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With the assumption that the preservation of free speech and democracy is paramount to social, political, and environmental adaptation, the question arises: to whom falls the stewardship of honest and fair public discourse for problem solving? If the average United States citizen is, at best skeptical of the news media, and, at worst, turned off entirely to what has been the default mechanism of social self study and an occasional forum for thoughtful debate, then who will engage the interests of the public in productive exchange? This paper proposes that, as a result of the news media's self-inflicted credibility crisis and other conditions, the time has come for non-news media communicators (including professional communicators and "lay" communicators) to assert themselves as credible sources of the truth and to be recognized by the public as responsible fiduciaries of the public trust. Serious questions arise from this statement, including whether professional communicators are willing to embrace this responsibility and whether their skills and ethical abilities are up to the task. There are also questions about the institutions of higher learning who train them. If the future holds greater ethical demands for professional communicators, then what are the ramifications for the organizations that they represent? Are organizations and communication practitioners ready to embrace realities of symmetrical communication? (Contains 50 references.) (Author/NKA)
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ABSTRACT: With the assumption that the preservation of free speech and democracy is paramount to social, 
political and environmental adaptation, the question arises: to whom falls the stewardship of honest and fair 
public discourse for problem solving? If the average U.S. citizen is, at best, skeptical of the news media, and, 
at worst, turned off entirely to what has been the default mechanism of social self-study and an occasional 
forum for thoughtful debate, then how will who engage the interests of the public in productive exchange?

This paper proposes that, as a result of the news media's self-inflicted credibility crisis and other 
conditions, the time has come for non-news media communicators (including professional communicators and 
"lay" communicators) to assert themselves as credible sources of the truth and to be recognized by the public 
as responsible fiduciaries of the public trust.

Serious questions arise from this statement including: Are professional communicators willing to embrace 
this responsibility? Are their skills and ethical abilities up to the task? What about the institutions of higher 
learning who train them? If the future holds greater ethical demands for professional communicators, what 
are the ramifications for the organizations whom they represent? Are organizations and communication 
practitioners ready to embrace realities of symmetrical communication?
"Life as we want it depends on the truth."
— Eric Bergman ABC, senior consultant, Bergman & Associates, and member of the International Association of Business Communicators Accreditation Council

The time has come for professional communicators to assert themselves as credible sources of the truth and to be recognized by the public as responsible fiduciaries of the public trust. Serious questions arise from this statement along with challenges from and to practitioners including whether or not they are up to the moral challenge of public problem solving. This paper represents an initial probe into the concept of repositioning the role and reputation of professional communicators in the real world where organizational welfare has never been more dependent upon the ability to optimize and sustain relationships which, in turn, depend on the asset of trust. As the public turns away from traditional news media as a forum for social self-study and debate, an opportunity presents itself to redefine the venue and habits of exchange between organizations and publics for problem solving.

METHODOLOGY

Exploration of the thesis included an initial literature review followed by an e-mail query requesting reactions to the abstract of this paper (May 1998) of 65 leaders of the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC) and the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA). Responses took the form of thirteen in-depth interviews (several IABC leaders deferred to the chair’s response instead of contributing their own) and seven written replies. While formal quantification of responses was not attempted, a feel for general opinions was achieved. Further literature review ensued with the benefit of insights gathered from respondents. In addition to sharing their own time and thoughts through personal interviews and written discourse, these communication executives pointed me to additional resources and prompted additional inquiry that informed this and future writing. Their opinions were diverse,
and may not be explicitly reflected here. To be sure, some will disagree with my propositions and conclusions. Nevertheless, I wish to gratefully acknowledge their generous participation. (See Appendix One.)

KINDS OF COMMUNICATORS

For the purposes of this paper, the term “non-news-media” communicators is meant to address those people who can serve as sources of information outside of the news media including “lay” and “professional” communicators.

“Lay” communicators are those in the organization who, as experts on a topic, or as part of a leadership responsibility, may be called upon to articulate some aspect of the organization to a constituency (for example, an organizational environmental researcher in a public forum or a vice president of human resources at an employee meeting) on an “ad hoc” versus routine or day-to-day basis. These individuals are not directly involved in managing communication policy or communication operations but nevertheless in a position to affect organizational reputation. Communication technicians, communication craftspeople exclusively serving the marketing promotion function of an organization and customer service representatives would fall into the “non-news-media” or “lay” communicator category.

Categorizing communicators according to the term “professional” is controversial. Debate has raged for a long time concerning the legitimacy of attaching the modifier “professional” to the role of communicator. Many comments and perspectives exist (too numerous to reiterate here). Critics suggest, that since communicators are not licensed, they cannot, among other reasons, be considered professionals. Proponents of the term argue that professionalism is a state of conduct not negated by a lack of governmental regulation (Wilcox, 1998, pp. 63-66). For the purposes of this writing, the term “professional communicator” shall encompass those identified as communication managers and senior advisers according to the criteria spelled out in the findings of the IABC Research Foundation Excellence Study (Dozier, 1995).

