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In a replication and extension of a 1984 study by Ferguson to investigate the status of theory building by public relations scholars, 748 abstracts and/or articles published in Public Relations Review, Journal of Public Relations Research and its predecessor Public Relations Research Annual, since their inceptions through the year 2000, were subjected to content analysis. Nearly 20 percent of articles analyzed were found to have contributed to theory development in public relations compared to only 4 percent in Ferguson's study. Theory was most prevalent in articles about excellence/symmetry, public relationships, ethics and social responsibility, crisis response, critical-cultural, feminism/diversity and international topics. These and interdisciplinary influences are expected to continue to contribute to ever more theory building in public relations.
Introduction and Purpose

What is the status of theory building by public relations scholars? In 1984, Mary Ann Ferguson, grounding her work in Kuhn (1970), analyzed nearly ten years’ worth of abstracts of articles published in public relations’ then-sole academic journal, Public Relations Review. Ferguson concluded that there had not been much productive theory development at all. She identified three foci that she predicted held great potential for theory development: social responsibility and ethics, social issues and issue management, and public relationships. She argued the latter, in which the unit of study is the relationships between organizations and their publics, offered “the most opportunity for a paradigm focus to speed the development of theory in this field” (Ferguson, 1984, p. ii). Ferguson presented her findings to the Public Relations Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. Although her paper has been widely cited (see, for example, Cancel, Cameron, Sallot & Mitrook, 1997; Grunig, 1993; Heath, 2001), it was never published.

The ending of one millennium and the beginning of another presents a natural opportunity to look, Janus-like, back to see where we’ve been and forward to see where we might be heading. The purposes of this paper are to replicate Ferguson’s work and to extend her analysis to the present in order to assess what theory development has been accomplished and to identify fruitful direction for future theory building in public relations. The present work briefly reviews theory building in general (from which this paper draws its odd name), Ferguson’s work in more detail, and theory building about public relationships to date. It then presents findings and discussion of the present analysis of 748 abstracts and/or articles published in Public

What is Theory?

Volumes discussing theory and theory development fill libraries at countless institutions of learning, so it is well beyond the scope of this paper to do little more than explain how "theory" as a concept has been used in preceding self-examinations of the public relations academy and how it was operationalized for the purposes of this study.

In reviewing academic literature about theory, it is striking that animal similes are used often to describe theory and development of ways of thinking, or paradigms, and the sets of theoretical and methodological axioms that come to constitute a discipline. For instance, Causey likened "a good, general theory" to the torso of an octopus, with "auxiliary hypotheses... like tentacles" (p. 398), and suggested that when theory grows more than eight arms and spawns new auxiliary hypotheses, then theory becomes a myriapus. Ferguson (1984) likened the theory of public relations to a unicorn, and rather playfully characterized it as "a green one at that" (p. 28). Kavoori and Gurevitch (1993) compared the supposed fragmentation of mass communication as a discipline to a platypus, a zoological embarrassment defying classification. Discussing theories and models, Rosengren (1993) employed frog ponds for comparison. Charting problems in histories of communication studies in the U.S., Robinson (1988) drew on dragons for analogy. There are so many such animalistic allusions in academic literature about theory, history and philosophies of science that D.C. Phillips called his guide to fabled threats

---

1 Hence the "animalistic" title of this paper.

Traditionally, in what Craig (1993) described as the “received view,” theory has been thought to comprise a body of scientific generalizations describing functional relationships among empirically measured or inferred variables. The goals of scientific theory traditionally have been description, explanation, understanding, prediction, and control of phenomena. Communication researchers have been encouraged to build “theories of the middle-range,” those that would yield hypotheses about a “delimited range of phenomena” which could be rigorously tested (p. 27). These middle-range theories were thought to be superior to speculative “grand theories” and to “isolated empirical generalizations,” such as those concerning effects of fear appeals on attitude change. Popper (1959) had taught scholars that falsifiability is the “sine qua non” of scientific theory and that “speculative grand theories inherently lacked this essential quality.” Likewise, isolated empirical generalizations or “sets of laws” were inferior to “conceptually integrated” middle-range theories because they lacked “organizing and heuristic advantages” (Craig, 1993, p. 27).

Following Kuhn’s (1962) postpositivist history and philosophy of science, communication science was thought to be in a “preparadigmatic state” in search of a paradigm (Craig, 1993, p. 27). Judging by many predominant publications about communication science and current communication theory textbooks, this received view continues to dominate and communication scholars and students alike continue to define theory largely in the traditional terms, as Craig (1993) discussed them above. However, the assumption implicit in the writings

---

2 A bestiary, according to Webster’s dictionary, is a work in verse or prose describing with an allegorical moralizing commentary the appearance and habits of real and fabled animals. This animalistic approach pervades science—even Hanson, for example, used drawings of duck-rabbits, antelope-pelicans and the like in which an object appears to be one thing sometimes and an entirely different thing other times to test sensory core theory (Suppe, 1977a).
of Kuhn and others that theories are “deep conceptual systems which provide a Weltanschauung,3 or perspective for viewing the world” (Suppe, 1977a, p. 114) has been called into question. Given that an individual’s whole background including “training, experience, knowledge, beliefs, and intellectual profile” can be relevant in “working with a theory,” it becomes “exceedingly doubtful” whether a Weltanschauung can be the “joint possession” of a group of scientists, as required by Kuhn, according to Suppe (1977a, p. 218). Rather it’s more likely that groups of scientists in a particular community share the same or similar language (Suppe, 1977a, p. 220).

Additionally, because of increasing interdisciplinary discourse such as that stimulated by postmodernism, deconstruction, critical/cultural and other influences, Craig (1993) argues the humanities have “mounted a serious challenge to received notions of scientific theory” (p. 29). In what he attributes to a “rhetorical turn” (Simons, 1990), Craig suggests theory can be conceived as practical, historically-situated discourse. Such theory-as-discourse poses a challenge to epistemological criteria such as falsifiability to the theory-as-knowledge received view. This theory-as-discourse may make the traditional vocabulary of scientific theory construction “irrelevant” to the new forms of theory. Craig further asserts, “However much one may like or dislike this situation, to ignore or deny it can only serve to worsen our present state of confusion about theory” (p. 29).

Certainly the received view—and Kuhn’s history and philosophy—guided Ferguson’s (1984) research, which the present study replicates and extends. Ferguson worked from the assumption that theory is “not an explanation based on supposition or conjecture” but that theory

---

3 This linguistic-conceptual approach to the philosophy of science is thought to be heir to the traditions of Nietzsche, Peirce, Lewis and Quine in a neo-Kantian pragmatism (Suppe, 1977a, pp. 126-127).
She argued that practitioners who question the value of theory in practice have two choices: make decisions based on intuition or conjecture, or make decisions based on generalizations culled from empirical evidence. Generalizations useful to public relations can come from many different fields and bodies of knowledge, she suggested.

Ferguson acknowledged that some critics of public relations question whether the field was worthy of scholarship and theory-building efforts, and that other critics charge that public relations merely applied theories developed in and by other disciplines. Ferguson, influenced by Kuhn (1962), argued that a paradigm focus in public relations research would “greatly enhance” the probability of productive theory development (p. 1) and would be “essential” for public relations research (or, for that matter, any other academic discipline) to be called a science (p. 6), and, she argued, without a paradigm focus “there may be such activity we call research in public relations but there will not be much theory development” (p. ii).

Kuhn’s work, including his ideas about paradigms and use of that term, which he clarified somewhat through notions of “exemplars” and “disciplinary matrixes,” has been roundly criticized. However, since arguments about paradigms, how they come to be and their usefulness, are beyond the scope of this paper, they will be set aside.

Assumptions of the Present Research about Theory

Drawing from Causey (1977), the present research assumes that theory involves generalizations culled from empirical evidence; that these generalizations help us describe, explain, understand and predict phenomena under study; that hypotheses derived from theories

---

4 For an excellent review of the history and philosophy of theory in science and the social sciences, including criticisms and defenses of Kuhn, see Frederick Suppe’s (1977b) *The Structure of Scientific Theories, 2nd edition*, an outgrowth of the symposium by the same title of 1,200 scholars held at the University of Illinois in 1969.
can be tested; that testing of hypotheses may result in the identification of relevant variables or attributes and the development of models of relationships between or among these variables; and that theory may determine its own and new applications.

The present research also assumes, as did Ferguson (1984), that theory can be flexible in terms of potential methodologies and units of analysis used to test it. Following Craig’s (1993) ideas, it is assumed new theories do not necessarily have to be bound to the traditions of the received view of science.

As Suppe (1977a) suggested, theories are assumed to be interpreted symbolic generalizations. Different interpretations of these symbolic generalizations are likely to stimulate a proliferation of theories, and different members of a scientific community are likely to formulate and employ different but possibly related theories, so that there is no one theory which is the “common possession of the community” (p. 144); nor is there one shared worldview from which theory derives, although similar language pertaining to theory might be shared.

Theories are assumed to be dynamic, growing entities that cannot be fully understood if they are divorced from the dynamics of their developments.

And, finally, theories and theory development are assumed in the present work to be desirable in an academic discipline, specifically public relations.

