tests of the research questions.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the general evaluations of four publics about five of the major acts performed by the public relations Practitioner.

Specifically, the study was concerned with determining the different evaluations held by Business Editors, Business Educators, Practitioners, and Corporate Executives about the Practitioner's performance of five major functions or duties: Press Relations, Employee Relations, Financial Relations, Community Relations, and Government Relations.

Using the statistical procedures outlined in the previous chapter, calculations were carried out to determine whether or not significant differences were present among the general attitudes of PUBLICS on the combined FUNCTIONS being investigated.

The study also asked which of the areas of FUNCTIONS were viewed differently by the population regardless of the group of PUBLICS to which they belonged.

Additionally, the study sought to discover if the areas of FUNCTIONS were viewed in a different manner because of the division of PUBLICS to which the respondents belonged.

The study also was concerned with the areas of FUNCTIONS each group of PUBLICS viewed in a similar manner.

Finally, each group of PUBLICS' perception of performance of FUNCTIONS was correlated to see how closely their perceptions agreed.

The Semantic Differential (SD) was administered as the measuring instrument to gauge general attitudes of PUBLICS about performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner.

Each respondent to the study rated every area of FUNCTIONS on a series of seven-point, bi-polar adjective rating scales. The rating was made according to the respondent's evaluation of the relatedness or association of the adjective to the given area of FUNCTIONS.

Every respondent yielded a mean score on 10 scales over each division of FUNCTIONS. The respondents which together comprised a specific segment of PUBLICS indicated a mean agreement of general attitude toward the Practitioner's performance of each area of FUNCTIONS.

For purposes of scoring consistency, the author uniformly assigned the unfavorable poles of the evaluative scales (bad, incomplete, untimely, etc.) the score "1," and the favorable poles (good, complete, timely, etc.) the score "7."

Response

Questionnaire booklets were mailed to 400 randomly selected subjects, and 174 usable responses were received. The return percentages among the different groups of PUBLICS is indicated in Table I.

In the composition of the booklet, the author provided a place for respondents to indicate their affiliation with one of the four groups of PUBLICS. If the booklet indicated that the respondent was not closely identified with the specific group sought, his booklet was considered unusable.

TABLE I

RESPONSE BY THE PUBLICS AND PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS

PUBLICS	Sample Size	Usuable Responses	
Practitioners	100	64	64%
Business Editors	100	60	60%
Business Educators	100	50	50%
[Corporate Executives]	[100]	[14]	[14%]
Total	300	174	58%

The most flagrant violators of the check system were Corporate Executives. The author received 37 responses from "Corporate Executives," yet only 14 indicated that a Corporate Executive completed the booklet. The remaining 23 booklets were completed by the corporation's public relations Practitioners.

Due to the invalid responses from the Corporate Executives, the few usuable responses were not considered enough to warrant their inclusion in the statistical analyses of the study.

Many of the respondents did enter comments about the Practitioner's performance of FUNCTIONS. Most of the comments were general and either favorable or unfavorable.

A number of respondents in each of the groups of PUBLICS indicated a strong interest in the results of the study, asking for a copy of the final study. A Business Editor in Arizona even phoned the researcher about obtaining a copy of the study.

One Business Educator mailed to the author a magazine article concerned with the problems the Practitioner faces in his relations with the company president.

A Practitioner, who taught a public relations class at a university, copied the questionnaire booklet and gave it to his class to see his students' perceptions of the Practitioner's performance of FUNCTIONS.

Other persons wrote and said they would prefer not to respond because of their bias or lack of time. A few said they could not generalize enough to answer the questionnaire. These few indicated they might respond if the questionnaire specifically identified the Practitioner in the booklet.

Overall, the negative responses were few compared to the total respondents of the study.

Tests of Research Questions

Prior to turning to the five research questions posed in Chapter III and the four statistical treatments of the usable data, an overview of general attitudes about performance of FUNCTIONS of the PR Practitioner is appropriate. As indicated earlier, a mean score of each respondent was calculated on each area of FUNCTIONS. The respondent's mean score was combined with other mean scores of members of his level and a general mean was obtained. The overall mean gave an indication of that group of PUBLICS' general attitude about the performance of a principal duty of the Practitioner.

Direction of attitude, favorable or unfavorable, is indicated by the selection of the polar adjectives by the subjects. Osgood (35, pp. 191-192) said that a score which falls at the origin ("4") is to be taken as an index of neutrality of attitude. The intensity of attitude is indexed by how far away from the origin the score lies. There are only three levels of favorable or unfavorable intensity. The three levels are "slightly" (5), "quite" (6), and "extremely" (7). (35, p. 192)

Table II, page 52, projects the mean scores of PUBLICS for FUNCTIONS and vice versa. The tabulated data reflect the judgments of 174 respondents, who provided a total of 8,700 raw scores. Four statistical treatments--Two-Factor Mixed Design factorial analysis of variance, t-Test for differences among means, Distance-Cluster Analysis, Product Moment Correlation--were applied to seek more meaningful analy-

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PARADIGM: MEAN SCORES

FOR FUNCTIONS BY PUBLICS

		PUBLICS			
		Practitioners	Business Editors	Business Educators	Means
FUNCTIONS	Press Relations	5.02	4.90	4.67	4.86
	Employee Relations	4.66	4.78	4.29	4.58
	Community Relations	5.00	4.94	4.65	4.86
	Government Relations	4.34	4.74	4.22	4.43
	Financial Relations	5.23	5.35	4.74	5.11
	Means	4.85	4.94	4.51	4.77 Grand Mean

ses of the data reflected in Table II. The statistical treatments will illuminate the previously asked research questions. These questions will be repeated as the data are introduced in this chapter.

To answer the first three research questions, the researcher sought to determine if the differences in the mean scores were greater than the differences which could be expected by chance. In other words, is there a statistically significant difference in the means of the independent variables?

A level of significance with a high probability tells one that there is a relationship between the independent variable (or variables) and the dependent variable. A high level of significance is considered to be $<.05$. This level implies that if the research procedure were conducted 100 times, only 5 times in 100 would the differences between means occur by chance. In other words, it is not simply a question of one mean being greater than another. It is, rather, a question of whether one mean differs from another mean beyond the difference to be expected on the basis of chance.

Research questions 1, 2, and 3 asked by the author are illustrated in Analysis of Variance F-Ratio Table III. The key information is found in the F-ratios and their corresponding level of significance.

1. Are there significant differences among Business Editors, Business Educators, and Practitioners in their evaluations of the performance of the combined five functions by the public relations Practitioner?

Based on the data projected in Table II, a relative order of PUBLICS' mean scores for the five areas of FUNCTIONS is possible.

TABLE III

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F-RATIO

Source	ss	df	ms	F	p
Total	1095.52	869			
Between Subjects	613.67	173			
Publics	27.12	2	13.56	3.94	.05
Error_b	586.55	171	3.44		
Within Subjects	481.85	696			
Functions	50.49	4	12.62	20.35	.001
Functions x Publics	6.68	8	.83	1.33	n.s.
Error_w	424.68	684	.62		

PUBLICS

Rank		Mean
1.	Business Editors	4.94
2.	Practitioners	4.85
3.	Business Educators	4.51

Figure 2. Relative Order of PUBLICS and Means for Five Areas of FUNCTIONS

Are the three mean scores of the PUBLICS for areas of FUNCTIONS due to real differences among the PUBLICS? As indicated in the Analysis of Variance F-Ratio Table, the level of significance among PUBLICS is significant or the means are different than one would ordinarily expect from chance. There are meaningful differences among the three groups of PUBLICS in evaluations of performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner.