“The communication manager role consists of formal authority to manage the communication function and make communication policy decisions. Top communicators in this role hold themselves accountable for the success or failure of communication programs, as do others in the organization. Through their experience and training, top communicators in this role are organizational experts in solving communication and public relations problems (p. 107)."

“Professional communicators" are further seen here as issues managers working in for-profit, not-for-profit and governmental entities. They are, according to Heath's (1997) definition, individuals with the capacity to manage “organizational and community resources through the public policy process to advance organizational interests and rights by striking a mutual balance with those of stakeholders” (p. 9). Depending upon their involvement in shaping and executing communication policy, and their commitment to a two-way communication function bent on mutually beneficial outcomes, CEOs and other senior managers (including but not limited to human resources and operations) may fall into the professional communicator category along with those individuals typically working in departments or under titles of corporate communications or public relations including media relations, community relations, investor relations, financial relations, employee relations, member relations, corporate communications, industry relations, development, and multi-cultural relations.

THE TIME HAS COME

A collection of trends and opportunities enables a shift in perspective concerning the role of professional communicators and the value they bring to organizations and the environments in which those organizations exist. The following short list of current conditions suggests it is time for professional communicators to differentiate themselves from functionary technicians of communication to functional facilitators of relationships.
News media not forums for problem solving

The news media no longer serve as primary sources of truly “need to know” information, the kind that concerns the detail that people need to manage their lives. Add gaping credibility, and the result is the demand for a new forum in which public problem-solving can proceed.

Criticism of the popular news media is widespread. Just a handful of headlines and book titles tell the story:

- “Sizzle over Substance” Newsweek (Alter, 1996, January 29)
- “Holding up a mirror that makes everything ugly” The American Editor (Huffington, 1995, September)
- Breaking the News: How the Media Undermine American Democracy (Fallows, 1996)
- “Has the press lost its nerve?” Nieman Reports (Goodale, 1997, Summer)
- “All the news that fits; Network Failure: Are the major media frivolous or biased? Some of each, find our reporters in the field.” National Review (Baker & Graham, 1998, June 22)

“The news media feels the public doesn’t care about politics, so they say ‘we’re not going to cover it,’” according to Tim Graham, director of media analysis for the Media Research Center, a conservative media watchdog based in Alexandria, Virginia. “In the last few years, we haven’t just been asking for unbiased but for some political coverage.” In National Review, Graham and co-author Brent H. Baker stated,

Criticism of the media used to vary depending on whether the critic was on the Right or on the Left. Liberal critics would complain that the networks, in response to market, were frivolous, while conservatives focused on their liberal bias. Unfortunately, we don’t have to choose. (1998, June 22)

Arianna Huffington wrote, “Much more fundamental than a liberal bias...is a cynical bias, a debunking bias, a nihilistic bias, a bias to believe the worst about us. It often finds expression in an attitude of casual disdain, and even casual cruelty.” (1995, p. 8) Author of Out of Order and professor of political science Thomas Patterson was quoted in Newsweek (“We investigate less ...” 1996, January 29, p. 65) to say:

“Journalists are obsessed with the underbelly of American politics. Negative news more than doubled since the 1970s and now exceeds positive coverage.” The same Newsweek article also quoted Susan Faludi, author of Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women:

A democracy requires a wide exploration of different viewpoints. But our media typically reduce issues to two extremes—the “conventional” view that enforces the status quo and the most “radical” opinion which the media dub a lunatic fringe; then the media sic the two against each other in a fixed fight in which the conventional always wins. Our press is hooked on gotcha journalism, where new ideas are met with cynicism—and knocked down.

During in-depth interviews with communication executives, I detected no apparent argument with the assertion that the credibility of the American news media was in bad shape. However, most respondents indicated that their personal experience with reporters was relatively positive and not on par with the distortion and sensationalism now ascribed to network television.

John Finney ABC, communication and education practice leader, Watson Wyatt Worldwide-Detroit Office, and immediate past chair of IABC suggested that the neither traditional news media or communicators are an absolute, credible source. “Both perspectives are valuable” (Finney, 1998, June 8) and provide a balance of information to publics. Finney noted that new media such as internet and intranet technologies, though not panaceas, provide information alternatives for publics seeking information. “Organizations and communicators must respect audience knowledge, intellect and the access they have to information...the public is more demanding of news media and organizations,” he asserted.