The Ferguson (1984) Research Further Reviewed

There have been a fair number of introspective investigations of the public relations academy ranging from analyses of gaps in the body of knowledge and of citations to differences in research agendas between journals (see, for example, Broom, Cox, Krueger & Liebler, 1989; McElreath & Blamphin, 1994; Pasadeos & Refro, 1992; and Pasadeos, Renfro & Hanily, 1999). However, the only scholar to study general theory development in the field is Mary Ann
To investigate the main foci or themes in public relations research, Ferguson (1984) conducted content analysis of 171 abstracts and/or articles published in *Public Relations Review* over a ten-year span. At the time Ferguson conducted her analysis, *Public Relations Review* was the only academic journal being published about public relations; Ferguson's analysis covered articles published from the journal's inception—volume 1, issue 1—in 1975 and into 1984—through volume 10, issue 2.

Ferguson concluded from her analysis that there were three overall foci of research conducted in public relations from 1975-1984 that lent themselves to productive theory development: social responsibility and ethics, social issues and issues management, and public relationships. She predicted that the area of public relationships offered the best opportunity for theory development in public relations for the following reasons:

1. By putting the research focus on relationship rather than on the organization or on the public, [researchers] can come to better understandings of what is important about these relationships, both to the public and to the organization. In a relationship-centric model, the relationship is assumed to be the prime issue of concern, not the parties involved.

2. This type of focus at the macro level should result in new methodologies with which to study the phenomenon of public relationships. To study relationships rather than organizations or groups, different units of analysis will be needed.

3. Focusing public relations scholars' concerns on public relationships should create a niche or domain for the field's research efforts. Students of public relationships should all come to share similar assumptions and knowledge.

4. Including the organization and the public in new models along with communication variables should allow integration of findings from many fields to aid in understandings of
public relationships.

5. Theories that focus on the relationship as the unit of analysis can be as broad or as narrow as the researcher desires.

6. A research paradigm focus that comes to understand the study of public relations as the study of relationships between organizations and publics will do as much to “legitimize” the field of public relations, as have past efforts at defining the field in terms of the activities of those who practice it (pp. 25-26)

In sum, Ferguson’s recommendations represented a potential area for theory development in public relations which she predicted would serve to unify a variety of research methods, constructs, and applications under an overall focus of organization-public relationships.

A Relational Theory of Public Relations

Since Ferguson’s recommendations in 1984, several researchers have tested and extended concepts associated with adopting a relational theory approach to public relations research; this research is the tangible result of Ferguson’s prediction. For example, in a discussion of the roles of “image” and “substance” in public relations, Grunig (1993) cited Ferguson’s identification of attributes of relationships that researchers can use to define and measure organization-public relationships: their dynamic nature; the level of openness; the degree of satisfaction for both parties; the power distribution; and the extent of mutuality of understanding, agreement, and consensus. To this list, Grunig recommended adding two additional relational concepts: “trust and credibility” and “the concept of reciprocity” (p. 135). Grunig distinguished between symbolic relationships, which he described as a focus on image, and behavioral relationships, or “the actual interaction between an organization and its publics” (p. 123). He concluded, “for public relations to be valued by the organizations it serves,
practitioners must be able to demonstrate that their efforts contribute to the goals of these organizations by building long-term behavioral relationships with strategic publics ... [and] must strive to build linkages between the two sets of relationships [symbolic and behavioral] if their work is to make organizations more effective” (p. 136).

Also building on Ferguson's assertions regarding the potential for organization-public relationships as a theoretical focus in public relations research, Broom, Casey and Ritchey (1997) proposed a model for constructing such a theory, including specific variables which may impact these relationships as either antecedent conditions or consequences. Broom et al. pointed to other research fields such as interpersonal communication, psychotherapy, organizational communication, and systems theory in developing their conclusions and recommendations. Further, Broom et al. proposed a concept of relationships as involving properties of exchanges, transactions, communications, and "other interconnected activities." They identified "antecedent conditions" of organization-public relationships, including social and cultural norms, collective perceptions and expectations, needs for resources, perceptions of an uncertain environment, and legal/voluntary necessity. Finally, "consequences" of organization-public relationships included goal achievement, dependency/loss of autonomy, and routine and institutionalized behavior. Based on this model, Broom et al. proposed the need for further explication, "to attend to the concept [of the organization-public relationship] itself and to develop empirical descriptions and measurements of the phenomenon" (p. 96). In 2000, Ledingham and Bruning published their book, Public Relations as Relationship Management, in which they continue developing theory of public relationships.

Several researchers have successfully expanded and tested Broom et al.'s recommendations for an organization-public relationship approach to theory-building and
research in public relations. In a study of the relationship between a bank and its customers, Bruning and Ledingham (1999) designed and applied “a multiple-item, multiple-dimension organization-public relationship scale” (p. 157). Through factor analysis, Bruning and Ledingham identified three dimensions in relationships that occur between organizations and key publics: professional, personal, and community. They concluded “the notion of the relationship itself must be considered as multi-dimensional” (Bruning & Ledingham, 1999, p. 166).

In a commentary on the use of the World Wide Web in public relations practice, Kent and Taylor (1998) proposed “dialogic communication as a theoretical framework to guide relationship building between organizations and publics” (p. 321) based on Broom et al.’s conclusion that relationship formation and maintenance represents a process of mutual adaptation and contingency response. They offered five strategies for practitioners to use to create dialogic relationships with Internet publics which “include feedback mechanisms as specific tactics” (p. 331). These strategies should assist practitioners in developing Web pages, structuring content, organizing information, appealing to publics, and “most importantly, build[ing] relationships with publics” (p. 331).

Finally, Taylor (2000) proposed a public relations approach to nation building based on Broom et al.’s recommendations for relationship-building processes. She specifically explored two of Broom et al.’s conclusions: that relationships consist of patterns of linkages through which parties in relationships pursue and service their independent needs, and that relationships may lead to increased dependency, loss of autonomy, and structured interdependence as routine and institutionalized behavior (Broom et al., 1997). Taylor’s data showed both accomplishments and consequences of a public relations campaign for nation building which support a relational
communication approach centered on theoretical concepts of control, trust, and intimacy. Taylor suggested the following principles underlie this approach: nation building requires two levels of relationships, those between individuals and those between individuals and government. In addition, these relationships can be fostered through communication and must be negotiated in social contexts. Taylor concluded "campaigns that allow individuals to control their own relationships, foster trust, and provide for intimacy will be beneficial for relationship building, and ultimately, for nation building" (p. 207).

These are only a few examples of how public relationships have become a focus of recent research in the field. While such research seems to support Ferguson's predictions of advances in theory building about public relationships, only new analyses of academic literature can answer with any confidence the primary research question of the present study, which is "what is the status of theory building by public relations scholars in their academic field?" The following section describes how the present study attempts to fill this gap in the public relations body of knowledge.

Method

An analysis of publishing activity provides evidence by which disciplines are often judged. Cole and Bowers (1973) contend that published scholarly journal activity exposes ideas to "cleansing" evaluations and criticism by colleagues and provides an objective measurement of research in the field of mass communication. Studies providing a description of article activity measure contributions of certain disciplines to the discovery, dissemination and verification of knowledge (Soley & Reid, 1983).

Given the scarcity of research examining the role of theory development in public relations scholarship, an informal, descriptive method was deemed most appropriate for this
study. Instead of testing preconceived hypotheses, a descriptive approach allows the researchers to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the topic at hand (Hon, 1997). Krippendorff (1980) justifies the importance of descriptive aims in content analysis studies. While such studies are presented as factual, they are most meaningful when placed in the context of the problem that makes it significant (p. 25). The goal of the present research is to describe, in order to better understand the breadth and scope of public relations scholarship and the role that theory development plays in that scholarship.

The present study, which replicates and extends Ferguson's (1984) research, consists of content analysis of all articles published in Public Relations Review through volume 26, number 4 (Winter 2000), all articles in Public Relations Research Annual volumes 1, 2 and 3, and all articles in Journal of Public Relations Research through volume 12, number 4 (year 2000). While these journals are not a complete representation of public relations scholarship, their contents are assumed to be representative of the foci of public relations scholarship for the past twenty-five years.

Analysis in the present study began by using the classification system developed by Ferguson (1984). In the earlier study, Ferguson read the titles and abstracts of the articles she analyzed, then arranged them into three primary classifications that simply emerged: articles that were introspective, articles that related to the practice or application of public relations, and articles that involved theory development in public relations. For her introspective and practice/application classifications, Ferguson also allowed several sub-categories to emerge. The present study initially adopted Ferguson's classes and sub-categories but also allowed others to emerge.

5 The first volume of Journal of Public Relations Research is numbered 4.
The unit of analysis was the title and abstract; however, in cases where there was no abstract or the abstract was ambiguous with regard to the article’s relationship with theory, coders then read the actual articles in part or entirely.

There were five coders in all, four of whom are public relations faculty with doctoral degrees in mass communication and one who is a doctoral student in mass communication with emphasis in public relations; all are conversant with public relations academic literature.

Each title and abstract/article was read and coded as belonging to the most appropriate main class and sub-category, at first using Ferguson’s categorization system as a guide but, as coding progressed, letting new categories emerge as warranted. Each unit was coded into only one category; side notes were made suggesting possible alternative categories for any units thought by coders to belong to multiple classes or sub-categories. Also, when a coder did not see an appropriate existing category, she or he noted a recommended classification. These notes regarding possible alternative or new categorizations were re-considered after the preliminary round of coding by two of the coders in a check for goodness of fit, with special attention given to suggested alternate or new categories that had emerged.

