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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides a brief overview of quantitative findings described later in this report.

PURPOSE AND RELEVANCE

The purpose of this study is to identify and content analyze the stream of trade and academic publications on international public relations or related materials published by selected U.S. and U.K. academic journals, the Institute for Public Relations’ online publications and international association publications (i.e., IABC-IPRA) from 1990 to 2005. Because of the constant expansion of the body of knowledge all over the world, this report is part of a long-term documentation project that will be updated over time to capture trends and advancements. Future research would include the body of knowledge produced in many other countries and languages.

One of the important roles of scientific research and its contribution to the professional community is to organize and systematize data from a variety of reliable sources, presenting “the big picture” of the field. Science is cumulative in nature as it continuously reviews, reevaluates and builds upon the previous knowledge. This content analysis aims to provide such systematization to the growing number of trade and academic publications on global, international, comparative and regional public relations. The research team believes that this academic exercise should be beneficial to public relations practitioners crossing national borders, even continents, or facing international competition at home more and more in their day-to-day activities. This work provides them a systematic account, a “knowledge base,” of multicultural public relations scholarship with a potential to allow the substitution of often anecdotal stories about various countries, the localization of practices and needed skills to succeed in global environments.

The hope is that public relations professionals will be able to identify topics of their interest, authors producing relevant work and institutions from which research and documentation of international practices are being generated. A simple click on the “find” function of their computers with selected keywords would allow professionals to discover academic and professional articles previously unnoticed to further inform their practice and somehow fulfill their intellectual curiosity. The results of this study of the publications listed at the end of this document could also be used to generate ideas and continue the already existing cooperation among professional and academic authors. Enhanced professional-academic alliances would result in useful, rich and systematic documentation of global, international, comparative and regional practices and phenomena contributing to the consolidation of the industry and education programs.

A review of the trade and academic scholarship will convince practitioners, scholars and students that public relations faces many common and some unique challenges all over the globe. Another way to take advantage of the work documented in this study is to identify subject areas to outsource, develop in-house or sponsor applied or theory-building research found to be underexplored, lacking key components or completely ignored. Filling the research gaps will take great efforts from both the professional and academic communities. Yet, the utility of such
research is rooted in the overall goals of science, which “are often stated as understanding, prediction, and control” (Shoemaker, Tankard & Lasorsa, 2004, p.169). They continue: “All three of these outcomes can allow people to accomplish tasks and to bring about desirable outcomes.”

**PRIMARY FINDINGS**

The primary findings of the research include:

- The research in international public relations experienced two periods of explosive growth in the early nineties and at the beginning of the XXI century.
- While the first growth period (early nineties) is associated with academic journal and trade publications, the second period (beginning of the XXI century) is associated with book publications and again with academic journal articles.
- International collaboration among academic authors is unfortunately a rare phenomenon.
- Collaboration between the academic and professional communities, however, is far more developed.
- The authorship is quite distinctive for different publication types: full professors author book chapters, professional consultants author trade publications and academic journal articles are equally authored by assistant professors and professionals.
- The United States hosts the majority of international public relations scholarship.
- The institutional affiliations of the most prolific authors are largely U.S. research universities: University of Florida, University of Maryland and University of Missouri.
- The majority of research is focused on Europe and Asia.
- The country outside the United States of America with the most research is the United Kingdom.
- Among the scholarship types the less present is theory development; mostly such articles concentrate on the excellence theory, organizational communications theories or ethics/social responsibility theory development.
- Introspective scholarship is somewhat present, mostly focusing on the issues of profession and pedagogy.
- Practice and application scholarship is developed rather well with dominant focus on implementing specific programs and campaigns.
- Finally, contextualized research does not cover all the variables equally; culture and socio-economic environment receive more attention than legal environment or activism.
- Much of the international public relations research is not international in its true sense; rather scholarship tends to describe public relations in a certain country or a region.
- The scholarship focused on the international issues, such as public relations by multinational corporations, by supranational organizations, between the nations or comparison of public relations practices among different countries or regions, is rare.
- There is a correlation between issues and regions discussed in academic journal and trade publications; the book chapters, however, are somewhat different in scope.
- The scholarship relies primarily on primary quantitative research methodologies.
- The scholarship also primarily relies on the U.S. public relations multidisciplinary literature.
These findings are graphically displayed and discussed in depth in the third and fourth sections of this research report.

**Methodology Summary**

The study content analyzes public relations or related academic and trade publications from 1990 to 2005. A coding sheet was developed after a literature review of similar content analysis of publications. The actual study was conducted in two stages. The first stage used commercial databases and key words to identify academic and trade publications related to international public relations. The second stage or verification stage used a more comprehensive set of key words and focused on the databases and hard copies of primary academic and trade publications. In the second stage the table of contents and abstracts of each issue of the selected publications. SPSS version 13.0 for Windows is the statistical software used for data analysis.

**Sponsor**

The Institute for Public Relations’ Commission on International Public Relations requested and has endorsed this research project. The Institute authorized the principal investigator to use all data, findings and project report issued in conjunction with this study for academic papers, presentations and publications.