Albeit the level of .05 indicated that there was a significant difference among the means for the PUBLICS, it did not specify the differences. The t-Test for Differences Among Several Means was used to see if there were significant differences for the three combinations of means. (2, pp. 112-115) The critical differences for the means to be significant were .21 at the .05 level and .33 at the .001 level. The t-Test results of combination of PUBLICS' means, showing levels of significance, are found in Table IV.

The t-Test indicated that there was no significant difference between the means of Business Editors and Practitioners regarding their evaluations of the Practitioner's performance of FUNCTIONS. The test did, however, point to significant differences between Business Editors and Business Educators, and between Practitioners and Business Educators. The difference between each combination of means was more than one would expect by chance. The differences as large as those observed among the means would occur by chance no more than one time in 1,000.

TABLE IV

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG PUBLICS

PUBLICS	Mean	PUBLICS	Mean	d	p
Business Editors	(4.94)	Practitioners	(4.85)	.09	n.s.
Business Editors	(4.94)	Business Educators	(4.51)	.43	.001
Practitioners	(4.85)	Business Educators	(4.51)	.44	.001

2. Are there significant differences among Press Relations, Employee Relations, Community Relations, Financial Relations, and Government Relations performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner as evaluated by the combined three publics?

Again, using the data in Table II, a relative order of FUNCTIONS mean scores for the three groups of PUBLICS is possible.

Are there significant differences of mean scores by the respondents among the areas of performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner? As indicated in Table III, the Analysis of Variance F-Ratio Table, the probability is significant at least at the .001 level. Thus, there are meaningful differences among the five areas of performance of FUNCTIONS by the PR Practitioner as perceived by three groups of PUBLICS. Differences as large as those observed among the means probably would occur by chance or random fluctuation less than one time in 1,000.

FUNCTIONS

Rank		Mean
1.	Financial Relations	5.11
2.	Press Relations	4.86
3.	Community Relations	4.86
4.	Employee Relations	4.58
5.	Government Relations	4.43

Figure 3. Relative Order of Functions and Means for Three Groups of Publics

The level of .001 indicated that there was a significant difference in the mean scores of FUNCTIONS. But the statistical treatment told the author only that there was a significant difference between the highest, Financial Relations, 5.11, and the lowest, Government Relations, 4.43.

Again, the t-Test for Differences Among Several Means was used to determine if there were significant differences for the combination of all means. (2, pp. 112-115) The critical differences for significant means were .16 at the .05 level and .27 at the .001 level. The t-Test results of combination of means of FUNCTIONS, with levels of significance, are shown in Table V.

The t-Test indicated that 8 of the 10 possible combinations among the FUNCTIONS means were at a significant level. Only two combinations of means, Press Relations vs. Community Relations, and Employee Relations vs. Government Relations could occur by chance more than 5 times in 100. The respondents to the survey viewed the Practitioner's performance of FUNCTIONS by the Practitioner as being significantly different in 8 of the 10 possible combinations. In other words, the various mean scores for the Practitioner's performance of FUNCTIONS did constitute very real differences among evaluations of the FUNCTIONS.

TABLE V

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG FUNCTIONS

FUNCTIONS	Mean	FUNCTIONS	Mean	d	p
Financial Relations	(5.11)	Government Relations	(4.43)	.68	.001
Financial Relations	(5.11)	Employee Relations	(4.58)	.53	.001
Financial Relations	(5.11)	Community Relations	(4.86)	.25	.05
Financial Relations	(5.11)	Press Relations	(4.86)	.25	.05
Press Relations	(4.86)	Government Relations	(4.43)	.43	.001
Press Relations	(4.86)	Employee Relations	(4.58)	.28	.001
Press Relations	(4.86)	Community Relations	(4.86)	.00	n.s.
Community Relations	(4.86)	Government Relations	(4.43)	.43	.001
Community Relations	(4.86)	Employee Relations	(4.58)	.28	.001
Employee Relations	(4.58)	Government Relations	(4.43)	.15	n.s.

3. Are there significant differences among the results of the interaction effects of PUBLICS and FUNCTIONS?

Table III, page 54, shows a non-significant interaction F-ratio of 1.12. Membership in a particular group of PUBLICS did not make a difference in the evaluations of the five areas of FUNCTIONS performed by the Practitioner. The mean scores were not different enough from the grand mean of 4.77 to be statistically significant. The differences in the scores from the grand mean were not enough to have not occurred by chance more than five times in 100.

As an example, Business Editors' evaluations of the Practitioner's performance of FUNCTIONS are not significantly different from the other two groups of PUBLICS, the Business Educators and the Practitioners.

Thus, the two independent variables, FUNCTIONS and PUBLICS, operated independently and not upon or with each other.

The answers to research questions 4 and 5 are based on the information projected by the Distance-Cluster Analysis and the Product Moment Correlations, respectively.

4. Do any two or more performances of functions by the Practitioner have similar "semantic meaning space" among the three groups of PUBLICS?

In other words, does any group of the PUBLICS view any two or more of the concepts (FUNCTIONS) in a similar manner?

If two concepts are close together in semantic space, they are alike in meaning for the group of PUBLICS making the judgment. Conversely, if the concepts are separated in semantic space, they differ in meaning. Thus, the measurement needed is the distance between the concepts within each group of PUBLICS.

The author used the Distance-Cluster Analysis to measure the distance between concepts for each group of PUBLICS. The analysis resulted in the Distance-Matrix for Practitioners shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI

DISTANCE-MATRIX FOR PRACTITIONERS

	Press	Employee	Community	Government	Financial
Press	0.00	1.40	0.62	2.20	0.89
Employee	1.40	0.00	1.24	1.09	1.99
Community	0.62	1.24	0.00	2.16	0.89
Government	2.20	1.09	2.16	0.00	2.89
Financial	0.89	1.99	0.89	2.89	0.00

There are several ways to analyze the D-matrix. Basically, all are designed to search out concepts that cluster together. In this study, a cluster is a subset of the set of FUNCTIONS, the members of which are closer to each other than they are to members outside the cluster.

The smaller the distance between any two concepts, the closer they are in meaning for the group of PUBLICS being studied.

One way to analyze the D-matrix is to pair the small D's to define clusters of concepts. Looking at the first row in Table VI, one can see that the D's for Press and Community and also for Press and Financial are small. Looking across the second row, one can see that Employees and Government have a small D, forming another small cluster.

The analysis has emphasized two clusters of concepts for Practitioners:

1. Press, Community and Financial
2. Employee and Government

The areas of FUNCTIONS in each cluster have similar semantic spaces or meanings for the Practitioners.

Table VII represents the D-matrix for Business Editors:

TABLE VII

DISTANCE-MATRIX FOR BUSINESS EDITORS

	Press	Employee	Community	Government	Financial
Press	0.00	1.03	0.66	0.98	1.67
Employee	1.03	0.00	0.96	0.70	1.94
Community	0.66	0.96	0.00	0.92	1.51
Government	0.98	0.70	0.92	0.00	2.07
Financial	1.67	1.94	1.51	2.07	0.00

Looking across the first row in Table VII, one can see that the D's for Press and Community are small. The second row indicates that Employee and Government have a small D of .70. It forms the second cluster.