Abstracts/articles for which new classifications had been suggested were rotated again and reconsidered for recoding by four of the five coders. For example, a “Women and Minorities” sub-category under the introspection class emerged in the initial coding process with 17 articles resulting in “no fit” otherwise. During the second round of coding, all 17 articles were categorized in the new “Introspection, Women and Minorities” class/sub-category.

Likewise, coders also again reviewed articles for which they disagreed on categorization.

---

6 The authors of this paper apologize in advance to any authors included in our analysis who believe their articles are mis-categorized.
and tried to resolve their disagreements, each coder noting his/her justification in writing for discussion purposes. Finally, after discussion, a summary of coding disagreements was created.

After this final round of coding had been completed, descriptive results were compiled in an informal table. No attempt was made to evaluate the article quality, length or other characteristics. It is important to reiterate that this exhaustive coding process was created and implemented to obtain a descriptive overview of the scholarship in the field of public relations.

Results

In total, 748 titles, abstracts and/or articles were analyzed. (See appendix for categorizations by titles of articles.) In all, there was unanimous agreement among the coders on categorizations for 715 (95.6%) of the articles. Twenty-seven articles (3.6%) were agreed upon by three out of four coders; majority ruled in these instances regarding categorizations. Only six articles (.8%) resulted in split (2 to 2) votes. Two articles (.3%) resulted in two votes for one class and two sub-classifications; the remaining four articles involved votes split (2 to 2) across different classes. Therefore, inter-coder reliability was .93.7 Thirty-three (19.3%) titles of the 171 titles in Ferguson’s 1984 analysis were re-categorized in the present study; some of these were placed in categories new to this study.

Introspective Articles

Table 1 summarizes the sub-categories of articles that were considered of the introspective class. Of the 748 articles reviewed, 295 (39.5%) were placed into this class—the most of any class. Four subcategories from the Ferguson (1984) study were used in the first round of analysis in this study. They are: a) pedagogy/education in public relations, b) ethics and

---

7 Scott’s pi index, which corrects for the number of categories used and also for the probable frequency of use (Wimmer & Dominick, 1997), was used to calculate inter-coder reliability.
social responsibility, c) history of public relations, and d) the profession of public relations.

Additional sub-categories in the introspection category emerged and were added in the present study to include: e) women and minorities, f) international public relations, g) image/reputation/impression management and h) scholarly research.

Table 1. Introspective. Class 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Profession of Public Relations</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy/Education in Public Relations</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Public Relations</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Public Relations</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Social Responsibility</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and Minorities</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Research</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/Reputation/Impression Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>295</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most frequently assigned sub-categories were the profession of public relations with 70 articles, pedagogy/education in public relations with 69 articles, and history of public relations with 59 articles. Image/reputation/impression management was the least often used category with only 3 articles.

Practice/Application Articles

The practice/application of public relations class had 291 articles (39%), summarized in Table 2. The six sub-categories that emerged in the Ferguson (1984) study used initially here were: a) management in public relations, b) implementing public relations programs and campaigns, c) applied research issues and methodologies, d) organizational communication, e) social issues/issues management, f) new communication technologies, and g) legal issues.

Additional sub-categories in the practice/application class that emerged and included in the
The most often assigned sub-category was implementing programs/campaigns, with 92 articles. The least commonly assigned sub-categories were image/reputation/impression management, with 1 article; and ethics, also with 1 article.

Theory Development Articles

A total of 148 articles (19.8%) were placed in the Theory Development in Public Relations class. (See Table 3.) All the sub-categories are new to this study; Ferguson had no sub-categories in this class. They are: a) role theory/models, b) risk communication, c) excellence theory/symmetrical communication/Grunig’s models, d) rhetorical underpinnings, e) fund raising, f) women’s studies/Feminist school/gender/diversity/minority theories, g) academic vs. applied research, h) organizational communication, i) situational theory, j) ethics-social responsibility, k) social issues and issues management, l) public relationships, m) international public relations, n) contingency theory, o) crisis response theory, p) public opinion/persuasion,
q) critical/cultural r) complexity theory, and s) general social science theory.

Table 3. Theory Development in Public Relations. Class 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence Theory/Symmetrical Communication/Grunig's Models</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relationships</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Response Theory</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical/Cultural Theory</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics/Social Responsibility</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic vs. Applied Research</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Theory</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies/Feminist School/Gender/Diversity/Minority</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Public Relations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Theory/Models</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Underpinnings</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion/Public Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues and Issues Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Theory</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Social Science Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most often assigned sub-category was Excellence theory/symmetrical communication/Grunig's models with 19 articles; this was followed by public relationships (14 articles) and the crisis response theory sub-category (14 articles). Least often assigned were sub-categories for complexity theory and general social science theory, with 1 article each.

**Articles relating to the publication itself.** Eight articles were placed into a new, fourth class of “relating to the publication itself.” These articles consisted of editors’ notes to readers about the journal.

**Summary of Disagreements in Coding.** Table 4 summarizes the six articles for which agreement among the four coders was split. Four of the six articles appeared in *Public Relations Review*. Two appeared in *Public Relations Research Annual*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Coder #1: I Introspective, Ethics</th>
<th>Coder #2: I Introspective, Ethics</th>
<th>Coder #3: I Introspective, The Profession</th>
<th>Coder #4: I Introspective, The Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moving Toward Higher Standards for American Business (John Koten), PRR, 12:3, 3-11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

In the past, public relations was thought to suffer from lack of a unifying theory or even satisfactory theory development (Ferguson, 1984). Perhaps interpreting too literally Lewin's (1951) oft-quoted observation that there is nothing so practical as a good theory, some have argued that effective public relations should draw from both professional practice and theory (IPRA, 1982; Ferguson, 1984). More recently, some have suggested that public relations has evolved into two sometimes overlapping, sometimes conflicting branches—the applied branch and the theory-based research/scholarship branch—and as a result the field is in a paradigm

---

8 From a fascinating chautauqua in Communication Monographs asking, "Why are there so few communication theories?", it might be surmised that public relations' sufferance was in very good company indeed—apparently the company of the entire field of communication. Berger (1991) lamented that the communications field does not foster theory development because of lack of commerce and unity among the subgroups and risk aversions among academics and graduate students. Burleson (1992) suggested scholars need to take the field more seriously and develop a philosophy of communication. Redding (1992), resisting applied-theoretical and practical-pure dichotomies, argued that valuable theories can emerge from the applied and that descriptive quasi-theories might be useful. Likewise, Proctor (1992) noted that ties between the discipline and practical communication activities are an asset instead of a liability. Purcell (1992), noting there are plenty of theories harking back to 2500 years to rhetorical traditions, asked if there are so few communication theories. Berger (1992) replied to all that communication theory has failed to answer very basic questions about how communication works, but that attacking some of those fundamentals will help motivate the theory development still needed to increase our understanding about communication. In concluding the chautauqua in Journal of Communication, Craig (1993) asked, "Why are there so many communication theories?" But he believes more theories are needed, not fewer.
struggle, perhaps sparked by new models and theories of public relations developed since the 1980s (Botan, 1993).

Now this study has found that nearly 20 percent of articles published in the major public relations journals during the past twenty-five or so years have contributed to theory development in public relations. By comparison, in Ferguson's 1984 analysis of articles published in one major journal over nearly ten years, only 4 percent contributed to theory development.

Given this finding, the answer to the primary research question of this study—"What is the status of theory building by public relations scholars?"—is a resounding: "We've made tremendous progress in our scholarship toward building theory, thank you, and we're getting better all the time." Happily, public relations scholars have come a long way since 1984 when Ferguson noted that many scholars and professionals alike would react to the term public relations theory by saying, "What a quaint notion."

It is important to note once more that this study was limited to an analysis of theory published in the academic journals in the field. If the plethora of theory-building books about public relations published since the late 1980s had been taken into account as well, the growth in public relations' theoretical base would be seen to be even more robust than this study suggests. All one need do is pick up Heath's (2001) hefty new Handbook of Public Relations, thumb through its 802 pages in 62 chapters, and bask in the rosy glow of certainty that public relations' theory building is in fine fettle, indeed.

---

No Dominant Paradigms Per Se

Contrary to Ferguson's (1984) expectations, however, it can be argued from the results of this study that no dominant paradigms per se have emerged. Of the 148 articles classified as theory development, the largest share—but still only 13 percent—were categorized as concerned with Excellence theory, arguably the closest public relations comes at this time to having a paradigm. Certainly, Grunig and his colleagues have stimulated much reflection, discussion and research in the field, and are to be commended for their contributions.

Ferguson proved more prescient when she predicted the potential for developing theory about public relationships, since it accounts for nearly 10 percent of the articles in the theory development class, as well as ethics and social responsibility, accounting for nearly 8 percent of theory development articles. In particular, Ledingham and Bruning have taken a lead in the area of public relationships, which seems likely to prove fruitful for other scholars as well. Some scholars, including Grunig and his colleagues, are making interesting linkages between public relationships and other areas of interest, such as evaluation in public relations, which should yield some very productive, theory-based scholarship.