**Research Team**

The chief investigator for this report is Juan-Carlos Molleda, Ph.D. assistant professor of public relations in the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Florida and charter member of the Institute’s Commission on International Public Relations. Feng Shen, doctoral student of the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Florida, served as research assistant in the first stage of data collection and analysis. Alexander Laskin, doctoral student of the same college, served as co-investigator and research assistant in the second and final stage of the 2005 study. Laskin will continue as a researcher in successive stages of this long-term research endeavor. Questions or requests for additional information concerning this study should be addressed to Juan-Carlos Molleda at 352-273-1223, fax 352-273-1227 or e-mail jmolleda@jou.ufl.edu.
I. INTRODUCTION

May 3, 2005 was the date of the public announcement of the Institute for Public Relations’ Commission on International Public Relations. This Commission formed on March 11 during the Eighth Annual International and Interdisciplinary Public Relations Research Conference in Miami, has as a goal to "...explore and document the science beneath the art of our practice, distinguishing between 'what we know' and 'what we don't' in terms of real research," according to Peter D. Debreceny, co-chair of the Institute for Public Relations and vice president-corporate relations for Allstate Insurance (Institute for Public Relations, 2005). He continues: “We will then be able to tell professionals, educators and students where to find essential knowledge that already exists, and to develop priorities for future research.”

The purpose of this study is to identify and content analyze the stream of trade and academic publications on international public relations or related materials published by selected U.S. and U.K. academic journals, the Institute for Public Relations’ online publications and international association publications (i.e., IABC-IPRA) from 1990 to 2005. This study is the beginning of a long-term documentation project that follows the steps of other public relations scholars (i.e., Botan & Taylor, 2004; Sallot, Lyon, Acosta-Alzuru & Jones, 2003; Taylor, 2001). Because of the constant expansion of the body of knowledge all over the world, the long-term nature of this project means that this will have to be updated over time to capture trends and advancements.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study uses content analysis to identify trends in international public relations-related publications. Content analysis is the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the content of documents, including print media and broadcast media coverage (Berelson, 1952). Today, this method is used for studying a variety of contents such as focus group and interview transcripts, print and electronic media coverage and corporate publications. The basic steps to implement this method include; the development of a coding sheet or codebook with a set of categories or variables to identify in the publications, the selection and gathering of materials and the evaluation of the instrument’s validity and reliability by assessing a percentage of gathered materials. After making sure of the instrument’s quality, publications are coded and data entered and analyzed with the use of a statistical software package.

Sampling technique

A census of publications concerning international public relations or related topics was used in this content analysis. The research team searched for the publications mechanically and manually to assure the inclusion of the existing body of knowledge. Both the selected publications’ databases and academic and trade data services were used to search for the articles, such as ABI-INFORM, EBSCO and LEXIS-NEXIS. The following keywords were used to identify the publications: Global public relations, international public relations, cross-cultural, international business communication, international public affairs, international media relations, international government relations, international community relations, cross-national, cross-borders, culture.
and public relations and corporate culture and public relations. In the second stage of this content analysis, six publications expected to have the most articles concerning international public relations were reviewed issue-by-issue by looking at the table of contents, then abstracts and, if needed, the body of the article (i.e., *Journal of Communication Management, Journal of Public Relations Research, Public Relations Review, Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, Journalism Studies* and *Frontline*). Until today, published content analyses of public relations-related literature have included solely public relations and mass communication publications. In this content analysis we wanted to go a step further by including journals from other academic disciplines that contain publications tightly linked to international public relations practices. This is the list of academic publications from which articles were analyzed:

- *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*
- *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*
- *Journal of Business Communication*
- *Journal of Communication Management*
- *Journal of International Business Studies*
- *Journal of Public Affairs*
- *Journal of Public Relations Research*
- *Journalism Studies*
- *Management Communication Quarterly*
- *Public Relations Review*

In addition, major academic books (entire publication or related chapters) which focus on international aspects of communication in general or public relations in specific and the Institute’s online international case studies were included:

The constitution of the coding sheet consisted of 97 categorical variables based on the existing literature that uses content analysis to categorize the public relations or communication body of knowledge (Botan & Taylor, 2004; Blake, Boble & Adams, 2004; Sallot, Lyon, Acosta-Alzuru & Jones, 2003; Taylor, 2001) and the researchers’ contributions to capture the nature of the international public relations field (see coding sheet in Appendix A).

In specific, the coding sheet or codebook consists of four major sections. The first section includes the name, type (trade or academic) and year of the publication. The second section records the name and classification of the solo author or various authors (until a maximum of five) according to their professional or academic status or rank as well as the author’s institutional affiliation and country of origin (when possible to identify). This second section also includes the number of authors and authorship mix, meaning whether the article was written by a faculty member or professional, faculty team, faculty and graduate student, graduate students or professional and faculty team.