Therefore, the analysis has emphasized three clusters of FUNCTIONS:

1. Press and Community

2. Employee and Government

3. Financial

The D-matrix for Business Educators is represented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

DISTANCE-MATRIX FOR BUSINESS EDUCATORS

	Press	Employee	Community	Government	Financial
Press	0.00	1.39	0.57	1.54	0.90
Employee	1.39	0.00	1.23	0.57	1.48
Community	0.57	1.23	0.00	1.43	0.74
Government	1.54	0.57	1.43	0.00	1.71
Financial	0.90	1.48	0.74	1.71	0.00

Small D's of .57 and .90 between Press and Community and Press and Financial, respectively, form the first cluster. Employee and Government form a second cluster. Business Educators have two clusters of concepts:

1. Press, Community, and Financial

2. Employee and Government

In summary, each group of PUBLICS possessed at least two clusters of concepts. Each group of PUBLICS viewed the concepts within its respective cluster as having similar meanings.

Having answered research question 4, the writer presents the last question posed:

> 5. Is there a similarity of semantic structures of three publics as they perceive the performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner?

The foregoing question is answered by correlating each of the three D-matrices with one another. In other words, the D-matrix of Practitioners is correlated with the D-matrix of Business Editors and of Business Educators. The D-matrix of Business Editors is correlated with Business Educators.

Is there a relationship among the D-matrices of the three levels of PUBLICS? By using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation technique, the correlation coefficients were computed. Was each coefficient greater than would be expected by chance or random sample fluctuation? To answer this question, the levels of significance were obtained by using a modified t-test. (2, p. 155) The correlation coefficients, the t values, and the levels of significance may be examined in Table IX.

Table IX indicates that r = .89 between Practitioners and Business Educators in the same sample of respondents would occur through random sample fluctuation less than 2 times in 1,000. Practitioners and Business Educators would show greater than chance relationship 999 times in 1,000.

Summary

This chapter has presented, with brief discussion, the data obtained in the study and the analyses of those data. Consideration was given to the significant differences among PUBLICS (Research Question One), among FUNCTIONS (Question Two), and of interaction effects of

PUBLICS and FUNCTIONS (Question Three). Also presented was the similarity of meaning space among the PUBLICS (Question Four) and the relationship of meaning space among the three groups of PUBLICS (Question Five).

TABLE IX

DISTANCE-MATRICES CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

PUBLICS	r	t	p
Practitioners vs. Business Educators	.89	5.4913	<.001
Practitioners vs. Business Editors	.45	1.4220	n.s.
Business Educators vs. Business Editors	.44	1.3816	n.s.

It was noted that there were significant differences among Practitioners, Business Editors, and Business Educators on their evaluations of performance of FUNCTIONS by the PR Practitioner and that there were no significant differences due to interaction effects of PUBLICS and FUNCTIONS.

There were meaningful differences among the five performances within FUNCTIONS by the Practitioner. Of the 10 possible combinations between means of areas of FUNCTIONS, 8 were at a significant probability of at least .05. Only two combinations of means, Press Relations vs. Community Relations and Employee Relations vs. Government Relations, could have occurred by chance more than 5 times in 100. In other words, evaluations of the Practitioner's performance of FUNCTIONS constituted very real differences, more so than one would expect by chance.

Each of the three groups of PUBLICS viewed some of the areas of FUNCTIONS in a similar manner. The Practitioners evaluated Press, Community, and Financial Relations in a like manner. Also, Employee and Government Relations were considered similar in their evaluations. Although to a different degree, Business Educators evaluated the same concepts in a manner similar to the Practitioners.

Business Editors, however, viewed the concepts of FUNCTIONS in a different manner from Business Educators and Practitioners. Of the five areas of FUNCTIONS, the Business Editors evaluated Press and Community Relations alike, Employee and Government Relations similarly, and Financial Relations apart from the other four. Obviously, there was not a very high correlation between the Business Editors' views of FUNCTIONS and those of the other two groups of PUBLICS.

The others, Practitioners and Business Educators, did have a correlation coefficient of .89. The coefficient was significant at the .001 level. Such a correlation between Practitioners and Educators would occur through random fluctuation less than 2 times in 1,000. The two groups of PUBLICS would show greater than chance relationship 999 times in 1,000.

On the basis of the data obtained and the analyses completed, each of the five research questions was answered.

Chapter V will summarize the study and offer conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

For at least 35 years the public relations profession has been plagued by a kind of internal neurosis growing out of its "image" problems, i.e., what is encompassed by public relations, are there common understandings of its function, both inside and outside the profession, etc. Based upon the field's solid growth, it is generally accepted as a necessary management tool, at least in good times. But despite its growing acceptance, there is evidence of continued misunderstanding about it.

The literature suggests that at least five functions are vital. Those functions--Press Relations, Community Relations, Employee Relations, Government Relations, and Financial Relations--are crucial in most enterprises. Despite widespread disagreement on other matters, the five functions listed above draw widespread support within the profession as crucial ones. For public relations as practiced in business and industry, the literature also seems to suggest that these publics are crucial: Business Educators, Business Editors, Corporate Executives, and the public relations Practitioners themselves.

A careful and exhaustive review of the literature revealed no other studies impinging upon the present research, in terms of the methodology applied. The semantic differential, a relatively new tool, has not been applied to the problem considered herein. While hundreds of theses and dissertations have been done on the subject of public relations, most have been descriptive or biographical-historical in nature. Relatively few have included statistical tests for significance.

The participants in this study were 64 Practitioners, 60 Business Editors, and 50 Business Educators representing each of three populations considered by the literature to be important to the public relations profession. A fourth public, Corporate Executives, was originally considered for the investigation. Because of inadequate response, this category was dropped from the study. The participants represented colleges of business, newspapers, or membership in the Public Relations Society of America, Inc., for the year 1970. The 174 subjects were from 39 different states and one foreign country. All of the respondents had been randomly selected from larger populations based upon widely accepted membership lists.

The instrument used to obtain the evaluations of the three groups of PUBLICS was the semantic differential. The researcher selected the bi-polar adjective scales which he thought would best measure the evaluative dimension to be used. The evaluative dimension is related to a person's tendency to judge something as good or bad.

The instrument was designed so that a subject could rate a given concept (e.g., a function) on a series of ten seven-point, bi-polar adjective rating scales. The rating was made according to the subject's evaluation of the relatedness or association of the adjective to the given concept.

Every participant responded to each of the concepts on the scales which constituted an attitude expression range of "neutral" to "very closely related." Their composite responses indicated four levels of favorable or unfavorable intensity from "neutral" to "extremely."

Statistical calculations were completed by the author through the use of the Oklahoma State University Computer Center. A factorial analysis of variance using the two variables of FUNCTIONS and PUBLICS was completed for each of the scales, the eight categories of the two variables, and for the total instrument (see Appendix B) so that research questions 1, 2, and 3 would be answered.

The first research question set forth for this study asked:

> Are there significant differences among Business Editors, Business Educators, and Practitioners in their evaluations of the performance of the combined five functions by the public relations Practitioner?

The factorial analysis of variance indicated that there were significant differences among the PUBLICS' means, i.e., the differences of the means were greater than one would expect from chance. The analysis projected a significant difference of .05 among the three groups of PUBLICS. In a follow-up test to determine the levels of significance, two of the three combinations of PUBLICS means were significant at the .001 level.