It is noteworthy that the proliferation of theory development since Ferguson's (1984) study drove us to add several new sub-categorizations to the theory class, where Ferguson had none. Several trends in the more descriptive scholarly works also inspired us to add several new sub-categories to Ferguson's original categorization framework, such as "Women and Minorities," "International Practice," "New Communication Technologies," "Legal Issues,"

10 Of course, many would argue that Excellence theory is the dominant paradigm in public relations, especially when books are taken into account. It would have been difficult for Ferguson to have predicted the impact of Excellence theory in 1984, since Managing Public Relations, which first presented "Grunig's models," was published the same year.
“Crisis Response,” and several others. These simply reflect the proliferation of published research in these areas. (See appendix.) We would expect publishing activity in all these areas to continue to flourish. No doubt new themes will arise since scholarship in public relations gives every appearance of thriving.

If the recent past is any indicator, crisis response theory, critical-cultural theory, feminism/diversity and international influences may all prove of heuristic significance to public relations theory building in the future. Given our findings, we expect these present theory development trends to continue along with one other – we predict theory building in public relations will show the effects of greater interdisciplinary influences. In the spirit of Craig (1993), let a thousand flowers bloom, and the more the merrier. For, the greater the interdisciplinarity and the more theories developed will mean the more thriving, stimulating and vibrant the discipline. May the public relations academy enjoy such riches.

**Need to Clarify Theory Implications in Publications**

One recommendation to editors of journals and authors of journal articles stems directly from this study’s analysis. When publication content has a relationship with theory and/or theory development, it would be a great service to readers if the titles and abstracts as well as the articles themselves clearly reflect this. In addition, specifically what the relationship is should be clearly stated—for example, is a particular theory used as a frame? Is a particular theory being tested? Do findings support or refute a particular theory?

**Future Research**

Further analysis of data yielded in the present study will be conducted to investigate any differences regarding theory development between the journals surveyed here. Hopefully, others
will replicate and extend our work here, as we have attempted to accomplish with Ferguson’s research.

Conclusion

From this study, it appears our “ark” of theory development in public relations has every reason to expect smooth sailing ahead, given that our passenger-cargo manifest is filled with so many brilliant, beguiling breeds of beast. It’s quite a zoo we have accompanying us on our magical, mystical voyage into this realm of theory, this ultimate journey we’re undertaking to help us better describe, explain, understand and predict the world of public relations. Why, our companions range all the way from aardvarks to zebras! Ark ahoy! All aboard!
References

Appendix

Note: Titles of articles are followed by name(s) of authors in parentheses, year, abbreviation designating the journal, volume number, issue number, and page numbers. Abbreviations for journal titles are: Public Relations Review = PRR, volumes 1-26 (1975-2000); Public Relations Research Annual = PRRA, volumes 1-3 (1989-1991); and Journal of Public Relations Research = JPRR, volumes 4-12 (1992-2000). In the following tables, titles included in Ferguson's (1984) analysis and replicated here (PRR Volumes 1-10:2) are arranged alphabetically; titles published since then are arranged by journal in chronological order. Numbers next to classification headings were used for coding purposes. Titles in italics were included in Ferguson's (1984) study but are recategorized here. Classification headings in italics are new to this study. All other headings were included in Ferguson's (1984) study.

Class I. Introspective

101: Introspective: Pedagogy/Education in Public Relations

A Design for Graduate Study in Public Relations (Melvin L. Sharpe), 1984, PRR, 10:1, 53-58.
Educators and Professional Organizations (David E. Clavier and Donald K. Wright), 1982, PRR, 8:2, 25-30.
End-of-Decade Survey Shows Academic Growth in Public Relations (Albert Walker), 1982, PRR, 8:2, 46-60.
Foundation Lecture: Publications and Business Schools (Kerryn King), 1982, PRR, 8:2, 3-10.
Future Directions in Public Relations Education (Frank B. Kalupa and T. Harrell Allen), 1982, PRR, 8:2, 31-45.
The Image of Public Relations In Mass Comm Texts (Carolyn Cline), 1982, PRR, 8:3, 63-72.
Implications of the IPRA 'Gold Paper' (Donald K. Wright), 1983, PRR, 9:2, 3-6.
Micro-Relations for Students and Practitioners (Earl Hutchinson), 1980, PRR, 6:3, 23-32.
Preparing Today's Students for Tomorrow's Careers (Dennis L. Wilcox), 1975, PRR, 1:3, 47-55.
Public Relations Curricula In Transition (E. W. Brody), PRR, 1984, 10:1, 31-43.
Public Relations Education and the Business Schools (Donald K. Wright), 1982, PRR, 8:2, 11-16.
Public Relations Faculty: Costs and Compensation (Robert Kendall), 1984, PRR, 10:1, 44-52.

******************************************************************************

Women in Higher Education Public Relations: An Inking of Change? (Ruth Ann Weaver-Lariscy, Glen T. Cameron, and Duane D. Sweep), 1994, JPRR, 6:2, 125-140
Education for Corporate Public Relations (Bill L. Baxter), 1985, PRR, 11:1, 38-41.
Education for the '80s and Beyond (Gay Wakefield and Laura Perkins Cottone), 1986, PRR, 12:2, 37-46.
Knowledge and Skills Required by Public Relations Employers (Gay Wakefield and Laura Perkins Cottone), 1987, PRR, 13:3, 24-33.
Management Skills Need to be Taught In Public Relations (Judy VanSlyke Turk), 1989, PRR, 15:1, 38-52.
Faculty Supports Communication Core Courses (Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver, David L. Martinson, and Gonzalo Soruco), 1989, PRR, 15:1, 67-72.
Gaps Are Narrowing Between Female And Male Students (DeAnna DeRosa and Dennis L. Wilcox), 1989, PRR, 15:1, 80-90.
Presentation of the Paul J. Deutschmann Award (Mary Ann Ferguson), 1991, PRR, 17:4, 343-347.
Public Relations Executives' Perceptions of Disciplinary Emphases Important to Public Relations Practice for the 1990s (Gay Wakefield and Laura Perkins Cottone), 1992, PRR, 18:1, 67-78.
Faculty Members in Ad/PR Perceive Discrimination in Academia (Fred Fedler and Ron F. Smith), 1992, PRR, 18:1, 79-89.
A Method to the Madness: The Selection of Student Public Relations Groups (Ronda Beaman and Paul G. Stoltz), 1992, PRR, 18:1, 91-96.
Public Relations Education in MBA Programs: Challenges and Opportunities (J. David Pincus, Bob Rayfield, and Coral M. Ohl), 1994, PRR, 20:1, 55-72.
Public Relations Education in the United Kingdom (Charlotte R. Hatfield), 1994, PRR, 20:2, 189-199.
Using Active Learning in Public Relations Instructions: Demographic Predictors of Faculty Use (Charles A. Lubbers and Diane A. Gorcyca), 1997, PRR, 23:1, 67-80.
Assessment of Undergraduate and Graduate Programs (Donald Rybacki and Dan Lattimore), 1999, PRR, 25:1, 65-75.
Toward the Ideal Professional Master's Degree Program (Maria P. Russell), 1999, PRR, 25:1, 101-111.
An Exploratory Look at Graduate Public Relations Education (Linda Alldory and Elizabeth L. Toth), 2000, PRR, 26:1, 115-126.

102: Introspective Ethics and Social Responsibility
Foundation Lecture: Public Relations, Stubborn Opportunity (Allen H. Center), 1978, PRR, 4:1, 3-10. (Ferguson had in #104)
Measuring the Effect of Messages About Social Responsibility (Byron Reeves and Mary Ann Ferguson-DeThorne), 1980, PRR, 6:3, 40-55.
On Expecting Corporate Ethical Reform (Gerald Prout), 1978, PRR, 4:2, 13-21.
Professionalism and Social Responsibility in Public Relations (Donald K. Wright), 1979, PRR, 5:3, 20-33.
Social Responsibility of Business (Edward L. Bernays), 1975, PRR, 1:3, 5-16.

Investigating the Application of Deontology Among U.S. Public Relations Practitioners (Cornelius B. Pratt, SungHoon Im, and Scarlett N. Montague), 1994, JPRR, 6:4, 241-266.
Age and the Moral Values of Practitioners (Donald K. Wright), 1985, PRR, 11:1, 51-60.
Public Relations As A Source of Power (Lee Levitt), 1985, PRR, 11:3, 3-9.
Trans-national Terrorism As Public Relations? (S. E. Rada), 1985, PRR, 11:3, 26-33.
Ethics Research in Public Relations: An Overview (Donald K. Wright), 1989, PRR, 15:2, 3-5.
The Need For An International Code of Ethics (Dean Kruckeberg), 1989, PRR, 15:2, 6-18.
Ethics in College And University Public Relations (Frank Winston Wylie), 1989, PRR, 15:2, 63-67.
Universal Ethics Code: Both Possible and Feasible (Dean Kruckeberg), 1993, PRR, 19:1, 21-31.
An Approach to Ethics in the Information Age (Larry R. Judd), 1995, PRR, 21:1, 35-44.

103: Introspective: The History of Public Relations
After the Fall -- Opportunity: 1918-1947 (Joe B. Frantz), 1978, PRR, 4:3, 63-73.
American’s Era of Many Opinions: 1790-1830 (Barbara Wolter Hartung), 1980, PRR, 6:2, 3-10.
Building a Public Relations Definition (Rex Harlow), 1976, PRR, 2:4, 34-42.
The First Public War: 1861-1865 (Frank E. Vandiver), 1978, PRR, 4:3, 28-37.
Foundation Lecture on Public Relations In American History (Ray E. Hiebert), 1978, PRR, 4:3, 3-4.
A Public Relations Historian Recalls the First Days of Public Relations (Rex Harlow), 1981, PRR, 7:2, 33-42.
Public Relations Definitions Through the Years (Rex Harlow), 1977, PRR, 3:1, 49-63.
Public Relations in the Jackson White House (Fred P. Endres), 1976, PRR, 2:3, 5-12.