The third section focuses on the content of the publication, including elements such as the continent portrayed and the specific country or countries profiled (maximum seven). The most important component of the content analysis is in this section, specifically the items that clarify the type of scholarship present in the article; that is, introspective, practice/application and theory development. According to Sallot et al. (2003), articles focusing on introspection contain discussions or commentaries about the profession or certain practices, including ethics. They categorized articles as contributing to theory development as those articles that “(a) attempted to conceptualize or reconceptualize public relations, (b) assessed the usefulness of a particular theory, or (c) developed a new perspective that helps explain, understand, or predict the practice of public relations” (p. 39). Articles were coded in one or more scholarship types. Thus, each
The scholarship type called introspective includes the following sub-categories: pedagogy/education, ethics, social responsibility, history, the profession, image/reputation/impression management, scholarly research, women and other (in case that the introspective content represents a new sub-category). The type of scholarship described as practice and application contains these sub-categories: management decision making/problem solving, implementing programs/campaigns, applied research issues and methodology, organizational communication, social issues management, new communication technology, legal issues, crisis response/communication, integrated marketing communication, image/reputation/impression management, contextualized research (one country and comparative), ethics in practice and other for new sub-groups. Lastly, theory development is classified in various sub-groups as well: role theory, risk communication, excellence theory/symmetrical communication/Grunig’s models, rhetorical underpinnings, fundraising, women studies, gender/diversity/minorities, academic versus applied research, organizational communication, situational theory of publics, ethics and social responsibility, social issues/issues management, public relationships, contingency theory, crises response, public opinion/persuasion, critical/cultural perspective, complexity theory, general social science theory, contextualized research (one country or comparative), game theory, psychological theory and other for new sub-categories that may be identified in the census of publications.

In addition to Sallot et al.’s scholarship types, section three of the coding sheet includes Taylor’s (2001) categorization named contextualized research. Five contextual variables identified by Verčič, L. Grunig and & J. Grunig (1996) were included as separate classification of contextualized research: media infrastructure and practice, political environment, legal environment and regulations, activism, cultural dimensions and socioeconomic level.

The forth section of the codebook registers the type of data used in the article (i.e., primary, secondary, pure literature review, commentary or position), the nature of the literature review (i.e., solo U.S. literature, solo non-U.S. literature, mainly U.S. literature, mainly non-U.S. literature), specific solo public relations literature or multidisciplinary literature, and type of research method used as separate items (i.e., qualitative, quantitative, literature review, commentary/position). The final component of section four was added after realizing that the term “international public relations” was mainly an ethnocentric view of the body of knowledge. The research team reflected on this question: because a paper addresses public relations in China, could it be called an international public relations publication? We went back to the literature and studied Hugh M. Culbertson’s (1996) definitions of public relations in an international context. He defines comparative public relations as the study of similarities and differences between the nations, and international public relations as practiced by international organizations, governments, transnational economic transactions and interactions among citizens of different nations. We could not classify all the articles of our population according to these two definitions. Thus, we came out with a new set of classifications: regional/national, comparative, international...
and global public relations. We consulted the online version of *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* to adopt accepted definitions of the various terms.

The first classification is regional/national. Regional means affecting a particular region (localized), or related to, characteristic of or serving a region (a broad geographical area distinguished by similar features), therefore, an article is classified as regional when it contains public relations philosophy or practice for a certain region. The term national relates to or belongs to a nation, therefore, national public relations refers to the practice in one single country of the world. Most often, authors select a country as a political geographical definition of a region and thus concentrate on public relations practices of a certain country (e.g., public relations in China, the United Kingdom, etc.). Sometimes, authors use other approaches to defining the regional scope of their articles such as physical geographical definitions (i.e., continents), and describe public relations practices in Europe or Africa. In addition, sometimes authors rely on social geographic and geocultural definitions (i.e., public relations in Latin America or Oceania) and finally sometimes the authors choose to define the region based on politico-economical alliances, such as public relations in the European Union or the Commonwealth of Independent States.

We use the term comparative (relating to, based on, or involving comparison), as it is defined by Culbertson. That is, when an article compares public relations practices between two or more countries of the world. The term international (relating to, or involving two or more nations or extending across or transcending national boundaries) also derived from Culbertson’s definition, when an article studies public relations practices between nations or concerning several nations or transcending national boundaries. And lastly, global (relating to, or involving the entire earth; worldwide) is used when an article describes public relations practices of supranational organizations or practices concerned with worldwide global issues. We feel it is important to distinguish the international and global articles as they are quite distinct in their scope and the issues under investigation. In fact, Wikipedia, a leading Web-based encyclopedic resource, comments that it is enough to have at least two different nations involved for something to become international; yet global involves or potentially involves the entire world. Thus, global issues often “transcend species or generations” (Wikipedia, 2005).

**Data coding, entry and analysis**

The articles and book chapters were printed or photocopied and a coding sheet attached to each piece. Many articles were saved as PDF files. A database with all the references coded was created in EndNotes (see full list of articles and book chapters coded on Appendix B). The unit of analysis was the entire article including references. Holsti’s inter-coder reliability was calculated with 10 percent of the articles, achieving a coefficient of .90 with two coders analyzing the same articles. The statistical analysis was carried out with SPSS v. 13.0 for Windows. Descriptive statistics, frequencies, timeline analysis, cross-tabulations and graphically displays were run to explore, report and illustrate findings. The findings are analyzed and presented in two sections: academic publications, including journal articles, book chapters and case studies; and trade publications.
Limitations

Very few articles were not coded because the researchers did not gain access to either hard or electronic copies; mainly these were publications from the early 1990s. Nonetheless, the research team is confident that this does not represent a critical mass of articles that will significantly change the results of this study. In this first content analysis of a long-term research project, the research team only reviewed the table of contents and abstracts of six main publications. Moreover, the databases accessed may not include some published materials on the topic or may have them available in other subject categories than the ones chosen for this study. In the future, a more comprehensive set of keywords and issue-by-issue review will be used to diminish the effect of this limitation. This approach will be used in the next stages of the study, which will be accomplished in 2006.