The second research question posed for this study asked:

> Are there significant differences among Press Relations, Community Relations, Financial Relations, Employee Relations, and Government Relations performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner as evaluated by the combined three publics?

The factorial analysis of variance showed a significant difference of $<.05$ among the means of the FUNCTIONS. In a follow-up test of means of FUNCTIONS, it was determined that 8 of the 10 possible combinations differed significantly at the .05 level.

The third research question asked:

> Are there significant differences among the results of the interaction effects of PUBLICS and FUNCTIONS?

The analysis of variance indicated that there was non-significant interaction. The differences in the scores were insufficient not to have occurred by chance more than 5 times in 100.

A Distance-Cluster Analysis and a Product-Moment Correlation were employed to answer research questions 4 and 5, respectively.

In the Distance-Cluster Analysis, the scores of each of the ten scales, for each area of FUNCTIONS, and for each group of PUBLICS, were calculated by the University Computer Center (see Appendix C) in answer to research question 4, which asked:

> Do any two or more performances of FUNCTIONS by the Practitioner have similar "semantic meaning space" among the three groups of PUBLICS?

The analysis indicated two clusters of areas within FUNCTIONS for Practitioners:

1. Press, Community, and Financial
2. Employee and Government

The areas of FUNCTIONS in each cluster have similar semantic spaces or meanings for the Practitioners.

The cluster analysis projected three clusters within FUNCTIONS for the Business Editors:

1. Press and Community
2. Employee and Government
3. Financial

Analysis of data from Business Educators has produced two clusters:

1. Press, Community, and Financial

2. Employee and Government

Each of the three groups of PUBLICS possessed at least two clusters of concepts. Each group of PUBLICS viewed the concepts within its respective cluster as having similar meanings.

So that question 5 would be answered, the Distance-matrix of each group of PUBLICS was correlated with all other groups. Relationships among the D-matrices of PUBLICS were realized by using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation to compute correlation coefficients.

The final question in the study asked:

> Is there a similarity of semantic structures of three publics as they perceive the performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner?

The relationship between Practitioners and Business Editors was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The same was true regarding the relationship of Business Educators and Business Editors.

There was, however, a significant correlation at $>.001$ level between Practitioners and Business Educators. Practitioners and Business Educators would show greater than chance relationship 999 times in 1,000.

In conclusion, significant differences were found among PUBLICS and among FUNCTIONS of the public relations practitioner. There were no significant differences in the interaction effects of PUBLICS and FUNCTIONS. Each of the groups of PUBLICS possessed at least two clusters in which certain areas of FUNCTIONS were viewed in a similar manner. When correlating the perceptions regarding FUNCTIONS, a very high correlation was noted between Practitioners and Business Educators. Each of the five research questions was answered.

Conclusions

It was the purpose of this study to determine the evaluations of three salient publics with reference to the performance of five major functions by the PR Practitioner. On the basis of the results of this study, the following conclusions seem valid.

1. Significant differences are present among the mean scores of the three groups of PUBLICS. Of the three, only the means between Business Editors and Practitioners could have occurred by chance more than 5 times in 100.

2. Business Editors and Practitioners evaluated the performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner significantly more favorably than did Business Educators.

3. Significant differences do exist between the mean scores of the respondents regarding performance of FUNCTIONS by the PR Practitioner. The PUBLICS did see a significant difference in the performance of FUNCTIONS by the Practitioner except between Press Relations and Community Relations, and between Employee Relations and Government Relations.

4. Financial Relations was considered the most favorable performance of the five areas of FUNCTIONS. Government Relations was thought to be the least favorable performance by the Practitioner.

5. All of the areas of FUNCTIONS were evaluated in a favorable manner, although not to a very high degree. Most of the FUNCTIONS were thought to be just above the neutrality area and close to the "slightly" favorable area of intensity. Financial Relations was considered past the "slightly" favorable range and toward the "quite" favorable level of intensity by the respondents.

6. Such evaluations underscore the thought suggested in the literature that the image of public relations is hazy at present. The favorable attitudes of the different publics were not very strong in intensity regarding the performance of five functions by the Practitioner.

7. Each group of PUBLICS did view some areas of FUNC-

TIONS in a similar manner. The Practitioners considered the performance of Press, Community, and Financial Relations functions to be about the same. Likewise, they thought Employee and Government Relations were at about the same level of performance.

8. Business Editors considered Press and Community functions similarly. As had the Practitioners, they also viewed the Employee and Government Relations functions alike. The performance of Financial Relations by the Practitioner was thought to be different enough from the other four functions to constitute a third cluster.

9. Perceptions by Business Educators were similar to the Practitioners' clusters of performance of FUNCTIONS by the public relations Practitioner. The two groups of PUBLICS correlated very highly in their views. Such a correlation between the two groups would occur through random fluctuation less than 2 times in 1,000.

It should be remembered that the conclusions mentioned above are based on a limited study of three different publics and five types of functions as defined on page 38. Any generalizations based upon these conclusions, or the data of the study, should not be carried beyond the populations surveyed.

Recommendations

On the basis of the study's findings, certain recommendations seem justified both for the present situation and for future research in this area.

Concerning the PUBLICS and FUNCTIONS used in this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. The Public Relations Society of America should initiate efforts to inform the PUBLICS of the role which the public relations Practitioner is expected to fulfill.

2. In order to inform the subjects involved in this study, copies or summaries of this study should be mailed to each of the respondents.

3. So that the importance of the study can be projected, copies or summaries of the study should be distributed to those persons who were selected in the samples but failed to respond.

4. Implementation of recommendations 2 and 3 should consist of a cover letter from the PRSA which briefly would state the reason for its interest in the study. The letter should also stimulate feedback from the different publics and the PRSA should respond accordingly.

5. Continual efforts should be undertaken to evaluate the public relations Practitioner's performance of basic duties.

Future research in the areas considered in this study could and should take many forms, always with the one aim of improving the image of the public relations Practitioner through the performance of his varied functions. The following recommendations related to future research seem worthy:

1. This study should be replicated. Such replication should serve to strengthen the instrument used and to either support or fail to support the present findings.

2. Research should be undertaken to obtain systematic continual evaluations of the specific performance of functions by the public relations Practitioner. The present instrument was used to gather general evaluations.

3. Another instrument and method might be used to specifically measure each of the variables which together combine to form a major PR act or duty. Only then will there be a determination of specific points of success or failure in performance by the Practitioner.

4. There are other publics which are important to the PR profession. Also, there are other functions performed by the Practitioner than those noted in this study. Efforts should be initiated to identify these other publics and functions and to determine their general and specific evaluations of the work of the Practitioner.

5. Efforts to determine general and specific evaluations of the Practitioner's performance will be a major task. The author would not recommend that the research be conducted solely in the national offices of the Public Relations Society of America or the Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education. The procedure to obtain the evaluations of the Practitioner should be carefully planned in the New York offices, but the actual data gathering should be done by each of the PRSA chapters throughout the United States. After each chapter gathered the data, the data should be forwarded to New York for the major statistical calculations and conclusions. Such a project should be initiated by the Society's national offices and accepted by its chapters as a valuable project for the profession.