The Campaign of the Committee on Public Information: Its Contributions to the History and the Evolution of Public Relations (Bruce Pinkleton), 1994, JPRR, 6:4, 229-240.
"To Redeem the Soul of America": Public Relations and the Civil Rights Movement (Linda Childers Hon), 1997, JPRR, 9:3, 163-212.
Dissonant Notes of a Retiring Feminist: Doris E. Fleischman’s Later Years (Susan Henry), 1998, JPRR, 10:1, 1-33.
Titanic and Public Relations: A Case Study (Tim Ziaukas), 1999, JPRR, 11:2, 105-123.
Retrospective: Bernays’ Doctrine of Public Opinion (Marvin N. Olasky), 1984, PRR, 10:3, 3-12.
A Reappraisal of 19th-Century Public Relations (Marvin N. Olasky), 1985, PRR, 11:1, 3-12.
Pioneering Public Relations for Foreign Governments (Scott M. Cutlip), 1987, PRR, 13:1, 13-34.
Retrospective: Ivy Lee and the German Dye Trust (Brad E. Hainsworth), 1987, PRR, 13:1, 35-44.
Public Relations Footnote To the Pete Rose Affair (Scott M. Cutlip), 1989, PRR, 15:4, 46-58.
Publicity and American Culture: An Overview (Claire Badaracco), 1990, PRR, 16:3, 3-4.
Publicity and Modern Influence (Claire Badaracco), 1990, PRR, 16:3, 5-18.
Propaganda, Puffing, and the Public Interest (Richard W. Pollay), 1990, PRR, 16:3, 39-54.
The "Culture" of J. Walter Thompson, 1915-1925 (Peggy J. Kreshel), 1990, PRR, 16:3, 80-93.
Progressive Drive to Shape Public Opinion, 1898-1913 (Stephen Ponder), 1990, PRR, 16:3, 94-104.
Cultural History From Corporate Archives (Roland Marchand), 1990, PRR, 16:3, 105-114.
Lithuania's First Independence Battle: A PR Footnote (Scott M. Cutlip), 1990, PRR, 16:4, 12-16.
Pen Dudley's Name Finally Disappears from the Public Relations Marquee (Scott M. Cutlip), 1991, PRR, 17:4, 403-412.
National and Local Public Relations Campaigns During the 1946 Steel Strike (Karen S. Miller), 1995, PRR, 21:4, 305-324.
The Role of At&T's Public Relations Campaign in the Press Coverage of the 1982 Breakup (Jack Glascock), 2000, PRR, 26:1, 67-83.
When Congress Tried to Cut Pentagon Public Relations: A Lesson from History (Mordecai Lee), 2000, PRR, 26:2, 131-154.

104: Introspective: The Profession of Public Relations
Accreditation's Effects on Professionalism (Donald K. Wright), 1981, PRR, 7:1, 48-61.
Credibility of Public Relations for Journalists (Craig Aronoff), 1975, PRR, 1:2, 43-54.
Foundation Lecture: The Hour Strikes for Public Relations (George Hammond), 1979, PRR, 5:1, 3-10.
Foundation Lecture: The Individual Pursuit of a Profession (Scott Jones), 1981, PRR, 7:1, 3-16.
Hiring Criteria of Public Relations Employers (Dennis L. Wilcox), 1979, PRR, 5:2, 35-42.
An Insider's Outside View of Public Relations (Bruce R. Barstow), 1984, PRR, 10:1, 10-17.

(Ferguson had in #205)

Public Affairs Execs: Orators or Communicators (Jeffery A. Sonnenfeld), 1982, PRR, 8:3, 3-16.
Public Relations in the Government (Scott M. Cutlip), 1976, PRR, 2:2, 5-28.

(Ferguson had in #205)

Survey on Licensing Public Relations practitioners (Frank A. Tennant), 1978, PRR, 4:1, 37-42.
Testing the Practitioner's Impact on Clients (Glen M. Broom and George D. Smith), 1979, PRR, 5:3, 47-59.

Power in the Public Relations Department (Larissa A. Grunig), 1990, PRRA, 2, 115-155.
Images of Public Relations in the Print Media (Christopher H. Spicer), 1993, JPRR, 5:1, 47-61.
The Missing Story of Women in Public Relations (Elizabeth L. Toth and Larissa A. Grunig), 1993, JPRR, 5:3, 153-175.
CEO Perceptions of Investor Relations As a Public Relations Function: An Exploratory Study (Barbara K. Peterson and Hugh J. Martin), 1996, JPRR, 8:3, 173-209.
Antipathy Between PR, Journalism Exaggerated (E. W. Brody), 1984, PRR, 10:4, 11-15.
Aligning Values of Practitioners and Journalists (Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver), 1984, PRR, 11:2, 34-42.
Rethinking Leadership For Public Relations (Lee Thayer), 1986, PRR, 12:1, 3-12.
Recognition Comes From Consistently High Standards (Melvin L. Sharpe), 1986, PRR, 12:4, 17-25.
Practicing What We Preach: Strategic Communications (Edward W. Block), 1987, PRR, 13:4, 3-10.
Integrated Marketing Communications: A New Master's Degree Concept (Clark Caywood and Raymond Ewing), 1991, PRR, 17:3, 237-244.
Commentary: Communications Doesn't Define PR, It Diminishes It (John Budd, Jr.), 1995, PRR, 21:3, 177-180.
Negative Connotations in the Use of the Term "Public Relations: in the Print Media (Julie K. Henderson), 1998, PRR, 24:1, 45-54.

Doing Public Relations by the Numbers: Little Mac or Big Mac? (Marion K. Pinsdorf), 2000, PRR, 26:3, 261-275.

130: Introspective: Women and Minorities (new category)
Watch for Falling Glass...Women, Men, and Job Satisfaction in Public Relations: A Preliminary Analysis (Shirley A. Serini, Elizabeth Toth, Donald K., Wright, and Arthur G. Emig), 1997, JPRR, 9:2, 99-118.
Power, Gender, and Public Relations: Sexual Harassment as a Threat to Practice (Shirley A. Serini, Elizabeth L. Toth, Donald K. Wright, and Arthur Emig), 1998, JPRR, 10:3, 193-218.
Gender Shifts In Journalism and Public Relations (Kathryn T. Theus), 1999, PRR, 11:1, 42-50.
Sex Roles and Job Satisfaction in Public Relations (Gary W. Selnow and Shelly Wilson), 1985, PRR, 11:4, 38-47.
Women in Public Relations: An Overview (Larissa A. Grunig), 1988, PRR, 14:3, 3-5.
Breaking Public Relations' Glass Ceiling (David M. Dozier), 1988, PRR, 14:3, 6-14.
How Women Are Depicted In Annual Reports (Doug Newsom), 1988, PRR, 14:3, 15-19.

Women in Public Relations Graduate Study (Debra A. Miller), 1988, PRR, 14:3, 29-35.
A Research Agenda For Women In Public Relations (Larissa A. Grunig), 1988, PRR, 14:3, 48-57.
Status and Roles of Minority Public Relations Practitioners (Marilyn Kern-Foxworth), 1989, PRR, 15:3, 39-47.
Minority Practitioners: Career Influences, Job Satisfaction, and Discrimination (Eugenia Zerbinos and Gail Alice Clanton), 1993, PRR, 19:1, 75-91.
Gender Differences in Public Relations Students' Career Attitudes: A Benchmark Study (Betty Farmer and Lisa Waugh), 1999, PRR, 25:2, 235-249.

131: Introspective: International PR Practice (new category)
Good Future Forecast for British PR (Parry D. Sorensen), 1977, PRR, 3:1, 33-37. (Ferguson had in #104)
Craft and Professional Models of Public Relations and Their Relation to Job Satisfaction Among Korean Public Relations Practitioners (Yungwook Kim and Linda Childers Hon), 1998, JPRR, 10:3, 155-175.
Ethiopian Relief: A Case Study In Failed Relations (Gage W. Chapel), 1988, PRR, 14:2, 22-32.
The Impact of Social and Cultural Conditioning on Global Public Relations (Melvin L. Sharpe), 1992, PRR, 18:2,
International Public Relations: Critique and Reformulation (Carl Botan), 1992, PRR, 18:2, 149-159.
Professional Public Relations in India: Need Outstrips Supply (Doug Newsom and Bob Carrell), 1994, PRR, 20:2, 183-188.
Guest Relations: A Demanding but Constrained Role for Lady Public Relations Practitioners in Mainland China (Ni Chen and Hugh M. Culbertson), 1996, PRR, 22:3, 279-296.
From Communist Control to Glasnost and Back? Media Freedom and Control in the Former Soviet Union (Denise P. Ferguson), 1998, PRR, 24:2, 165-182.
Media Relations in Bosnia: A Role for Public Relations in Building Civil Society (Maureen Taylor), 2000, PRR, 26:1, 1-14.
Public Affairs Practitioners in the Netherlands, A Profile Study (Rob de Lange), 2000, PRR, 26:1, 15-29.
The Emergence of Public Relations in the Russian Federation (David W. Guth), 2000, PRR, 26:2, 191-207.
Public Relations in Contemporary India: Current Demands and Strategy (Raveena Singh), 2000, PRR, 26:3, 295-313.
Communication Management in The Netherlands (Betteke van Ruler), 2000, PRR, 26:4, 403-423.