Only major academic and trade journals were coded; other publications may contain international public relations-related content, which could be added to the created data file for further enhancement of the study. Finally, another limitation is that some authors’ institutional affiliation and national origin were absent in some publications, especially in trade publications. The missing values may have decreased the power of the data to make inference to the entire population of international public relations-related materials of the selected publications.

III. Findings

The content analysis includes a total of 649 academic journals and book chapters, as well as articles from trade publications. The findings are summarized in three main sections: academic journal articles, academic book chapters and articles in trade or professional publications.

Academic journal articles

A total of 236 academic journal articles were content analyzed, including the following publications: Public Relations Review (n = 99; 42%), Journal of Communication Management (n = 69; 30%), Journal of Public Relations Research (n = 26; 11%), Journal of Public Affairs (n = 11; 5%), Journal of Business Communication (n = 9; 4%), Journal of International Business Studies (n = 6; 3%), Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly (n = 6; 3%), Journalism Studies (n = 5; 2%), Management Communication Quarterly (n = 2; 1%), and Journalism & Mass Communication Educator (n = 1; 0%). Public Relations Review and Journal of Communication Management have published the greatest number of articles on topics related to international public relations; together these two journals have almost 72 percent of all articles (see graph 1).
Graph 1.

Timeline

During the fifteen years included in the study, there has been a steady stream of articles from 2001 to 2004 averaging 35 publications per year. Interestingly, 18 articles were published in 1999 and 16 in 2000 indicating the beginning of a higher wave of studies published, and 10 articles so far in 2005 (as of Spring). The year with the lowest number of articles published is 1990 (n = 1) and an average of seven articles were published per year during 1993 to 1999 (see graph 2).

Graph 2.
Authorship

The study assesses the characteristics of the works’ authorship. The number of authors per article was counted: one author (n = 134; 57%), two authors (n = 76; 33%), three authors (n = 16; 7%), four authors (n = 6; 3%) and five authors (n = 2; 1%). The most salient category of authorship mix is solo faculty author (n = 85; 27%), followed by solo professional-consultant author (n = 40; 17%), faculty team (n = 37; 20%) and faculty-professional team (n = 10; 4%), see graph three.

The names of the various authors (i.e., first, second, third authorship) of the articles were collapsed into one composite variable. The authors with the most publications in the selected academic journals are: Maureen Taylor (n = 7); with six articles Glen T. Cameron, Juan-Carlos Molleda, Krishnamurthy Sriramesh, Betteke van Ruler and Yi-Hui Huang; Dejan Verčič (n = 5); with four articles Danny Moss, Jacquie L’Etang and Yungwook Kim; and with three articles Juyan Zhang, Judy Motion, Kevin Moloney, Bertil Flodin, James E. Grunig, Larissa A. Grunig, Ray E. Hiebert, Shirley Leitch, Gerhard Butschi, William L. Benoit and Dean Kruckeberg. Among the first authors only, the most prolific is Molleda (n = 6), followed closely by three authors with five articles each: Taylor, Sriramesh and Huang, and two authors with four articles each: L’Etang and van Ruler.

The authors hold the ranks of assistant professor (n = 55; 21%) and professional-consultant (n = 54; 21%), followed by associate professor (n = 38; 15%), full professor (35; 13%), faculty...
administrator (n = 21; 8%), other faculty (n = 19; 7%), senior lecturer (n = 16; 6%), principal lecturer (n = 12; 5%), master’s student (n = 8; 3%) and doctoral candidate or student (n = 4; 2%), see graph four.

Similarly, the authors combined with most journal articles published are affiliated to four U.S. universities, including University of Missouri (n = 16), University of Florida (n = 15), Rutgers University (n = 13) and University of Maryland (n = 12), and University of Waikato from New Zealand (n = 10). The editorial production of these five higher education institutions accounts for almost a third of the total academic journal articles published on international public relations topics between 1990 and 2005. Other well-published authors are associated with the following institutions: with eight articles each Manchester Metropolitan University and Free University of Amsterdam; with six articles Purdue University and University of Stirling; with five articles Illinois State University, Pristop Communication Group (only consultancy from Slovenia reaching this level of editorial productivity), University of North Carolina, National Chengchi University and University of Miami; with four articles Leeds Metropolitan University, Nanyang Technological University, North West University, Fordham University, Southern Illinois University and Bournemouth University; and finally with three articles University of Oklahoma, University of Canberra, Eindhoven University of Technology, University of Warwick, University of Iowa, National University of Singapore and University of South Florida (see graph 5).
Finally, the country of origin of the group of authors was coded. The results indicate that the majority of research teams are based in one country (n = 199; 87%) and only one tenth in multiple countries (n = 13; 14%). The authors are based in several countries, including: The United States (n = 157), United Kingdom (n = 66), Netherlands (n = 24), Australia (n = 15), New Zealand (n = 15) and South Korea (n = 12); followed with eight authors each by Singapore, Taiwan and South Africa; with five authors each from Norway and Canada; four authors from Slovenia; and finally three authors each from Switzerland, Germany, Austria and Sweden.