Of course, the sharp decline in news media credibility does not show up as an increase in credibility column for non-news media communicators. However, the public’s need for trustworthy information with which to make decisions remains. The negative condition of news media credibility does provide an impetus for professional communicators to fulfill that need without, by any means, attempting to replace the news media but giving publics a choice of easily accessible, timely, accurate and detailed information. The time has come for stakeholders to acquire the habit of turning as quickly, frequently and assuredly to non-news organizations as they do to news organizations. News organizations do serve the public interest when they turn attention to
issues relevant to the democratic process. But uncovering problems is only the first step in a problem-solving process that requires more than mediated messages of questionable pertinence and accuracy.

**Going direct**

The loss of the mass media as forums for public discourse bolsters arguments for direct interaction with publics versus third-party-mediated communication. Instead of depending on the news media to provide information to stakeholders, organizational communicators increasingly are responding to publics through grassroots measures characterized by non-mediated, interpersonal communication.

When it comes to creating relationships with constituencies, “Trust is something that has to be built outside of the [news] media. Once [a story] hits, it’s too late to start building trust,” according to Eric Bergman from Bergman & Associates, a national officer of IABC.

Debra Stevens APR, director of public relations for SRO Communications (which handles the NBA’s Phoenix Suns) and former PRSA district chair and Phoenix Chapter president, indicated that her agency was interacting directly with constituencies and opinion leaders more than ever before. Community get-togethers, town hall meetings, and dialogues with civic organizations lead to the compilation of community programming that reflects priority issues and actually involves members of the community on Phoenix Suns issue/event advisory boards (Stevens, 1998, June 3).

Jackson, Jackson & Wagner Senior Counsel Pat Jackson APR, a PRSA Fellow and former board member, promotes a five-point strategy for engaging clients with constituencies:

- **Step 1)** Go direct. Don’t let the three gatekeepers [news media, politicians and special interest groups] come between you and your stakeholders.
- **Step 2)** Go to tightly targeted key stakeholder groups who can act in the short term (before the environment changes and negates relevancy).
- **Step 3)** Go to opinion leaders. You can’t reach everyone, so build one-on-one relationships with them.
- **Step 4)** Use the organizational family (often front-line personnel [lay communicators]) to build relationships where they already most naturally thrive.
- **Step 5)** All issues are local. [A one size communication program does not fit all.] (1998, May 26)

Another manifestation of the trend to “go direct” is The International Association of Public Participation (IAP2), established in 1990 as a nonprofit corporation with a purpose to promote public participation in relation to governments, institutions and other entities that affect the public interest in nations throughout the world. IAP2’s 11-hundred-plus membership includes policy makers, facilitators and multi-party mediators, project managers, citizen activists, public affairs and public relations professionals, government agencies, utilities and transit agencies, environmental groups, advocacy groups and professional organizations from Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, England, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Hungary, India, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Russia, Slovakia, South Africa, Thailand, and the United States.

Fred Lash APR, public relations director for the National Defense Council, is a member of PRSA’s Section Council on the Environment and a member of IAP2. His experience has been that what PRSA would name “public relations” IAP2 terms “public involvement.” Titles such as “public involvement coordinator” or “public outreach director” label jobs that require two-way symmetrical communication, he explained (1998, May 29). Lash’s hope of a closer relationship between PRSA and IAP2 will get a boost this October when they will hold concurrent conferences in Tempe, Arizona.

Professional communicators must prepare themselves and lay communicators for the challenges inherent in “going direct” including managing public expectations, feedback and the demands of relatively symmetrical versus relatively asymmetrical communication. “Going direct” internally can mean the elimination of in-house media such as newsletters as well (Jackson, 1998, May 26). Through personal interaction between stakeholders, a record of trust can be built—a precursor to new public/stakeholder information seeking behaviors and habits that are also likely to generate word-of-mouth, the most powerful form of communication.
Loss of community, civic apathy

The intensified social polarization of recent decades has resulted from a combination of interest group politics and the decline of mediating institutions (Gray & Langton, 1995, p.1). According to Kruckeberg and Stark, "public relations is better defined and practiced as the active attempt to restore and maintain a sense of community." (1988, p. xi) It seems a shame that a decade ago, these gentlemen proposed exactly the kind of perspective that, if appreciated at the time, perhaps could have stemmed or even averted the incalculable injury to the concept of community by the 90s-style downsizing and international job flight that has crushed the morale of employees and thereby the communities in which they—and organizations—live. To the question posed in a five-years-post-reengineering study, "If you had it to do over again, what would you do differently," three quarters of CEOs indicated they would do a better job of communication. (Finney, 1998, June 8) Is it any wonder that civic participation is reported at an all time low when economic partners are perceived to have bailed out and the default forum of public debate, the news media, chooses polemics over middle-ground leaving no room for debate and conciliation?