132: Introspective: Image/Reputation/Impression Management (new category)
Values Advocacy: Enhancing Organizational Images, Deflecting Public Criticism, and Grounding Future Arguments
(Denise M. Bostdorff and Steven L. Vibbert), 1994, PRR, 20:2, 141-158.

199: Introspective: Scholarly Research (new category)
The Missing Link in Public Relations Research (Walter K. Lindemann), 1979, PRR, 5:1, 26-36. (Ferguson had in Class III)
Influential Authors and Works of Public Relations Scholarly Literature: A Network of Recent Research (Yorgo Pasadeos, R. Bruce Renfro, and Mary Lynn Hanily), 1999, JPRR, 11:1, 29-52.
Public Relations Body of Knowledge (PRSA Task Force), 1988, PRR, 14:1, 3-39.
Content and Citation Analysis of Public Relations Review (Linda P. Morton and Li-Yun Lin), 1995, PRR, 21:4, 337-350.

Class II: Practice/Application of PR
205: Practice/Application of PR: Management in Public Relations/Decision Making/Problem Solving
Farley Manning Lecture: Communicating on Public Issues: The CEO's Changing Role (James F. Fox), 1983, PRR, 9:1, 11-23. (Ferguson had in #209)
Foundation Lecture: Public Relations And the Human Art of Management (Robert L. Fegley), 1984, PRR, 10:1, 3-9.
Managements's View of the Future of Public Relations (Walter Lindemann and Alison Lapetina), 1981, PRR, 7:3, 3-14. (Ferguson had in #104)
Managing Public Policy Issues (Barrie Jones and W. Howard Chase), 1979, PRR, 5:2, 3-23. (Ferguson had in #209)
PERT, A Technique for Public Relations Management (T. Harrell Allen), 1980, PRR, 6:2, 38-49.
Psychology and Public Relations Counseling (Philip Lesny), 1979, PRR, 5:3, 3-9. (Ferguson had in #206)

***************
The Missing Link: The Public Relations Manager Role as Mediator of Organizational Environments and Power Consequences for the Function (Martha M. Lauzen and David M. Dozier), 1992, JPRR, 4:4, 205-220.
Evolution of the Manager Role in Public Relations Practice (David M. Dozier and Glen M. Broom), 1995, JPRR, 7:1, 3-26.
Public Relations/Public Affairs in the New Managerial Revolution (Andrew B. Gollner), 1984, PRR, 10:4, 3-10.
The Vantage Point Problem of Public Relations (Jon White), 1988, PRR, 14:2, 3-11.
Not-For-Profits Appear To Lack P.R. Sophistication (Donna Rouner and Carl Camden), 1988, PRR, 14:4, 31-44.
When Marketing Involvement Matters at the Manager Level (Martha M. Lauzen), 1993, PRR, 19:3, 247-259.
A Balanced Scorecard Approach to Public Relations Management Assessment (Craig S. Fleisher and Darren Mahaffy), 1997, PRR, 23:2, 117-142.

206: Practice/Application of PR: Implementing Public Relations Programs and Campaigns


Case Study Effects of Student Opinions of Big Business (Glen M. Broom, Mary Ann Ferguson-DeThorne, and Arlene M. Ruksza), 1980, PRR, 6:2, 50-57.


Corporate Rebuttals to “Trial by Television” (David E. Clavier and Frank B. Kalupa), 1983, PRR, 9:1, 24-36.

Discovering Media-Value Associations (Dennis W. Jeffers), 1983, PRR, 9:1, 37-44.

Energy Conservation Treatment in Exxon’s The Lamp (Mary Ann Ferguson-DeThorne), 1978, PRR, 4:1, 43-57. (Ferguson had in #209)


How Public Opinion Is Formed (Edward B. Block), 1977, PRR, 3:3, 5-16.

Industry and the Environment: A Communication Gap (Gerald R. Prout), 1983, PRR, 9:4, 41-52. (Ferguson had in #209)

Informing Americans on Violence: The Media’s Role (John A. McDernott), 1982, PRR, 8:1, 35-39. (Ferguson had in #209)

Matching Perceptions of Food Editors, Writers and Readers (Joyce E. Knodell), 1976, PRR, 2:3, 37-56.


Planning Programs for Exceptional Events (Mark P. McElreath), 1979, PRR, 5:3, 34-36.

Evaluating Communication with Public Agencies (John E. Bowes and Keith R. Stamm), 1975, PRR, 1:1, 23-37. (Ferguson had in #207)

Predictors of Success in Placing Releases in Newspapers (Craig E. Aronoff), 1976, PRR, 2:4, 43-57.

Public Relations in Direct Mail Political Fundraising (Brian A. Haggerty), 1979, PRR, 5:3, 10-19.


Strategies of the Political Communication Process (Michael B. Hesse), 1981, PRR, 7:1, 32-47.


“Uses and Gratifications” To Implement a Public Relations program (Leonard J. Snyder), 1978, PRR, 4:2, 32-39.


Using Public Relations Theory to Evaluate Specialized Magazines as Communication “Channels” (Dennis W. Jeffers), 1989, PRRA, 1, 115-124.

The Uses and Effects of Public Service Advertising (Garrett J. O’Keefe and Kathaileen Reid), 1990, PRRA, 2, 67-91.

Du Pont and Greenpeace: The Dynamics of Conflict Between Corporations and Activist Groups (Priscilla Murphy and Juliet Dee), 1992, JPRR, 4:1, 3-20.

Matching Public Relations Research to the Problem: Conducting a Special Focus Group (Larissa A. Grunig), 1992, JPRR, 4:1, 21-43.

Identifying and Responding to Activist Publics: A Case Study (Deborah S. Anderson), 1992, JPRR, 4:3, 151-165.

Enhancing VNR Impact: The Effects of Captioning on Memory and Understanding of TV News (Stephen D. Reese and Glen T. Cameron), 1992, JPRR, 4:4, 221-234.

Does Publicity Outperform Advertising? An Experimental Test of the Third-Party Endorsement (Glen T. Cameron), 1994, JPRR, 6:3, 185-207.


Walgreens: A Case Study in Health Care Issues and Conflict Resolution (Kenneth D. Plowman, Cynthia ReVelle,
Descriptive Modeling for Public Relations Environmental Scanning: A Practitioner's Perspective (Samuel Coad Dyer), 1996, JPRR, 8:3, 137-150.
Demonstrating Effectiveness in Public Relations: Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation (Linda Childers Hon), 1998, JPRR, 10:2, 103-135.
Hacks, Flacks, and Spin Doctors Meet the Media: An Examination of the Congressional Press Secretary as a (Potential) Public Relations Professional (Edward J. Downes), 1998, JPRR, 10:4, 263-286.
Content Class as a Contextual Cue in the Cognitive Processing of Publicity Versus Advertising (Kirk Hallahan), 1999, JPRR, 11:4, 293-320.
Linkage Beliefs and Diagnosing An Image (Carl J. Denbow and Hugh M. Culbertson), 1985, PRR, 11:1, 29-37.
Information Subsidies And Influence (Judy VanSlyke Turk), 1985, PRR, 11:3, 10-25.
Putting Public Relations to Work for the Social Sciences (Carl H. Botan and Lawrence R. Frey), 1987, PRR, 13:1, 60-64.
Corporate Advocacy Advertising and Political Influence (Herbert Waltzer), 1988, PRR, 14:1, 41-55.
Audience Complexity As a Component of Campaign Planning (John. V. Pavlik), 1988, PRR, 14:2, 12-21.
Effectiveness of Camera-Ready Copy in Press Releases (Linda P. Morton), 1988, PRR, 14:2, 45-49.
Strategic Program Planning (Brad E. Hainsworth and Laurie J. Wilson), 1992, PRR, 18:1, 9-15.

207: Practice/Application of PR: Applied Research Issues and Methodologies
An NBS Internal Communications Study: A Comment (Richard S. Fransen), 1977, PRR, 3:4, 83-88. (Ferguson had in #208)
Corporate Use of Reach In Public Relations (Otto Lerbingen), 1977, PRR, 3:4, 11-20.
How Far Toward the Social Audit (Otto Lerbingen), 1975, PRR, 1:1, 38-52.
How Opinion Surveys Can Help Public Relations Strategy (Harry W. O'Neill), 1984, PRR, 10:2, 3-12.
PR Evaluation: Myth, Option—or Necessity? (Frank W. Wylie and Simeon P. Slovacek), 1984, PRR, 10:2, 22-27.
Survey Research as a Public Relations Tool (Harry W. O'Neill), 1977, PRR, 3:3, 17-35.

The Innovation of Research in Public Practice: Review of a Program of Studies (David M. Dozier), 1990, PRRA, 2, 3-28.
Communicating Public Relations Research (Gael F. Walker), 1994, JPRR, 6:3, 141-161.
Government Research and Evaluation Gap (Ray Eldon Heibert and Carolyn M. Devine), 1985, PRR, 11:3, 47-56.
Monitoring a Group's Symbolic Environment (Klaus Krippendorff and Michael E. Elley), 1986, PRR, 12:1, 13-36.
Multiple Measurements of Public Relations (Philip Lesly), 1986, PRR, 12:2, 3-8.
Barriers to Public Relations Program Research (Erica Weintraub Austin, Bruce E. Pinkleton, and Andrea Dixon), 2000, JPRR, 12:3, 235-253.
Role Relationships Using Research and Organization Types (Larry R. Judd), 1987, PRR, 13:2, 52-59.
Demasking Wall Street's Influence On Stock Prices (Kenneth A. Saban), 1987, PRR, 13:3, 3-11.
Using Focus Group Research in Public Relations (Larissa A. Grunig), 1990, PRR, 16:2, 36-49.
Using Research to Predict Learning From a PR Campaign (Connie Rosser, June A. Flora, Steven H. Chaffee, and John W. Farquhar), 1990, PRR, 16:2, 61-77.