**Content**

The selected journal articles focus on one or a group of countries. This category was collapsed resulting in a composite measure. Two countries are the most represented in the selected literature: The United States (n = 54), the United Kingdom (n = 24) and South Korea (n = 15), followed with 11 articles each by Germany, India and China; and with 10 articles by New Zealand. Other countries represented in the body of knowledge with three or more articles are: Taiwan (n = 9); Netherlands and Canada with eight articles each; Australia and Japan with seven; South Africa (n = 5); France, Norway, Thailand and Spain with four articles each; and Brazil, Italy, Austria, Russia and Denmark with three articles each.

To better represent the geographic coverage of the international public relations scholarship, the
world was divided into the macro-regions. The base for such classification is the United Nations classification of macro-regions and sub-regions of the world (United Nations, 2000). According to this classification, the world is divided into six macro-regions: Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, North America and Europe. This classification was accepted without any modifications. After that the articles were also divided according to the sub-regions. However, at this stage the authors modified the United Nations classification of sub-regions for the European macro-region. The United Nations classification divides Europe into Eastern Europe, Northern Europe, Southern Europe and Western Europe. Such classification is not applicable for international public relations research today. First of all, it is important to show distinction between the former socialist countries and the Western democracies due to the historically different public relations development in such countries. In this classification, however, the distinction is muted. For instances, the sub-region of Southern Europe includes such countries as Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, as well as countries like Italy, Spain and Andorra. Second, today’s process of integration in the European Union influence development of public relations in these countries as well as public relations research that increasingly considers the European Union to be one unified region. In this classification; however, the members of the European Union are scattered across all these sub-regions (Southern Europe, Western Europe, Northern Europe and even Eastern Europe). Thus, the decision was made to divide Europe into two sub-regions: Western Europe and Eastern Europe (former socialist countries). Thus, this is the complete list of sub-regions: Africa – Eastern Africa, Middle Africa, Northern Africa, Southern Africa and Western Africa; Asia – Eastern Asia, South-central Asia, South-eastern Asia and Western Asia; Europe – Eastern Europe and Western Europe; Latin America – Caribbean, Central America and South America; North America – no sub-regions; Oceania – Australia and New Zealand, Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

As a result, at the macro level, the two macro-regions best represented are: Europe (n = 89; 38%) and Asia (n = 65; 28%). The other regions are less researched: Oceania (n = 14; 6%), North America (n = 11; 5%) and Latin America (n = 9; 4%). The least researched macro-region is Africa with slightly more than two percent (n = 5). Forty-three articles (18%) do not focus on a specific macro-region of the world. After that, it comes as no surprise that among the sub-regions the leader is Western Europe (n = 79; 34%). The Eastern Asia is second most researched region, yet it has twice less articles than Western Europe. Eastern Asia is a geographic focus of 38 articles (16%). Twenty-nine articles do not focus on a specific sub-region (12%), while 15 more articles (12%) focus on more than one sub-region within a macro-region), five articles consider the whole macro-region (2%). The less researched sub-regions are Central America with just three articles (1%) published in academic journals and South America with four (2%); not far away is Southern Africa also with two percent (n = 5). For details, see graphs 6a and 6b.
The type of scholarship present in the journal articles was coded as introspective, practice and application and theory development. Each major type of scholarship was further divided in sets of comprehensive sub-categories. The content of the introspective articles is mostly focused on the profession itself (n = 46; 20%), pedagogy (n = 23; 10%) and history (n = 17; 7%). The least amount of introspective articles is concerned with image, impression or reputation (n = 1; 0%). All categories are presented in Table one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type: Introspective</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/reputation/impression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly research</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The articles concerned with practice and application tend to focus on specific campaigns (n = 19; 8%) and social issues management (n = 19; 8%); 16 articles (7%) focus on contextualized research of a country and 15 articles (6%) on reputation/impression management. The least researched areas seem to be legal issues (n = 3; 1%) and applied research issues (n = 4; 2%). Thirteen articles (5%) focused on issues not included in the original classification and thus are classified into “other” category; among such articles are pieces concerned with evaluation of public relations activities, lobbying, religious communications and other topics. All categories are presented in table two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type: Practice-application</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management decision-making/problem-solving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing program/campaigns</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied research issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues management</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New communication technologies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis response/risk communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated marketing communications</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/reputation/impression</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized research (one country)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized research (comparative)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theory building articles are often concerned with comparative contextualized research (n = 12; 5%), contextualized research of a country (n = 11; 5%), organizational communications (n = 10; 4%), excellence theory (n = 9, 4%), social responsibility or ethics (n = 9; 4%), public relationships (n = 8; 3%) and critical or cultural theories (n = 7; 3%). Some categories of theory-building articles did not produce any articles at all: fundraising, women studies/feminism, academic vs. applied research, situational theory, complexity theory and game theory. The articles coded in category “other” discussed cross-national conflict shifting, corporate disclosures, source-reporter interactions, agenda-building, gate-keeping, speech-act theories and others. All categories are presented in table three.