Today, organizations are fulfilling Kruckeberg and Stark's challenge by embedding themselves in the civic fiber of their communities through the proxy of their employees. "Organizations are listening to employees when it comes to their corporate citizenship strategies," according to a study by The Consulting Network cited in the pr reporter (Strategic Philanthropy, 1998, June 8, p. 1). Some 7.3 million employees were represented by the 89 companies participating in the survey which concluded "employees are as important, or more important, to community outreach than the contribution of dollars." Nearly three quarters of respondents indicated formal, organized employee volunteer programs frequently characterized by cash grants, recognition programs, release time, and in-kind donations and management assistance for organizations where employees volunteer. The survey also revealed that strategic giving was not affected solely by corporate interests but directed significantly by employee interests as well.

Hewlett Packard, listed this year as the fifth most admired company in America by Fortune magazine (1998, March 2), has seven corporate objectives. Among them is citizenship:

Citizenship: to honor our obligations to society by being an economic, intellectual and social asset to each nation and each community in which we operate ... As a corporation operating in many different communities throughout the world, we must make sure that each of these communities is better for our presence. This means identifying our interests with those of the community; it means applying the highest standards of honesty and integrity to all our relationships with individuals and groups; it means creating desirable jobs and generating exports and tax revenues; it means building attractive plants and offices of which the community can be proud; it means designing and providing products and services that are safe to use and can be manufactured, operated and disposed of in an environmentally responsible manner; it means contributing talent, time and financial support to worthwhile community projects. Each community has its particular set of social problems. As citizens of the community, HP people can and should do whatever they reasonably can to improve it—either working as individuals or through such groups as charitable, educational, civic or religious institutions. In a broader sense, HP's "community" also includes a number of business and professional organizations whose interests are closely identified with those of the company and its individual employees. These, too, are deserving of our support and participation. In all cases, managers should encourage HP people to fulfill their personal goals and aspirations in the community as well as attain their individual objectives within HP. (Hewlett Packard, 1998)

Brad Whitworth ABC, international communications and public affairs manager for the company, and an IABC Fellow and Accreditation Council member, explained that volunteerism is encouraged in part because it enables workers to improve their leadership skills in a "low threat" environment. Employees gain tremendous personal benefits, training and a sense of personal worth, and the process contributes to the company's long term reputation. (1998, May 27) "Research shows that people feel better about themselves, about their jobs,
about life in general if they are volunteering either in a community activity on behalf of the organization where they work or on an internal project." (Jackson, 1998, May 26)

Findings of The Consulting Network Study and Hewlett Packard's attitude toward community and civic responsibility jibe well with Kruckeberg and Stark's admonishment that "community relations...must offer more than a superficial combination of assuring a good environment for the organization, more than a simplistic concern for altruistic good citizenship, and more than mere emphasis on the techniques of community involvement." Revisiting the rebuke of superficiality, 1997 Moskowitz Prize winners Waddock and Graves, redefine corporate social performance (CSP) as the quality of stakeholder relationships including those with employees and community; CSP is "not simply a set of discretionary activities undertaken when there are sufficient slack resources. Rather, firms operate on a routine basis with and through their primary (and perhaps some of their secondary) stakeholders to effect their strategies." (Waddock, 1997)

Professional communicators have the opportunity to redirect negative energy bound up in the lament over waning participation in the traditional political process. Among players in organizations, professional communicators are best suited to positively influence civil action and community development by fostering organizational volunteerism (by employees functioning as "lay" communicators") that fulfills corporate and employee interests. Citizenship is an organization wide obligation, but the management and accountability for it clearly falls within the realm of expertise dominated by communication professionals.

Sustainability is out of the box

The sustainability movement is bringing a new paradigm to bear on organizational missions and value systems. In the 1987 Brundtland Commission report, Our Common Future, sustainability, as applied to communities, was defined as "development that meets the needs of those present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Ward, 1998, January)." A slightly different perspective is noted in the Economic Development Quarterly: "Sustainable development is an emerging approach to development combining aspects of traditional economic development with elements of environmental and social policy." (Colgan, 1997, May)

The bulk of impending issues management for professional communicators will come from the sustainability movement. Environmental degradation, social justice, resource management, regulatory changes, loss of cultural identity, population growth, are just a few of the foci for debate. Ultimately, they are also the realities to which organizations will have to adjust; and, the accommodation is occurring, or will, in a wide variety of stakeholder groups. Perhaps among the most remarkable is shareholders.