In summary, possibilities for research in all areas of public relations are limited only by available resources. Although some studies which give limited impressions of the public relations profession have been completed, an exploratory study such as this one should stimulate useful replications. It would appear that the public relations profession is a neglected area of meaningful research. Research such as that mentioned above should be started immediately and should be done continually by persons who are sincerely interested in the state of the PR profession.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aspley, John Cameron and L. F. Van Houton. The Dartnell Public Relations Handbook. Chicago: The Dartnell Corporation, 1956.

2. Bruning, James L. and B. L. Kintz. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.

3. Belson, Walter W. "How to Assure Good Relations with Government." Public Relations Handbook. Ed. Phillip Lesly. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

4. Berlo, David K. The Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

5. Black, Marvin M. and Rex F. Harlow. Practical Public Relations. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.

6. Buckalew, James K. and Robert W. Clyde. "Intermedia Standardization: A Q-Analysis of News Editors," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 46, pp. 349-351.

7. Burger, Chester. "The Crucial Gap in Public Relations." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 18 (April, 1962), pp. 18-20.

8. Canfield, Bertrand R. Public Relations Principles, Cases, and Problems. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.

9. Carter, Lorenzo Edward. "News Values of Editors-Reporters on Five Oklahoma Newspapers." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1970).

10. Center, Allen H. and Scott M. Cutlip. Effective Public Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

11. Cheney, Richard E. "Financial Public Relations in a Fast Buck Market." Current Thoughts on Public Relations. Ed. Malcom M. Johnson, Thomas A. Kindre, Will H. Yolen. New York: M. W. Lads Publishing Company, 1968.

12. Childs, Harwood L. "The Basic Problem of Public Relations." Perspectives in Public Relations. Ed. Raymond Simon. Norman: University Press, 1966.

13. Cookman, Aubrey O., Richard W. Darrow and Dan J. Forrestal. The Dartnell Public Relations Handbook. Chicago: The Dartnell Corporation, 1967.

14. Darrow, Richard W. "Public Relations: How Good Are We?" Current Thoughts on Public Relations. Ed. Malcom M. Johnson, Thomas Kindre, Will H. Yolen. New York: M. W. Lads Publishing Company, 1968.

15. "Does PR Need Public Relations?" Public Relations Journal, Vol. 26 (March, 1970), pp. 11-13.

16. Finn, David. Public Relations and Management. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1966.

17. Fisher, Emil, Jr. "The Public Relations Wire Service and Selected Chicago News Media." Journalism Abstracts, Vol. 3. Ed. Wayne A. Danielson, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1965.

18. Harlow, Rex F. Practical Public Relations. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1947.

19. Gribbin, August. "Once a Pitchman, Now He's 'Relenavt'." The National Observer, Vol. 9, Number 35 (August 31, 1970).

20. Heise, David R. "Semantic Differential Profiles for 1,000 Most Frequent English Words." Psychological Monographs, Vol. 79, No. 8. Ed. Gregory A. Kimble. Washington, D.C.: The American Psychological Association, Inc., 1965.

21. Hendry, Gordon. "A Challenge for PR." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 9 (September, 1953), pp. 5-6.

22. Huddleston, Tom. "Public Relations Analysis of American Airlines," (Unpublished Master's Thesis, East Texas State University, 1964).

23. Hughes, Anthony D. "Trends in Financial Relations." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 26 (October, 1970), pp. 101-106.

24. Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

25. Kindre, Thomas A. "Industrial Editing: Six Conceits to Demolish." Current Thoughts on Public Relations. Ed. Malcom M. Johnson, Thomas A. Kindre, Will H. Yolen. New York: M. W. Lads Publishing Company, 1968.

26. Lerbinger, Otto and Albert J. Sullivan. Information, Influence & Communication. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

27. Lerbinger, Otto. "The Social Function of Public Relations." Information, Influence & Communication. Ed. Otto Lerbinger and Albert J. Sullivan. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

28. Lesly, Phillip. "Exactly What Is Public Relations?" Public Relations Handbook. Ed. Phillip Lesly. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

29. Manning, Bayless. "A Book Review of The American Stockholder by Joseph A. Livingston." Information, Influence & Communication. Ed. Otto Lerbinger and Albert J. Sullivan. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

30. Marston, John E. The Nature of Public Relations. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

31. Miller, Kleber R. "PR--An Inward Look." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 10 (June, 1954), pp. 3-5.

32. Miller, Raymond W. and William A. Nielander. Public Relations. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1951.

33. Nathans, Robert. "Meeting Press Criticism of PR Practice." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 10 (December, 1954), pp. 10-11.

34. Michols, Harold and Raymond G. Smith. "Semantic Differential Stability As A Function of Meaning Domain," (Unpublished paper, Indiana University, no date given).

35. Osgood, Charles E., George J. Susi and Percy H. Tannenbaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

36. Parten, Mildred Bernice. Surveys, Polls, and Samples. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1966.

37. Peek, Wilbur J. "Community Relations." Public Relations Handbook. Ed. Phillip Lesly. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

38. Pimlott, J. A. "Public Relations Down to Earth." Information, Influence & Communication. Ed. Otto Lerbinger and Albert J. Sullivan. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

39. "Public Relations Today." Business Week (July 2, 1960), pp. 41-62.

40. Rhoades, George R. "News Values and News Decisions of Selected Associated Press and United Press International Newsmen in Oklahoma," (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1971).

41. Roalman, Arthur R. Profitable Public Relations. Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin, Inc., 1968.

42. Robinson, Edward J. Communications and Public Relations. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merril Books, 1966.

43. Safire, William L. The Relations Explosion. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963.

44. Sandberg, Robert A. "New Roles for PR Managers." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 26 (October, 1970), pp. 101-106.

45. Sanger, Edward F. "Does Public Relations Need Public Relations." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 15 (February, 1959), pp. 13-17.

46. Sauerhaft, Stanley. "How to Reach Your Shareholders by Really Trying." Current Thoughts on Public Relations. Ed. Malcom M. Johnson, Thomas A. Kindre, Will H. Yolen. New York: M. W. Lads Publishing Company, 1968.

47. Schabacker, William. "Public Relations and the News Media. A Study of the Selected and Utilization by Representative Milwaukee News Media of Public Relations Sources." Journalism Abstracts, Vol. 1. Ed. Wayne A. Danielson, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1963.

48. Schafer, John S. "What the Editor Thinks About Publicity." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 25 (January, 1969), pp. 22-24.

49. Schoenfield, Clarence A. Publicity Media and Methods. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963.

50. Simon, Raymond. Perspectives in Public Relations. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966.

51. Strickland, Richard A. "PR Question of the Month." Public Relations Journal, Vol. 7 (September, 1951), pp. 13-14.

52. Teahan, Frederick H. (Unpublished letter to Tom Huddleston, Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education, New York, 1970).

53. Ward, Walter J. "News Values, News Situations and News Selections: An Intensive Study of Ten City Editors," (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967).

54. Williams, Archibald. "Employee Relations." Public Relations Handbook. Ed. Phillip Lesly. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

The first introductory letter was printed inside the booklet and was used only in the first mailing. The second introductory letter was printed inside the booklet and was used in the second and third follow-ups. The third letter was included in the last follow-up, but not printed inside the booklet.

Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education

New York, New York

and

Oklahoma State University
School of Journalism-Broadcasting

Stillwater, Oklahoma

ask your brief cooperation in the study

"Evaluations of Functions of the Public Relations Practitioner"

Dear Sir:

Please know that we are aware of your busy schedule; therefore, your response to the following questionnaire will require only a few moments of your time.