Finally, the articles focused on contextual description of a region or regions are mostly concerned with such environmental variables as culture (n = 28; 12%) and media (n = 19; 8%). The least amount is paid to legal environment (n = 5; 2%) and activism (n = 6; 3%). Among variables coded as “other” two articles focused on corporate environment as a contextual variable. All variables are presented in the table four.
The majority of the selected journal articles are not really international in its traditional sense, meaning involving relations between two or more nations. In fact, the focus of more than half of all the “international” public relations articles published in academic journals is regional/national (n = 134, 57%). In other words, these articles describe the domestic practices of public relations but in countries other than the United States. Although, we do not intend to lower the importance and significance of such research, it would be highly ethnocentric to call such research international. However, it also would be unfair to exclude such research from our database.
because these articles provide invaluable knowledge about the public relations practices in other countries to the U.S. scholars and practitioners. Thus, we suggest coding such articles as regional/national. It is, however, pity that in the modern era of globalization not many articles focus on the issues extending beyond one’s country national borders. Such articles are less evident: international articles concerned with relations between nations and cultures (n = 40, 17%), global articles concerned with global issues (n = 34, 15%), and finally comparative articles that compare public relations practices in various regions or countries of the world (n = 26, 11%), see graph seven.

Graph 7.

Data type and research methodologies used

Most articles of international public relations scholarship published in academic journals rely on primary data (n = 122; 52%), in contrast with just 14 articles (6%) that use secondary data sources. The most often used methodology is quantitative (n = 88; 38%) versus qualitative used in 66 articles (28%). In addition, 79 articles (34%) are pure literature review pieces and 19 articles (8%) are classified as commentary/position pieces (see graph 8).
For literature review, authors primarily rely on U.S. literature (n = 195) with 37 (16%) articles having solo U.S. literature and 158 articles (51%) mainly U.S. literature. In contrast, only 11 articles (5%) rely on solo non-U.S. literature and 63 articles (28%) on mainly non-U.S. literature (see graph 9).
Concerning the origin of the literature review or references used in the articles, 38 articles (17%) rely exclusively on public relations literature and 103 articles (46%) rely mainly on public relations literature, meaning the articles also includes literature from related fields or disciplines of study that inform public relations problems or practices. Significantly less articles use communication-related literature (n = 31; 14%). Finally, some articles use multidisciplinary literature with focus on business literature (n = 28; 12%), see graph 10.

Graph 10.

**Trade articles**

A total of 244 articles published in trade publications were content analyzed. International Public Relations Associations’ publications was the leader by the quantity of articles (n=156; 64%), including 113 articles (46%) in *International Public Relations Review* (published up to March 1999) and 43 articles (18%) in *Frontline* (published after March 1999). The subsequent titles followed the IPRA’s publications: *Communication World* (n=37; 15%), *Public Relations Quarterly* (n=36; 15%) and *Public Relations Journal* (n=15; 6%), see graph 11.
Timeline

During the fifteen years included in the study, the majority of articles are dated back to early nineties: 1992 (n = 45), 1990 (n = 32), 1991 (n = 29), and 1993 (n = 26), see graph 12.
Authorship

The characteristics of the trade works’ authorship present the following picture: the majority of articles were written by one author (n = 206; 84%). Thirty-one articles (13%) were written by two authors and one article by three authors. Subsequently, the most salient category of authorship mix is solo professional-consultant author (n = 168; 80%). The other categories are significantly less represented: solo faculty (n = 28; 13%), faculty team (n = 7; 3%) and faculty-professional team (n = 5; 2%), see graph 13.

Among the first authors only, the most prolific is Sam Black (n = 8), followed by Susan Fry Bovet with five articles and by Shabanji Opukah and Ray Josephs with four articles each. Frank Ovaitt, Jeffrey R. Sharlach, Maud Tixer and Ursula Lucas-Bachert had three articles each. When the names of the various authors (i.e., first, second, third authorship) of the articles were collapsed into one composite variable, the situation practically did not change at all, probably due to the fact that the majority of trade articles are written by one author only.

The dominant amount authors are professional-consultant (n = 189; 78%). All other categories are significantly less present: full professor authored 15 articles (5%), followed by faculty administrator (n = 10; 4%), assistant professor (n = 8; 3%), associate professor (n = 6; 2%), other faculty (n = 5; 2%), senior lecturer (n = 3; 1%) and undergraduate student (n = 2; 1%). Principal lecturer, master’s student and doctoral candidate or student authored one article each (see graph 14).
Similarly, the authors with most trade articles published are affiliated to the International Public Relations Association (n = 8), International Public Relations Co. (n = 7) and the University of Stirling (n = 6).

Finally, the country of origin of the group of authors was coded. The results indicate that only six articles (less than 3%) were written by authors from multiple countries. The authors are based in several countries, including: the United States (n = 77), United Kingdom (n = 27), France (n = 9) and followed with eight authors each by Australia, Canada and South Africa; with six authors each from the Russian Federation, Germany and Belgium; and four authors each from Slovenia, New Zealand, Japan, Sweden, India and Brazil.