Shareholder advocacy attuned to environmental and social responsibility recently has experienced phenomenal gains. In 1997, nearly one of every ten dollars under management in the United States was part of a responsibly invested portfolio, according to The Social Investment Forum, a national non-profit membership association dedicated to promoting the concept, practice and growth of socially and environmentally responsible investing. SIF's membership includes more than 400 financial advisors, analysts, portfolio managers, banks, mutual funds, researchers, foundations, community development organizations and public educators. In its 1997 Report on Responsible Investing Trends in the United States, SIF stated, "For the first time ever, more than $1 trillion in assets are under management in the U.S. in socially and environmentally responsible portfolios, which have grown from $639 billion in 1995 to $1.185 trillion in 1997." Other highlights included:

- Growth of socially screened portfolios significantly outpaced the broad market between January 1, 1995, and January 1, 1997, with total assets under management in screened portfolios for socially aware investors rising 227 percent. During the same period, institutional tax-exempt assets grew by 84 percent.
- The number of responsibly invested mutual funds nearly tripled between 1995 and 1997, with no fewer than 144 (a gain of 162 percent) mutual funds employing social and/or environmental criteria as part of formal, publicly stated investment policy.
Shareholder advocacy is leveraged to the tune of $736 billion in the form of resolutions, proxies voted on the basis of formal policies embodying socially responsible goals, and/or active lobbying of publicly traded companies to encourage more responsible behavior.

Community-based investments of $4 billion center on local development initiatives, affordable housing and small business lending in many of the neediest urban and rural areas of the country. (Responsible Investing Trends, 1997)

The connection between management reputation and socially responsible corporate behavior was made explicit in Finding the link between stakeholder relations and quality of management (Waddock & Graves, 1997), a study in which researchers reframed the basic question from an emphasis on the relationship between financial performance and social performance to an emphasis on the spectrum of stakeholder positions that included shareholders as one among many. "What emerges from this reframing is a redefinition of corporate social performance as the treatment of stakeholders, with owners, one of the important stakeholder groups, sharing the stage with primary stakeholders, such as customers, employees, communities, and the environment."

"Managements are well served by issues managers who know the costs that can result from strained relationships, whereby key stakeholders believe that the costs associated with the organization or industry outweigh the social and material benefits (Heath, 1997, p. xiii)." Issues management, prompted by the trend of sustainable development on economic, environmental and social fronts, is a reality for all organizations regardless of status as a governmental, non-profit or for-profit entities. "It is the management of organizational and community resources through the public policy process to advance organizational interests and rights by striking a mutual balance with those of all stakeholders (Heath, 1997, p. 9)." However achieving mutually beneficial interests is not easy in a multiple-stakeholder environment. Not all stakeholders see the world in the same way. Interests often conflict. Priorities differ. By achieving high standards of corporate responsibility through fostered mutual relationships, issues managers can attract stakes and avoid costly conflict. Good performance is a bottom-line issue. (Heath, 1997, p. 123)

In a presentation to the International Knowledge Management Summit in San Diego, June 1998, Hans Johnsson articulated the organic relationship that any organization has with its surroundings: "The environment defines the conditions for success. No living organisms can develop beyond the conditions set by the environment. All action is based on an exchange with the world around you."

Obviously, it is within the purview of non-news-media communicators (professional and lay) to steward stakeholder relationships. Doing so means partnership with other organizational leaders and departments including human resources, marketing, information technology, research and development, and operations. The time has come to recognize the economy of cooperation internal and external to the organization. "Future success depends on strategic alliances," Finney explained. "Change management depends on facilitation of insight and understanding." (1998, June 8)

The knowledge-based economy

The knowledge-based economy has forced re-definition and accounting of organizational assets, particularly human and "intangible" ones. "Real Assets, Unreal Reporting" was the headline in Fortune's July 6, 1998, issue. The article by Thomas A. Stewart was subtitled: "Why generally accepted accounting principles generally do an unacceptable job of accounting for the principal activities of knowledge-intensive companies."

Intangible assets such as reputation and relationships traditionally have been within the scope of professional communicators. Unfortunately, professional communicators as a whole have lagged far behind their organizational peers in their ability to account for what they do. A lack of business skills, evaluation methodology and a general indifference toward accountability have accumulated in the "no credibility" column for communicators. Now, with momentum building to accommodate intangible assets on the organization-wide
balance sheet, communicators can no longer afford their reluctance to embrace traditional and evolving methods of communication valuation and accountancy.

The Return on Communications project was initiated by the Swedish Public Relations Association to gain understanding of how an organization's returns and value can increase through investments in information, communications and relationships. We live in a new economy with an entirely new asset base, according to Hans Johnsson, proprietor of Sound Communications, who authored the Swedish Public Relations Association's Return on Communications report (1996) and co-authored Total Accounting—A Road to Total Accountability, a publication by KREAB Corporate Communication Counselors (1997). Johnsson has made the point (1998, June) that throughout history, we have seen three kinds of assets: earth-based, capital-based, and mind-based. Mind-based assets include information, communication, relationships and loyalty. The following characteristics make mind-based assets unique:

- they can be owned by the company or the individual;
- they can be intellectual and emotional (not just "knowledge")
- they grow when shared;
- they drive company growth and earnings; and
- they are invisible in traditional accounting practices. (Johnsson, 1998)

Johnsson (1998) has defined an asset as "any factor, physical or not, 'hard' or 'soft,' which can be defined and measured and which contributes to company growth and earnings." The value of an asset "is not based on what we once paid for it, nor on a guess of what we might get if we sell it."