We want your evaluations of five of the major acts or duties of the public relations practitioner. In your opinion, is the practitioner doing a good job in his work? A bad job? Is his work meaningful or meaningless? Worthwhile or worthless? What kind of image do you have of the practitioner's work?

The results of your questionnaire will be added to the responses of other corporate presidents, business-financial editors, business deans, and public relations practitioners located throughout the United States.

We have asked you, a business-financial editor, to respond because of the direct contact you have with public relations practitioners or their news releases.

This study is very important to the public relations profession. The results of the study may enable public relations practitioners to do their work more effectively. It also will give the public relations profession a basic foundation on which to initiate more research concerning its effectiveness.

Your response is most important. You were specifically chosen from a large number of potential subjects; therefore, we are counting on your evaluations. Please complete this questionnaire at your earliest convenience; then, return it in the enclosed, postage paid envelope. Thank you for your help in this important matter.

Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education
New York, New York

Oklahoma State University School of Journalism-Broadcasting
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Dear Sir,

Recently, we mailed to you a questionnaire booklet. When you complete the booklet, it will reflect your general attitudes or "feelings" about the work of the public relations practitioner. To date, we have not received your booklet.

Won't you please respond? You were specifically chosen for the study; therefore, your response is necessary before the study can be completed. Please, take only a few moments, complete the brief questionnaire, and place it in the postage-paid envelope which is enclosed.

We want your own evaluations of five of the major acts or duties of the public relations practitioner. In your opinion, is the practitioner doing a good job in his work? What kind of image do you have of the public relations practitioner's work?

It's understandable that you may not be familiar with any or only a few of the practitioner's principal acts or duties. However, we believe that you have some belief about how well he might perform his work. No doubt, you have some thoughts about his efforts. In other words, you have some kind of idea about his performance. This general attitude or idea is what the study is after.

We have asked you, a public relations practitioner, to respond because of the influence and interest you have within and about your profession.

This study is very important to the public relations profession. The results of the study may enable public relations practitioners to do their work more effectively. It also will give the public relations profession a basic foundation on which to initiate more research concerning its effectiveness.

Sincere thanks for your help in this important project.

Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education
New York, New York

Oklahoma State University School of Journalism-Broadcasting
Stillwater, Oklahoma

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

School of Journalism and Broadcasting 74074
(405) 372-6211, Exts. 477, 478, 479

Wednesday, April 28, you were mailed a questionnaire booklet which sought your general attitudes or "feelings" about public relations practitioners' work. The brief questionnaire is sponsored by the Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education, New York, New York, and the Oklahoma State University School of Journalism/Broadcasting, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

To date, your booklet has not been received. Won't you please respond? You were specifically chosen for the study; therefore, your response is necessary before the study can be completed.

Please, take only a few moments, complete the brief questionnaire, and place it in the postage-paid envelope which was enclosed in the earlier mailing.

Thank you very much. Obviously, your response is most important to this study.

Very truly yours,

Tom Huddleston

TH/tm

Instructions

The purpose of this study is to measure how well you think the practitioner is performing five different functions.

On each page of this booklet you will find different functions of the public relations practitioner to be judged and beneath it a set of scales on which you can indicate your judgement. You are to rate the function on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

Press Relations

The public relations practitioner secures the goodwill and cooperation of newspaper editors in the publication of news and articles about a corporation.

Now, how well do you think he is performing the function in terms of the following scales?

If you feel the performance of the public relations function at the top of the page is ***very closely related*** to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

good _x_ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ bad

or

good ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : _x_ bad

If you feel the performance of the function is ***closely related*** to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

bad ___ : _x_ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ good

or

bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : _x_ : ___ good

If the performance of the function seems ***slightly related*** to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

good ___ : ___ : _x_ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ bad

or

good ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : _x_ : ___ : ___ bad

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging.

If you consider the performance of the function to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

```
                              x
bad  ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____  good
```

IMPORTANT:

(1) Place your check-mark *in the middle of spaces,* not on the boundaries:

```
                  this      not this
                   x           x
____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____
```

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every concept—*do not omit any.*

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Please do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test.

Make each item a separate and independent judgement. Work at a fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true impressions.

Please turn the page and begin.

Press Relations

A function of the public relations practitioner which includes seeking goodwill and cooperation of editors and reporters; organizing press cónferences; determining the news value of a news release; writing the press release; distributing the news release to interested media.

Now, how well do you think he is performing the function in terms of the following scales?

good								bad
complete								incomplete
timely								untimely
graceful								awkward
painful								pleasurable
unsuccessful								successful
meaningful								meaningless
positive								negative
disreputable								reputable
healthy								sick

Any Comments?

Employee Relations

A function of the public relations practitioner which includes setting meetings between management and employees; advising and counseling management; editing employee publications; creating and directing films, radio, and television programs for employee consumption; measuring employee attitudes and morale.

Now, how well do you think he is performing the function in terms of the following scales?

bad	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	good
incomplete	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	complete
timely	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	untimely
awkward	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	graceful
pleasurable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	painful
successful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	unsuccessful
meaningless	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	meaningful
negative	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	positive
reputable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	disreputable
sick	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	healthy

Any Comments?

Community Relations

A function of the public relations practitioner which includes understanding community opinion; participating in civic endeavors; organizing plant tours and open houses; creating institutional advertising; employee relations; press relations: responding to relevant issues of the community.

Now, how well do you think he is performing the function in terms of the following scales?

good	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	bad
complete	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	incomplete
untimely	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	timely
graceful	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	awkward
painful	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	pleasurable
unsuccessful	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	successful
meaningful	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	meaningless
positive	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	negative
disreputable	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	reputable
healthy	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____ :	____	sick

Any Comments?

Government Relations

A function of the public relations practitioner which includes understanding and monitoring city, state, and national government agencies; interpreting government's actions to management; interpreting management's attitude to government agencies and officials; discovering marketing information.

Now, how well do you think he is performing the function in terms of the following scales?

good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	bad
incomplete	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	complete
untimely	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	timely
graceful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	awkward
painful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	pleasurable
unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	successful
meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	meaningless
positive	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	negative
disreputable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	reputable
healthy	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	sick

Any Comments?

Financial Relations

A function of the public relations practitioner which includes editing the annual report; sending financial messages to stockholders; disseminating information to the financial press, analysts, bankers and major lending institutions; organizing stockholder meetings.

Now, how well do you think he is performing the function in terms of the following scales?

bad	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	good
incomplete	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	complete
timely	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	untimely
awkward	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	graceful
pleasurable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	painful
successful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	unsuccessful
meaningless	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	meaningful
negative	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	positive
reputable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	disreputable
sick	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	healthy

Any Comments?

PLEASE CHECK: This questionnaire was completed by a corporate president___; business dean___; business-financial editor___; public relations practitioner___.