Content

The selected trade articles focus on one or a group of countries. This category was collapsed resulting in a composite measure. Two countries are the most represented in the selected literature: the United States (n = 16) and the United Kingdom (n = 16). They are followed by China (n = 15), Australia (n = 11), France (n = 11), Japan (n = 10), the Russian Federation (n = 9), South Africa (n = 8), Canada (n = 7), Germany (n = 7), Mexico (n = 5), Brazil (n = 5), India (n = 5), Argentina (n = 4), Hong Kong (n = 4) and Sweden, Netherlands, Hungary and Turkey with three articles each.
At the macro-region level, the best represented is Europe (n = 79; 32%). Other regions have less trade publications: Asia (n = 49; 20%), Africa (n = 21; 9%), Latin America (n = 15; 6%), North America (n = 13; 5%) and Oceania (12; 5%). Fifty-five articles (23%) do not focus on a specific macro-region of the world. Among the sub-regions, the leader is Western Europe with 55 articles (23%), followed by Eastern Asia (n = 28; 12%). Fifty articles (21%) do not focus on a specific sub-region, nine articles focus on more than one sub-region (4%), and twelve articles focus on the whole macro-region (5%). The least researched sub-regions are Central America (n = 2; 1%) and Northern Africa (2; 1%), followed by Western Africa (n = 3; 1%), Western Asia (n = 4; 1%), and Eastern Africa (n = 5; 2%). For details, see graphs 15a and 15b.
The type of scholarship present in the publications was coded as introspective, practice and application and theory development. Each major type of scholarship was further divided in sets of comprehensive sub-categories. The content of the introspective articles is mostly focused on the profession itself (n = 63; 26%) and pedagogy (n = 24; 10%). There is neither a single introspective article concerned with image/impression/reputation nor with women issues. Articles coded into category “other” are predominately concerned with professional associations’ activities. All categories are presented in table five.

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type: Introspective</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/reputation/impression</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The articles concerned with practice and application tend to focus on implementing specific programs/campaigns (n = 36; 15%) and comparative contextualized (n = 34; 14%); 27 articles (11%) focus on organizational communications and 24 articles (10%) focus on contextualized research of a country. The least researched areas with just one article each seem to be legal issues, applied research issues and new communication technologies. Thirteen articles (6%) focus on issues not included in the original classification and thus are classified into the “other” category. Among such articles are pieces concerned with intercultural training, conferences, roles of embassies and democratization process. All categories are presented in table six.

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type: Practice-application</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management decision-making/problem-solving</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing program/campaigns</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied research issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational communication</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New communication technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis response/risk communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated marketing communications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/reputation/impression</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized research (one country)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized research (comparative)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The trade articles are seldom concerned with the theory building. In fact, the most frequently mentioned theoretical perspective is ethics/social responsibility with just two articles (1%). One article each has roles/models, fundraising, academic vs. applied research, organizational communications, critical/cultural theories and comparative contextualized research. All other categories of theory-building articles did not produce any articles at all. All categories are presented in table seven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type: Theory development</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles/models</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence/Symmetrical/Grunig’s models</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical underpinnings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women studies/feminism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Diversity/Minority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic vs. applied research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational communications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics/social responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency theory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion/persuasion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical/cultural theories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity theory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General social science theories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized research (one country)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized research (comparative)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game theory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological theories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the articles focused on contextual description of a region or regions are mostly concerned with such environmental variables as culture (n = 27; 11%), media (n = 25; 10%) and socio-economic environment (n = 23; 9%). The least amount of attention is paid to legal environment (n = 6; 3%) and activism (n=6; 3%). All variables are presented in table eight.

The majority of the selected articles are not about relations between two or more nations. The focus of the majority is regional/national public relations outside the United States (n = 133; 55%), these articles describe the domestic practices of public relations but in countries other than the United States. There are less articles concerned with truly international practices, i.e. practices between two or more nations (n = 52; 21%); global articles concerned with global
issues (n = 33, 14%) and finally comparative articles that compare public relations practices in various regions or countries of the world (n = 26, 11%), see graph 16.

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type: Contextualized research</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political environment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic environment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 16.

Data type and research methodologies used

Three quarters of all articles of international public relations published in trade journals are commentary (n = 184; 75%). Fifty-one articles (21%) use primary data source. The qualitative methods are employed in 45 articles (18%) versus quantitative methods used in just six articles (3%). In addition, eight articles (3%) are pure literature review pieces and one article uses secondary data (see graph 17).
Although less than 30 percent of articles have some sort of literature review or just rely on literature in some way, those that do primarily rely on the U.S. literature (n = 50) with 40 articles having mainly U.S. literature and 10 articles solo U.S. literature. In contrast, seven articles rely on solo non-U.S. literature and 10 articles on mainly non-U.S. literature. Concerning the origin of the literature review or references used in the articles, nine articles rely exclusively on public relations literature and 43 articles rely mainly on public relations literature, meaning the articles also include literature from related fields or disciplines of study that inform public relations problems or practices. Other articles use communication-related literature (n = 8), business literature (n = 8) as well as literature from other fields.