Professional communicators should embrace news of new accounting practices with enthusiasm. (See also Ahlroth, et al., 1997, March; Malone, 1997, April; and Jennings, et al., 1996, June.) Personally, my reaction has been nothing short of sheer excitement and relief that finally the value of communication will become understood. The prospect of an organizational mind-set that, through new accounting practices, is set up to value the kinds of intangible outcomes that communicators have always striven for is nothing short of liberating. Forbes summed it up this way:

It has long been said that managements get what they measure. If the measurement systems are wrong, management is certain to devote its energies producing wrong results. The problem is that accountants don't know how to value most intangible assets. The stock market, however, has a fair idea of their worth. Companies like Microsoft, loaded with valuable intangibles, have market capitalizations greatly exceeding their book value. But those with poor market positions, bad relationships with customers and suppliers, poor business infrastructures and demoralized employees often trade in the market at below book value. (Davidow, 1996, April 8)

What communication professionals will notice about new accounting models is that the framework is very reminiscent of that which you would see in a typical communication plan yet it is applied to the entire organization. For example, in Return on Communications (p. 16) performance measurements across the board account for awareness, support and involvement, and profits/results. These three outcomes are accounted for according to groupings of stakeholders:

- leadership (organizational),
- market (customers and potential customers),
- finance (owners, potential investors, lenders, analysts, and financial media),
- employees (existing and potential); and
- community (politicians, opinion builders and general media).

Return on Communications outlines the results of the application of the new accounting framework on eleven companies. For example, in the case of Elekta, a global leader in medical technology, the process linked the work of the communicator to the market value of the company's stock. (p. 37) While communicators might suggest that the connection is nothing new, what is new is the idea that an organization-wide system of accounting would express such alongside outcomes in other areas such as marketing and community.

Finally, the advent of intangible accounting practices promises the placement of higher value on communication practices. "In the information age and knowledge based economy, the door is now opening and
there is a seat at the decision-making table [for communicators](Finney, 1998, June 8)." The time has come for professional communicators to stop brooding about being misunderstood and start getting ready for intensified expectations and influence on organizational performance.

**Reputation is still everything**

The benefits of a good reputation are as sought after as ever and the asset of trust has never been less expendable. After 16 years of ranking corporations by reputation, this year Fortune magazine said, "Apparently, being admired has never been more valuable." (Stewart, 1998) The time has come for professional communicators to work side-by-side with managers and lay communicators at all organizational levels to optimize the functional relationship between reputation, trust and operations. Consider the requisite of trust according to Fortune's ranking criteria (1998, March 2):

- "quality of management" requires a track record of trustworthy decision-making;
- "quality of products/services offered" requires consumer-tested integrity of marketing claims;
- "innovativeness" requires that supervisors trust employees with autonomy and requires employees to trust the organization's support for risk-taking;
- "long-term investment value" and "financial position" require that analysts and investors trust the organization's management of tangible and intangible assets;
- "ability to attract and keep talented people" requires that potential and current employees trust their employer with their future;
- "corporate and environmental responsibility" requires that governmental, civic and special interest stakeholders trust that the organization is reciprocating fully to its community; and
- "wise use of corporate assets" articulates the trust-based nature of proxy and the duty to avoid waste of resources.

In Trust in the Balance (1997), Shaw said, "The reality of today's business environment is clear: embrace change or die...Trust among organizational members increases the likelihood of success of change (p. 3)." By reducing distrust, "The organizational structure would be flatter, supervisors would be fewer; numbing sign-off, control, and measurement systems that require armies of line and support personnel would disappear. Profits would soar (Whitney, 1994, p. 3)" Imagine what could be accomplished, in Fortune's "innovativeness" category with payroll reclaimed by trust!

**PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATORS AS STEWARDS OF TRUST**

Unfortunately, the widespread reaction among IABC and PRSA leaders whom I interviewed to my premise that professional communicators become recognized as responsible fiduciaries of the public trust was relatively lukewarm if not skeptical. Criticism focused primarily on communicators' lack of credibility with management. One respondent articulated it as "public relations' own credibility crisis."

David French ABC, director of communication for Novartis Corporation and IABC accreditation board member said, "Before professional communicators can rise to this challenge, we need to answer the perennial question: how do we achieve credibility for what we do now? There are still too many opinion leaders (and probably most of the public at large) who think we're cut from P.T. Barnum's 'cloth.'" (French, 1998, May 13)

Curt Carlson, associate vice president for public affairs at Emory University and PRSA Section Council member said that despite the achievement of authentic dialogue with constituents and taking on controversial internal issues directly, he is still confronted by an attitude from other institutional leaders that what public affairs does is somehow one-sided or promotional and not objective or "informational." Carlson's remedy: communicators must continue to "walk the talk" and continually set an example that contradicts the you-must-be-hiding-something mentality.