208: Practice/Application of PR: Organizational Communication

Annual Reports I: Difficult Reading and Getting More So (Robert L. Hoskins), 1984, PRR, 10:2, 49-53. (Ferguson had in #206)
The Future: Salesmanship or Dialogue (Tom Ford), 1976, PRR, 2:1, 5-10.
The Increasing Importance of Employee Relations (Paul Keckley), 1977, PRR, 3:3, 70-76.
Public Relations: Functional or Functionary? (Sue H. Bell and Eugene C. Bell), 1976, PRR, 2:2, 47-57. (Ferguson had in #205)
Redefining the Role of the Company Magazine (Dennis W. Jeffers and David N. Bateman), 1980, PRR, 6:2, 11-29.

Credibility of Public Relations at the NRC (Linda Childers), 1989, PRRA, 1, 97-114.
Communication, Clinical Directorates, and the Corporate NHS (Wendy J. Button and Graham Roberts), 1997, JPRR,

Meeting the Communication Needs of Employees (Larissa Schneider Grunig), 1985, PRR, 11:2, 43-53.

A Study of Employee Feedback (Shirley B. Quate), 1986, PRR, 12:4, 41-47.


Organizational Response To Media Reporting (Kathryn T. Theus), 1988, PRR, 14:4, 45-57.


Strategic Public Relations Constituencies on a Global Scale (Larissa A. Grunig), 1992, PRR, 18:2, 127-136.


**209: Practice/Application of PR: Social Issues and Issue Management In Public Relations**

A Business Approach to Criminal Violence (Paul S. Forbes), 1982, PRR, 8:1, 59-64.


Coping With the Cost and Fear of Violence (Arthur H. White), 1982, PRR, 8:1, 31-34.


Foundation Lecture: A Declaration of Interdependence (Tim Traverse-Healy), 1976, PRR, 2:4, 4-10.

The Handicapped—Changing Attitudes or Acceptance? (Robert H. Ruffner), 1978, PRR, 4:2, 3-12.


The Power of Neighborhood Self-Help Programs (Lynn A. Curtis), 1982, PRR, 8:1, 6-14.

Preventing Violence in America: An Introduction (Carlton E. Spitzer), 1982, PRR, 8:1, 3-5.

The Prospects for a Fortress Society in America (John Crothers Pollock), 1982, PRR, 8:1, 15-18.

Public Relations and Economic Literacy (Walter Barlow and Carl Kaufmann), 1975, PRR, 1:1, 14-22.


TV Ascertainment Duty Falls to PR Directors (Gerald C. Stone), 1979, PRR, 5:2, 43-48. (Ferguson had in #206)


Violence as A Public Health Issue (Horace G. Ogden), 1982, PRR, 8:1, 40-44.


********************

Police in America: A Study of Changing Institutional Roles as Viewed by Constituents (Hugh M. Culbertson and Hochang Shin), 1989, PRAA, 1, 155-175.


Community Relations and Issues Management: An Issue Orientation Approach to Segmenting Publics (Dan Berkowitz and Kirk Turnmire), 1994, JPRR, 6:2, 105-123.


Toward a Model of Environmental Scanning (Martha M. Lauzen), 1995, JPRR, 7:3, 187-203.

Reconciling the Preferences of Environmental Activists and Corporate Policymakers (Priscilla Murphy and Juliet
Dee), 1996, JPRR, 8:1, 1-33.
Business and the Press: Conflicts Over Roles, Fairness (Fred J. Evans), 1984, PRR, 10:4, 33-42.
Managing Issues and Influencing Public Policy (Richard E. Crable and Steven L. Vibbert), 1985, PRR, 11:2, 3-16.
Corporate Philanthropy Comes of Age (Donn J. Tilson and Donald Vance), 1985, PRR, 11:2, 26-33.
Profile: Women In Canadian Public Relations (Judith Scrimger), 1985, PRR, 11:3, 40-46.
Monitoring 'Entitlement' Attitudes In the '80s (John S. Detweiler), 1986, PRR, 12:3, 28-42.
Variation in Relations with Environment Publics (Larissa A. Grunig), 1987, PRR, 13:3, 46-58.
How Corporations Define Issue Management (Brad Hainsworth and Max Meng), 1988, PRR, 14:4, 18-30.
Issues Management: An Overview (Brad E. Hainsworth), 1990, PRR, 16:1, 3-5.
The Distribution Of Advantages And Disadvantages (Brad E. Hainsworth), 1990, PRR, 16:1, 33-39.
Corporate Issues Management: An International View (Laurie J. Wilson), 1990, PRR, 16:1, 40-51.
Internal Process of Corporate Advocacy (Daniel A. Stout), 1990, PRR, 16:1, 52-62.
Social, Political, and Economic Contexts: Keys in Educating the True Public Relations Professionals (Hugh M. Culbertson and Dennis W. Jeffers), 1992, PRR, 18:1, 53-65.
From Relationships to Relationship Marketing: Applying Database Technology to Public Relations (Lisa A. Petrison...
Using Online Databases in Corporate Issues Management (Steven R. Thomsen), 1995, PRR, 21:2, 103-122.

Selling the Internet: A Cultural Studies Approach to Public Relations (Thomas J. Mickey), 1998, PRR, 24:3, 335-349.
Public Relations Practitioners’ Perceptions of the World Wide Web as a Communications Tool (Laura Newland IN and Candace White), 2000, PRR, 26:1, 31-51.
Organization of Corporate Web Pages: Publics and Functions (Stuart L. Esrock and Greg B. Leichty), 2000, PRR, 26:3, 327-344.

211: Practice/Application of PR: Legal Issues (new category)
Corporate Election Campaigns: In Conflict With the Law or Not? (Frank E. Walsh), 1983, PRR, 9:2, 7-17.
Photography and Copyright: What a Pro Should Know (Robert Kendall), 1979, PRR, 5:2, 24-34.
Uncle Sam’s Regulators are Watching You (Morton J. Simon), 1978, PRR, 4:1, 11-28.
For Corporate Libel Plaintiffs: Life After Gertz (Dulcie Straughan, Bill Chamberlin, and Carol Reuss), 1984, PRR, 10:3, 47-60.
Privacy vs. Publicity: Flip Sides of the Same Coin (Sondra J. Byrnes), 1990, PRR, 16:4, 29-35.
240: Practice/Application of PR: Crisis Response/Communication (new category)

An Anniversary Review and Critique: The Tylenol Crisis (Leonard Snyder), 1983, PRR, 9:3, 24-34. (Ferguson had in #206)


Eastern's Employee Communication Crisis: A Case Study (Martha Saunders), 1988, PRR, 14:2, 33-44.
Rockwell Fails In Response To Shuttle Disaster (John A. Kaufinan), 1988, PRR, 14:4, 8-17.
Wire Service Coverage of the Exxon Valdez Crisis (Samuel Coad Dyer, Jr., M. Mark Miller, and Jeff Boone), 1991, PRR, 17:1, 27-36.


The Role of Perception in Crisis Planning (John M. Penrose), 2000, PRR, 26:2, 155-171.


241: Practice/Application of PR: Integrated Marketing Communications (new category)

Images and Strategic Corporate and Marketing Planning (Gunther Haedrich), 1993, JPRR, 5:2, 83-93.
Communication Functions Performed by Public Relations and Marketing Practitioners (Christopher H. Spicer), 1991, PRR, 17:3, 293-305.
242: Practice/Application of PR: Image/Reputation/Impression Management (new category)
Impression Management Strategies Employees Use When Discussing Their Organization's Public Image (Rachel Harris Caillouet and Myria Watkins Allen), 1996, JPRR, 8:4, 211-227.

243: Practice/Application of PR: Ethics In Practice (new category)
Special Interest Group Coalitions: Ethical Standards for Broad-Based Support Efforts (Carol A. Bodensteiner), 1997, PRR, 23:1, 31-46.

Class III: Theory Development in Public Relations (all sub-categories are new)
312: Theory Development: Role Theory/Models
* A Comparison of Sex Roles In Public Relations (Glen M. Broom), 1982, PRR, 8:3, 17-22. (Ferguson had in #104)
* Program Evaluation and the Roles of Practitioners (David M. Dozier), 1984, PRR, 10:2, 13-21. (Ferguson had in #104)


Advancement For Public Relations Role Models (Glen M. Broom and David M. Dozier), 1986, PRR, 12:1, 37-56.

313: Theory Development: Risk Communication

Some Consistent Types of Employee Publics (James E. Grunig), 1975, PRR, 1:3, 17-36. (Ferguson had in #208)

Breadth of Perspective: An Important Concept for Public Relations (Hugh M. Culbertson), 1989, PRRA, 1, 3-25.
Field Dynamics and Public Relations Theory: Toward the Management of Multiple Publics (Jeffrey K. Springston, Joann Keyton, Greg B. Lechty, and Janet Metzger), 1992, JPRR, 4:2, 81-100.