APPENDIX B

TABLE OF MEANS

TABLE OF MEANS[a]

Subject Number	Functions[b] B_1	B_2	B_3	B_4	B_5
A_1					
1.	5.6	5.2	5.4	5.0	4.1
2.	5.5	6.0	5.1	4.7	5.8
3.	5.5	6.0	5.3	6.0	5.9
4.	5.7	5.8	5.0	6.0	6.2
5.	3.6	5.8	5.8	3.6	3.7
6.	6.2	6.4	7.0	6.6	6.2
7.	5.1	5.9	4.3	4.0	2.8
8.	5.2	3.6	5.3	4.5	4.2
9.	5.2	5.5	5.2	4.4	4.6
10.	5.8	6.0	5.0	5.2	4.8
11.	6.6	6.9	6.8	4.8	6.5
12.	4.0	6.1	5.5	4.2	4.0
13.	5.6	4.5	4.7	5.6	5.5
14.	5.2	5.4	5.3	5.3	3.6
15.	4.8	6.1	5.2	2.9	4.6
16.	5.3	5.6	6.0	5.6	5.6
17.	6.4	6.7	6.2	5.1	5.3
18.	4.6	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.5
19.	5.5	5.4	6.0	5.6	4.1
20.	4.6	5.8	4.3	5.4	5.6
21.	7.0	6.9	6.7	4.2	4.0
22.	5.5	7.0	6.7	6.1	6.0
23.	5.6	4.9	5.2	5.0	5.0
24.	4.7	6.1	4.6	5.1	5.6
25.	5.1	4.0	6.1	4.8	1.4
26.	5.2	6.3	4.6	4.9	4.4
27.	6.1	6.2	6.5	6.1	5.9
28.	5.8	5.4	5.6	5.4	5.1
29.	5.0	5.3	5.5	4.0	3.2
30.	5.9	5.9	4.5	4.6	5.2
31.	5.2	5.7	3.6	5.5	1.9

[a]Scoring Range: 1.00 (Extremely Unfavorable) to 7.00 (Extremely Favorable) on each item.

[b]A_1: Practitioners
A_2: Business Editors
A_3: Business Educators
B_1: Press Relations
B_2: Financial Relations
B_3: Community Relations
B_4: Employee Relations
B_5: Government Relations

Subject Number	B_1	B_2	B_3	B_4	B_5
A_1					
32.	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.5	4.8
33.	6.6	6.4	6.8	6.8	5.6
34.	3.9	3.5	3.0	4.2	3.0
35.	3.9	7.0	5.6	5.5	5.9
36.	4.3	4.6	3.3	4.2	4.1
37.	5.4	6.4	2.4	4.6	3.3
38.	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7
39.	5.1	2.8	3.5	4.8	4.1
40.	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.8	3.9
41.	5.3	4.3	6.2	5.2	6.4
42.	5.4	6.3	5.3	3.9	4.7
43.	5.6	3.1	4.4	5.1	3.1
44.	4.1	4.0	3.7	2.2	3.1
45.	4.6	5.3	5.5	5.1	4.2
46.	6.3	7.0	5.9	5.8	6.8
47.	5.1	6.2	4.9	5.7	2.5
48.	5.8	5.9	6.4	6.8	5.4
49.	2.6	1.4	6.2	1.4	4.0
50.	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.2	4.6
51.	5.7	5.8	4.8	5.8	5.8
52.	3.0	4.0	5.3	3.0	1.2
53.	3.4	5.6	4.4	3.3	2.3
54.	3.8	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.4
55.	4.9	5.6	5.1	3.8	4.2
56.	5.3	5.0	4.2	4.0	3.6
57.	4.9	6.2	5.3	4.7	4.6
58.	3.6	5.1	4.5	3.7	3.2
59.	4.1	4.8	3.7	3.0	3.5
60.	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.0	3.7
61.	5.0	5.8	4.9	5.2	2.6
62.	3.6	1.0	1.5	1.4	3.9
63.	4.7	4.8	5.0	5.1	4.6
64.	4.5	3.2	4.7	4.1	3.9
A_2					
1.	4.1	4.0	4.8	4.2	3.6
2.	4.1	5.6	3.5	3.7	3.3
3.	5.0	6.9	4.0	4.0	4.0
4.	4.0	6.0	5.5	4.5	4.4
5.	5.1	5.7	6.3	5.2	7.0

[a]Scoring Range: 1.00 (Extremely Unfavorable) to 7.00 (Extremely Favorable) on each item.

[b]A_1: Practitioners
A_2: Business Editors
A_3: Business Educators
B_1: Press Relations
B_2: Financial Relations
B_3: Community Relations
B_4: Employee Relations
B_5: Government Relations

Subject Number	B_1	B_2	B_3	B_4	B_5
A_2 6.	5.4	6.0	5.0	5.2	5.3
7.	3.3	5.2	3.3	4.4	4.1
8.	4.7	4.0	4.8	5.0	3.2
9.	4.7	4.7	2.8	3.8	4.0
10.	6.3	6.1	4.4	4.0	4.0
11.	4.1	5.8	5.3	5.6	4.6
12.	4.0	5.4	3.9	4.3	4.1
13.	4.5	4.9	3.6	5.0	4.9
14.	4.3	5.1	5.2	5.0	4.4
15.	4.9	5.7	5.8	4.0	4.0
16.	4.5	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.5
17.	4.1	6.0	3.4	4.2	5.8
18.	6.5	6.7	6.7	6.5	6.1
19.	6.5	7.0	6.9	6.7	5.7
20.	4.1	5.8	5.1	5.2	4.4
21.	4.0	6.7	4.3	3.9	4.0
22.	7.0	7.0	6.1	7.0	7.0
23.	5.0	5.4	6.0	4.7	4.0
24.	4.9	5.5	5.5	4.0	4.0
25.	5.2	7.0	6.8	6.1	5.6
26.	4.5	2.0	5.4	5.1	5.6
27.	5.4	4.3	5.3	2.8	4.9
28.	4.3	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
29.	6.7	7.0	6.0	5.6	6.3
30.	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
31.	5.1	5.0	5.1	4.2	3.2
32.	5.4	4.0	4.7	4.0	4.0
33.	5.0	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.0
34.	4.4	6.8	4.2	2.9	3.8
35.	6.0	3.9	1.0	7.0	5.5
36.	5.2	5.9	6.0	5.2	5.3
37.	5.1	5.6	5.9	4.7	5.4
38.	5.8	6.2	4.4	6.1	5.3
39.	3.9	4.5	4.0	4.2	3.4
40.	6.6	6.0	6.9	6.1	6.3
41.	4.0	5.7	4.7	4.0	5.3
42.	4.9	4.9	5.6	4.3	3.3
43.	4.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
44.	6.5	6.6	6.0	6.2	6.4
45.	6.1	5.0	7.0	1.3	5.6

[a]Scoring Range: 1.00 (Extremely Unfavorable) to 7.00 (Extremely Favorable) on each item.