Individual efforts by professionals like Carlson who exemplify communication accountability and a commitment to two-way symmetrical communication will be bolstered by industry efforts to engender better understanding of what communication is and is not in healthy, productive organizations. According to Jody
Buffington-Aud APR, vice president for corporate communications for Magellan Health Services and PRSA national director at large, PRSA has recently reshaped its mission to include achieve building global understanding and the value of the public relations profession across international borders and all organizational perspectives including government, non-profit and for-profit. The role of PRSA's president as a spokesperson for the public relations profession has intensified with numerous appearances and Socratic dialogues with non-public relations audiences in an effort to engender understanding. PRSA also has undertaken a relatively aggressive promotional effort on behalf of universal accreditation to achieve recognition by communicators and non-communicators of what that process signifies.

During the interviewing process for this paper, I perceived that the reluctance to get behind the concept of "communicators as stewards of public trust" seemed to be particularly time bound. In other words, there wasn't a complete dismissal of the idea, but there was general agreement that a relatively small number of communicators are ready right now to take on the role. I, however, maintain the assertion that the time is now because organizations cannot afford the cost of waiting to build trustworthy reputations. I also maintain that most communicators are not professional communicators. Those who fulfill the definition are at least basically equipped to meet the moral challenge of public problem-solving including:

- maintaining truth and a sense of justice in a multiple stakeholder environment;
- facilitation of dialogue between stakeholders,
- wrestling with the realities of symmetrical communication, and
- making a real-time investment in and conviction to ethics.

I also hold that professional communicators are well-suited to the task of leading and facilitating organizational adaptation to manifestations of the knowledge-based economy and sustainability issues. Professional communicators will share the execution of communication function with "lay" communicators, more than in the past. "Public relations people are no longer manufacturers of communication products. We are strategists, counselors and trainers." The task is for public relations to facilitate communication by others in the organization. (Jackson, 1998, May 26) Finney concurred, noting that the lines of communication responsibility are blurring and being shared throughout organizations "...the question is, is that a threat or an opportunity? For some of my colleagues it is a threat. If they have focused on the craft, have not advanced their skills ...perspective ...knowledge of business ...organizational behavior ...demographics ...stretched to what is happening in the global economy ...yes that can be a real threat."

Are professional communicators willing to embrace the responsibility of public problem solving?

My hope is to have forwarded an argument that demonstrates that there is no choice but to be willing. Leadership in the discipline seems to concur. "Without truth we really don't have a profession," asserted Jerry Bryan, vice president of corporate communications at Sverdrup Corp., at the opening session of the PRSA National Conference in St. Louis in 1996. (Stoff, 1996, p. 18) PRSA President Luis Moralis, in an address to the PRSA District Conference in San Antonio, Texas, April 13, 1996, said "It is my firm belief that these are the times in which we in public relations can step out from the crowd. By our own initiative, we can demonstrate our intellectual capability to identify and respond to issues that others are either too busy to see, or who lack the perception to understand their significance." (Morales, 1996)

Are communicators' skills and ethical abilities up to the task?

The informal consensus of those interviewed was that some are, but a majority are not.

"The vast majority [of communicators] will probably say they are, but in reality, most are ill-equipped in knowledge and experience to fulfill this important role," wrote Craig Miyamoto APR, principal and senior counsel, Miyamoto Strategic Counsel, PRSA Fellow and national director at large (1998, May 21). "It's not just a question of being willing to. It also raises the issues of competence, a set of high ethical standards and credibility among those who would entrust us to deliver the message(s)."

Pavlich, M.E.M. (1998, July 15) "Stewardship of Public Trust ..." NCA/ICA Conference in Rome, Italy
"Reading a large number of accreditation exams shows that many lower and mid-level people have problems identifying and knowing how to deal with ethics problems," stated David H. Simon APR, president of Simon/McGarry Public Relations, chair of the PRSA College of Fellows and member of the PRSA Accreditation Board. Public relations needs stronger ethical codes, according to Melvin Sharp Ph.D. APR, professor and director of the public relations sequence at Ball State University (1998, May 13).

**What about the institutions of higher learning who train them?**

"As a teacher of public relations, I try to prepare my students to be advocates for those they represent. I stress ethics as the basis of everything we do. We communicate to shape perceptions; to seek positive behavior, to build positive relationships. At the same time we look to merge the public and private interests, to operate in the public interest, and not to contaminate the channels of communication," responded Frank Stansberry APR, PRSA fellow and national director at large (1998, June 3).