Public Relations as Negotiation: An Issue Development Perspective (Gabriel M. Vasquez), 1996, JPRR, 8:1, 57-77.
Remembering the Public in Public Relations Research: From Theoretical to Operational Symmetry (Michael Karlberg), 1996, JPRR, 8:4, 263-278.

Conceptual Differences in Public Relations and Marketing: The Case of Health-Care Organizations (James E. Grunig and Larissa A. Grunig), 1991, PRR, 17:3, 257-278.
Image and Substance: From Symbolic to Behavioral Relationships (James E. Grunig), 1993, PRR, 19:2, 121-139.
The Limits of Collaboration (Greg Leichty), 1997, PRR, 23:1, 47-55.

315: Theory Development: Rhetorical Underpinnings
Public Relations and Symbolic Politics (Ulrich Saxer), 1993, JPRR, 5:2, 127-151.

316: Theory Development: Fund Raising
Fund-Raising Encroachment and the Potential of Public Relations Departments in the Non-Profit Sector (Kathleen S. Kelly), 1994, JPRR, 6:1, 1-22.

317: Theory Development: Women's Studies/Feminist School/Gender/Diversity/Minority
The Consequences of Culture for Public Relations: The Case of Women in the Foreign Service (Larissa A. Grunig), 1995, JPRR, 7:2, 139-161.
Justice and Gender: An Instrumental and Symbolic Explication (Ruth Ann Weaver Lariscy, Lynne Sallot and Glen T. Cameron), 1996, JPRR, 8:2, 107-121.
Feminist Values in Public Relations (Larissa A. Grunig, Elizabeth L. Toth, and Linda Childers Hon), 2000, JPRR, 12:1, 49-68.
Making Peace With Gender Issues In Public Relations (Elizabeth Lance Toth), 1988, PRR, 14:3, 36-47.
318: Theory Development: Academic vs. Applied Research
Response From a Communications Researcher (Richard F. Carter), 1979, PRR, 5:1, 45-47.
Response From an Advertising Researcher (Ivan Preston), 1979, PRR, 5:1, 40-44.
Response From a Public Relations Researcher (Scott M. Cutlip), 1979, PRR, 5:1, 37-39.
Special Section: The Two Worlds of Public Relations Research (James E. Grunig), 1979, PRR, 5:1, 11-14.

Partial Answers to Priority Research Questions -- and Gaps -- Found in the Public Relations Society of America's
Body of Knowledge (Mark P. McElreath and John M. Blamphin), 1994, JPRR, 6:2, 69-103.
The Paradigm Struggle and Public Relations Practice (Kirk Hallahan), 1993, PRR, 19:2, 197-205.
Toward an Understanding of the Use of Academic Theories in Public Relations Practice (Joep P. Cornelissen), 2000,
PRR, 26:3, 315-326.

319: Theory Development: Organizational Communication
Developing Economic Education Programs for the Press (James E. Grunig), 1982, PRR, 8:3, 43-62. (Ferguson had
in #206)
Review of Research on Environmental Public Relations (James E. Grunig), 1977, PRR, 3:3, 36-58. (Ferguson had in
#206)
Towards Theory-Building in Public Relations (Mark P. McElreath), 1976, PRR, 2:1, 44-57. (omitted from Ferguson
tables)
Organizational Culture and Ethnoecology in Public Relations Theory and Practice (James L. Everett), 1990, PRRA,
2, 235-251.
Observation and Measurement of Two Dimensions of Organizational Culture and Their Relationship to Public
Relations (K. Sriramesh, James E. Grunig, and David M. Dozier), 1996, JPRR, 8:4, 229-261.
Transactional Philosophy as a Basis for Dialogue in Public Relations (Wayne D. Woodward), 2000, JPRR, 12:3, 255-
275.
The Kindness of Strangers: Predictor Variables in a Public Information Campaign (John A. Ledingham), 1993, PRR,

320: Theory Development: Situational Theory
Putting the "Public" First in Public Relations: An Exploratory Study of Municipal Employee Public Service Attitudes,
Job Satisfaction, and Communication Variables (Dennis W. Jeffers), 1989, PRRA, 1, 197-213.
Memory for Investor Relations Messages: An Information-Processing Study of Grunig's Situational Theory (Glen T.
Cameron), 1992, JPRR, 4:1, 45-60.
Grunig's Situational Theory: A Replication, Application, and Extension (Peter K. Hamilton), 1992, JPRR, 4:3, 123-
149.
Information Processing and Situational Theory: A Cognitive Response Analysis (Michael D. Slater, Helen Chipman,
A Homo Narrans Paradigm for Public Relations: Combining Bormann's Symbolic Convergence Theory and Grunig's
Situational Theory of Publics (Gabriel M. Vasquez), 1993, JPRR, 5:3, 201-216.
Environmental Concern and Situational Communication Theory: Implications for Communicating with Environmental
The Utility of Situational Theory of Publics for Assessing Public Response to a Disaster Prediction (Ann Marie
321: Theory Development: Ethics/Social Responsibility


Ethical Values or Strategic Values? The Two Faces of Systems Theory in Public Relations (Ron Pearson), 1990, PRRA, 2, 219-234.

Examining Ethical And Moral Values Of Public Relations People (Donald K. Wright), 1989, PRR, 15:2, 19-33.


Can't We All Just Get Along? Cultural Variables in Codes of Ethics (Nancy L. Roth, Todd Hunt, Maria Stavropoulos, and Karen Babik), 1996, PRR, 22:2, 151-162.


Measuring Values Through Public Participation (James K. Van Leuven), 1980, PRR, 6:1, 51-56. (Ferguson had in #206)


323: Theory Development: Public Relationships

Coorientational Measurement of Public Issues (Glen M. Broom), 1977, PRR, 3:4, 11-20. (Ferguson had in #209)


Toward a Concept and Theory of Organization-Public Relationships (Glen M. Broom, Shawna Casey, and James Ritchey), 1997, JPRR, 9:2, 83-98.


Collapsing and Integrating Concepts of "Public" and "Image" into a New Theory (Mary Anne Moffitt), 1994, PRR, 20:2, 159-170.


Perceptions of Relationships and Evaluations of Satisfaction: An Exploration of Interaction (Stephen D. Bruning and

333: Theory Development: International PR
A Discursive Perspective from New Zealands: Another World View (Judy Motion and Shirley Leitch), 1996, PRR, 22:3, 297-309.
The Personal Influence Model and Gao Guanxi in Taiwan Chinese Public Relations (Yi-Hui Huang), 2000, PRR, 26:2, 219-236.

334: Theory Development: Contingency Theory

335: Theory Development: Crisis Response Theory
An Integrated Symmetrical Model for Crisis-Communications Management (Alfonso Gonzalez-Herrero and Cornelius B. Pratt), 1996, JPRR, 8:2, 79-105.
Communication and Attributions in a Crisis: An Experimental Study in Crisis Communication (W. Timothy Coombs and Sherry J. Holladay), 1996, JPRR, 8:4, 279-295.
Information and Compassion in Crisis Responses: A Test of Their Effects (W. Timothy Coombs), 1999, JPRR, 11:2, 125-142.
Using Games As a Model for Crisis Communications (Priscilla Murphy), 1987, PRR, 13:4, 19-28.
336: Theory Development: Public Opinion/Persuasion

*Agenda Setting Function of Mass Media (Maxwell McCombs), 1977, PRR, 3:4, 89-95. (Ferguson had in #206)*


Psychological Type and Public Relations: Theory, Research, and Applications (Ronald D. Smith), 1993, JPRR, 5:3, 177-199.

Vicarious and Persuasive Influences on Efficacy and Intentions to Perform Breast Self-Examination (Ronald Anderson), 2000, PRR, 26:1, 97-114.

337: Theory Development: Critical/Cultural Theory


Liberating the Intellectual Domain From the Practice: Public Relations, Activism, and the Role of the Scholar (David M. Dozier and Martha M. Lauzen), 2000, JPRR, 12:1, 3-22.

Postmodern Values in Public Relations (Derina R. Holtzhausen), 2000, JPRR, 12:1, 93-114.

Public Relations in a Democratic Society: Value and Values (Christopher H. Spicer), 2000, JPRR, 12:1, 115-130.

Broadening Research In Public Affairs (Elizabeth Lance Toth), 1986, PRR, 12:2, 27-36.

Bringing Critical Theory and Ethical Considerations to Definitions of a "Public" (Mary Anne Moffitt), 1992, PRR, 18:1, 17-29.


338: Theory Development: Complexity Theory


339: Theory Development: General Social Science Theory


Class IV: Relating to the Journal Itself

498: Editor's Notes re: Journal


From the Editors: Preface to the Special Issue (James E. Grunig and Larissa A. Grunig), 1993, JPRR, 5:2, 63-64.

Editor's Note (Elizabeth L. Toth), 1999, JPRR, 11:1, 1.


JAI Press Becomes New Publisher (Ray Eldon Hiebert), 1990, PRR, 16:4, 3-4.


Class V (500): Coder Disagreements (Cross references to Table 4)


Models of Public Relations in Bulgaria and Job Satisfaction Among Its Practitioners (Christopher Karadjov, Yungwook Kim, and Lyudmil Karavasilev), 2000, PRR, 26:2, 209-218.
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