[b]A_1: Practitioners
A_2: Business Editors
A_3: Business Educators
B_1: Press Relations
B_2: Financial Relations
B_3: Community Relations
B_4: Employee Relations
B_5: Government Relations

Subject Number	B_1	B_2	B_3	B_4	B_5
A_2					
46.	4.7	5.4	4.9	4.2	4.0
47.	5.2	5.1	4.7	4.6	5.0
48.	5.5	5.3	5.9	5.6	5.6
49.	5.6	6.0	5.7	5.8	6.1
50.	2.6	3.1	2.0	3.9	3.7
51.	3.4	2.9	3.3	3.1	4.0
52.	5.1	7.0	3.7	4.4	5.0
53.	2.7	5.0	4.9	5.2	3.0
54.	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.6
55.	6.1	6.2	6.1	6.0	6.0
56.	5.8	6.0	6.5	5.6	5.9
57.	4.3	5.0	5.3	5.2	3.9
58.	2.6	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
59.	3.8	3.6	4.1	4.6	3.7
60.	4.6	6.0	4.0	5.3	4.0
A_3					
1.	3.4	3.1	2.0	3.3	2.1
2.	5.0	4.4	4.0	5.2	4.0
3.	4.4	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.7
4.	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
5.	4.9	6.0	3.5	2.2	5.6
6.	4.9	5.0	3.5	4.1	4.9
7.	5.1	5.0	4.4	3.5	4.5
8.	3.4	4.7	4.7	4.5	3.4
9.	4.9	3.5	4.9	3.4	3.7
10.	4.0	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.6
11.	4.9	4.3	3.9	4.3	2.9
12.	5.7	6.4	5.8	5.2	3.5
13.	5.4	5.0	4.0	5.1	5.2
14.	3.3	4.5	3.2	3.5	3.2
15.	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.8
16.	4.9	4.1	5.0	4.8	5.8
17.	4.8	5.1	5.9	3.5	4.0
18.	4.4	3.7	4.6	3.4	4.0
19.	3.7	2.3	2.9	3.7	3.8
20.	3.3	7.0	6.0	2.5	1.4
21.	4.8	5.9	4.9	4.9	3.7
22.	5.0	5.2	5.9	4.7	5.5
23.	4.1	5.8	4.6	3.2	4.3

[a]Scoring Range: 1.00 (Extremely Unfavorable) to 7.00 (Extremely Favorable) on each item.

[b]A_1: Practitioners
A_2: Business Editors
A_3: Business Educators
B_1: Press Relations
B_2: Financial Relations
B_3: Community Relations
B_4: Employee Relations
B_5: Government Relations

Subject Number	B_1	B_2	B_3	B_4	B_5
A_3					
24.	5.5	4.3	4.4	3.5	3.5
25.	5.3	6.0	5.0	5.5	5.2
26.	5.7	6.3	6.3	5.6	5.9
27.	4.9	5.1	5.0	5.0	5.0
28.	5.5	7.0	5.7	5.3	6.0
29.	5.4	4.1	5.6	4.9	5.9
30.	5.4	7.0	6.7	5.9	5.6
31.	5.1	4.9	5.3	4.6	5.3
32.	5.3	5.0	4.7	4.0	3.7
33.	4.7	4.5	6.0	5.0	4.2
34.	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.5	4.6
35.	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.5	4.4
36.	4.9	2.1	5.0	4.6	1.2
37.	3.8	4.0	3.3	4.0	3.8
38.	4.9	3.4	4.0	4.2	4.0
39.	4.7	4.7	5.0	3.9	4.6
40.	5.0	2.4	3.8	4.3	4.8
41.	4.7	4.6	5.1	3.8	4.0
42.	5.5	5.8	5.7	5.4	5.5
43.	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.3	4.5
44.	2.4	3.7	3.2	2.4	2.8
45.	4.0	6.0	4.0	4.7	3.1
46.	3.9	2.3	5.6	6.0	2.0
47.	5.4	5.5	3.8	2.9	4.9
48.	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0
49.	5.3	5.7	5.9	5.7	5.7
50.	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.5	3.0

[a]Scoring Range: 1.00 (Extremely Unfavorable) to 7.00 (Extremely Favorable) on each item.

[b]A_1: Practitioners
A_2: Business Editors
A_3: Business Educators
B_1: Press Relations
B_2: Financial Relations
B_3: Community Relations
B_4: Employee Relations
B_5: Government Relations

APPENDIX C

TABLES OF MEANS FOR SCALES

DISTANCE-CLUSTER MATRICES

PRACTITIONERS

TABLE OF MEANS

Scales	Press	Employee	Community	Government	Financial
Good-Bad	5.4	4.7	5.0	4.4	5.4
Complete-Incomplete	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.2	5.1
Timely-Untimely	5.3	4.5	5.1	4.4	5.4
Graceful-Awkward	4.7	4.4	4.8	3.9	5.0
Pleasurable-Painful	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.1	4.9
Successful-Unsuccessful	5.1	4.6	4.9	4.1	5.2
Meaningful-Meaningless	4.9	4.6	5.0	4.5	5.2
Positive-Negative	5.0	4.8	5.1	4.3	5.4
Reputable-Disreputable	5.4	5.0	5.5	4.9	5.4
Healthy-Sick	5.2	5.1	5.1	4.6	5.3

EDITORS

TABLE OF MEANS

Scales	Press	Employee	Community	Government	Financial
Good-Bad	4.9	5.1	4.9	4.8	5.4
Complete-Incomplete	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.5	5.4
Timely-Untimely	5.1	4.5	4.9	4.9	5.4
Graceful-Awkward	4.6	4.7	5.0	4.7	5.2
Pleasurable-Painful	4.7	4.5	5.0	4.6	5.1
Successful-Unsuccessful	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.7	5.3
Meaningful-Meaningless	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.8	5.3
Positive-Negative	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.5
Reputable-Disreputable	5.6	5.0	5.5	4.9	5.7
Healthy-Sick	5.3	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.2

BUSINESS EDUCATORS

TABLE OF MEANS

Scales	Press	Employee	Community	Government	Financial
Good-Bad	5.0	4.4	4.8	4.3	4.9
Complete-Incomplete	4.5	3.9	4.4	4.0	4.6
Timely-Untimely	4.9	4.4	4.8	4.2	4.8
Graceful-Awkward	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.7
Pleasurable-Painful	4.6	4.1	4.8	4.0	4.5
Successful-Unsuccessful	4.7	4.0	4.5	4.2	4.6
Meaningful-Meaningless	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.1	4.9
Positive-Negative	4.9	4.5	4.6	4.4	5.0
Reputable-Disreputable	4.9	4.5	4.9	4.5	4.6
Healthy-Sick	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.8

VITA

Thomas Huddleston, Jr.

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: EVALUATIONS OF FUNCTIONS OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONER

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Dallas, Texas, June 15, 1940, the son of Thomas and Anna Huddleston.

Education: Attended grade and high school in Texarkana, Texas. Graduated from Texas Senior High School in Texarkana, Texas, in 1958; received the Bachelor of Science degree from East Texas State University, with a major in speech and journalism in August, 1962; attended Abilene Christian College, fall, 1962; received the Master of Science degree from East Texas State University, with a major in journalism and speech, and Master's thesis, "Public Relations Analysis of American Airlines," in January, 1965; attended East Texas State University, 1967-1969; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University, with a major in Higher Education, in May, 1972.

Professional Experience: Employed as radio announcer or news director at KTFS, Texarkana, Texas, KNIT, Abilene, Texas, KGVL, Greenville, Texas, 1959-1964; half-time instructor in speech at East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas, 1963-1964; Activities Manager at the Society of Petroleum Engineers of AIME, Dallas, Texas, 1964-1966; Public Relations Director, Texarkana Chamber of Commerce, Texarkana, Arkansas-Texas, 1966-1967; Associate Director of Public Relations, Dr Pepper Company, Dallas, Texas, 1967; Director of Admissions and Registration, East Texas State University, 1967-1969; part-time assistant to the Director of the School of Journalism and Broadcasting, half-time instructor in broadcasting, School of Journalism and Broadcasting, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1969-1971; Dean of Admissions, Bentley College, Waltham, Massachusetts, 1971.

Organizations: Sigma Delta Chi, Association for Education in Journalism, International Society for General Semantics, Phi Delta Kappa, American Association for College Registrars and Admissions Officers.