In an economy where workers' knowledge base turns over as frequently as every three years (Finney, 1998, June 8), the need for partnering between professional membership organizations and institutions of higher learning seems obvious. Among the challenges is persuading industry to take time for education and for education to accommodate the pace of the workplace. Interviews with professional communicators produced overwhelming agreement that more emphasis must be placed on business principles in the training of communicators. While European communication programs stress economics, many American programs are still hostage to journalism departments and university politics. Additionally, "the problems between media people and public relations people get propagated by colleges and universities around the country...we have to step back and start there to try and bridge that gap," Aud suggested, noting that her own journalism training did little to prepare her for the dynamic environment of public relations (1998, May 28).

In addition to principles of business, greater exposure to and understanding of public participation, philosophy and world religions may be in order, according to Michael McDermott APR, vice president of Finance One Corporation and PRSA Fellow and National Director at Large. (1998, May 22)

The multi-stakeholder environment suggests a need for better legal training of communicators. Fitzpatrick, in the Public Relations Review, emphasized,

> Many public relations professionals may be placing themselves and client organizations at risk of legal liability because they have little or no familiarity with important legal issues that affect public relations activities...A survey of [PRSA] members showed that today's professionals consider themselves only somewhat familiar with the law in the areas of commercial speech, contracts, financial public relations, copyright, privacy, libel, access to information, SEC regulations and professional malpractice. (1996, Spring, p.1)

At the time of this writing, the National Communication Association's first ever conference on public relations education was impending (Arlington, Virginia, July 9-11, 1998). The obligation of higher education to the role of professional communicators in organizations merits further investigation in light of NCA conference results.

My personal informal wish list of curriculum improvements includes:

- economics,
- the knowledge-based economy,
- mixed/motive game theory in the context of symmetrical/asymmetrical communication,
- practical application of coorientation model,
- a perspective of public relations as community builder versus promoter,
- stakeholders and issues management,
- theories of morality,
- coaching and facilitating,
- comparative ethics,
- law for the trenches,
- communication accounting practices, and
how organizational structure in non-profit, for-profit and government affects mission and operation.

**What are the ramifications for organizations?**

"Organizations also must raise their ethical standards in business, employment, communications, in the way they procure, and in the way they treat their customers and their suppliers," Miyamoto asserted. People growing up in a loving household are most likely to be loving parents. Likewise, communicators working in an ethical atmosphere early on in their careers, will most likely have high ethical standards ingrained in them. They will therefore be positioned to leave a legacy of ethics that will survive even after they're gone…it boils down to a triad partnership between employer, employee, and profession (including education). If the three work in harmony to instill competent, effective, ethical communication as a means to produce acceptable social change, then and only then can professional non-media communicators be entrusted with the responsibility of public discourse stewardship. (Miyamoto, 1998, May 21)

Organizations must be willing to raise an expectation among constituencies that the organization will “tell you the bad news too,” according to Karen Knapp ABC, manager of corporate communications for Union Texas Petroleum and IABC director at large (1998, May 18).

**Are organizations and communication practitioners ready to embrace realities of symmetrical communication?**

Again the conclusion is: some yes, most no for reasons noted previously. Fred Morgan APR, manager of public affairs for Jacobs Engineering Group, PRSA Fellow and national director at large, has had more than 20 years of experience practicing two-way symmetrical communication and public participation in the energy industry (1998, May 20). The following are some of the “realities” he has learned:

- Communicators and their organizations must think through the consequences of engagement in order to appropriately meet or exceed expectations of stakeholders.
- The process takes time and costs money.
- Organizations must anticipate the real possibility that plans, although made in partnership with communities, will change if the community changes its mind.
- The public is smarter than it is given credit for. Frequently its members know more about issues than the organization or government officials involved do.
- The process can lead you along a path that you had not intended.
- The process requires that communication professionals provide training, advice and strategy to management.
- Certain issues go beyond two-way communication to two-way decision making.
- Members of the community have responsibilities too, including: taking time for meetings, listening, learning, and following through.

**IN CONCLUSION**

The conclusion of this initial probe is that professional communicators and lay communicators will drive organizational performance as never before. The environmental shifts (knowledge economy and shifts in organizational asset valuation, sustainability) demand that the communication function not be relegated to anything but urgent among organizational priorities. Return on investment has always been of paramount importance to organizational leadership. Communicators (professionals) will be valued whose skill set includes rational accountability of communication results and the moral fortitude to facilitate productive dialogue and exchange with stakeholders.

The credibility of an organization and its communicators (professional and lay) depends, at once, on the individual reputations of both. Herein lies the greatest management challenge: achieving congruent communicative behavior (represented symbolically through oral, written and visual means) among its parts.
and reconciling them individually and in aggregate with stakeholder expectations. Organizations that thrive
will be those who accommodate the reconciliation process as organic to not ancillary to the achievement of
objectives. The result will be the most important organizational asset: trust.

For the individual, the greatest challenge will be having the knowledge and the courage to advocate and
initiate change. Finney (1998, June 8) put it precisely: "It's time to stop communicating about change and to
start changing the way we communicate."
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