**Book chapters**

A total of 169 book chapters were content analyzed, including 24 chapters of the Institute for Public Relations case studies in international public relations (editions one and two).¹

**Timeline**

During the fifteen years included in the study, the book chapters started to appear in the second half of the nineties. In the 21st century, however, the number of book chapters with a focus on

---

¹ For the complete list of references, see Appendix B.
international public relations experiences an explosive growth: from 15 in 1999 to 72 in 2004. As of the time of this report (September 2005), another book with 19 chapters copyrighted 2006. For more details, see graph 18. It is, however, important to point out that book publications do not provide such a steady stream as journal articles do; in fact, some years do not have any book chapters coded at all. The increased complexity of book publications should be kept in mind when comparing articles and book chapters.

**Graph 18.**

The majority of articles were written by one author (n = 106; 63%), the rest were authored by research teams. The most prolific category of book chapter authors is full professor; among first authors only, full professor authored 39 articles (23%). When all authors combined, full professor is still the most productive category with 64 articles to its name (26%). The second author category is professional-consultant with 45 publications (18%), followed by associate professor (n = 39; 16%) and assistant professor (n = 35; 14%), see graph 19.
Among the authors of book chapters with international public relations focus the most productive is Dejan Verčič (n = 9). Dean Kruckeberg and Krishnamurthy Sriramesh each have six chapters, and Gunter Bentele, Donn Tilson and Katerina Tsetsura each have four. Among the first authors only Dejan Verčič keeps the lead with six publications followed by Krishnamurthy Sriramesh with five book chapters.

The authors with the most book chapter publications are affiliated to Pristop Communication Group (n = 10), University of Maryland (n = 9), University of Northern Iowa (n = 8), Texas Tech University (n = 7), Nanyang Technological University (n = 6) and University of Miami (n = 6).

Finally, the country of origin of the group of authors was coded. The results indicate that 28 articles (almost 17%) were written by authors from multiple countries, the rest is written by the authors from the same country. The authors are based in several countries, with the majority of authors again residing in the United States (n = 103) and the United Kingdom (n = 19). Then, there is Slovenia (n = 9), Germany (n = 8), Singapore (n = 6), followed by Norway, Sweden and United Arab Emirates with four articles each.
Content

The geographic reach of book chapters in international public relations is wide. Based on the United Nations classification of the regions of the world, the most described macro-region in the book chapters is Europe (n = 65; 39%), followed by Asia (n = 40; 24%), Africa (n = 18; 10%), Latin America (n = 15; 9%) and finally North America and Oceania each with five articles (3%). When analyzed by sub-regions, Western Europe (n = 33; 20%) and Eastern Europe (n = 27; 16%) are two most researched sub-regions again, followed by two Asian sub-regions of South-eastern Asia (n = 16; 10%) and Eastern Asia (n = 10; 6%).

The selected book chapters focus on one or a group of countries. This category was collapsed resulting in a composite measure. The one country, the most represented in the selected literature, is the United Kingdom (n = 8). Then follows Slovenia, Russia and Nigeria with six book chapters each, and Thailand with five. See graph 20 for the geographic distribution.

The type of scholarship present in the book chapters was similarly coded as introspective, practice and application and theory development. Each major type of scholarship was further divided in sets of comprehensive sub-categories. However, the introspective and theory-
development scholarship is practically missing in the book chapter publications. The book chapters are only concerned with practice and application as well as contextualized research.

The practice and application scholarship tends to focus on implementing specific programs/campaigns (n = 97; 57%) and contextualized research of a country (n = 90; 53%) as well as with social issues management (n = 37; 22%). The book chapters focusing on contextualized description of a country usually cover the whole variety of environmental variables with culture and socio-economic environment discussed in 95 book chapters (56%) and media, legal, political environments and activism discussed in 94 (56%). See tables nine and 10 for details.

Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type: Practice-application</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management decision-making/problem-solving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing program/campaigns</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied research issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues management</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New communication technologies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis response/risk communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated marketing communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image/reputation/impression</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized research (one country)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualized research (comparative)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type: Contextualized research</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political environment</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal environment</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic environment</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the selected publications are not about relations between two or more nations. The focus of the majority is regional/national public relations outside the United States (n = 133; 79%), these articles describe the domestic practices of public relations but in countries other than the United States. There are less articles concerned with truly international practices, i.e. practices between two or more nations (n = 14; 8%); global articles concerned with global issues (n = 16, 9%) or comparative articles that compare public relations practices in various regions or countries of the world (n = 6, 4%), see graph 21.
Data type and research methodologies used

Almost 90 percent of all book chapters focusing on international public relations rely on primary data sources (n = 150; 89%). The qualitative methods are far more employed (n = 145; 86%) than quantitative (n = 5; 3%). More than 60 percent of chapters have a literature review with multidisciplinary public relations literature being the most used (n = 148; 88%). Mainly U.S. literature is used in 151 publications (89%).

Academic journal and trade publications comparison

One of the questions this research seeks to address is the issue of differences or similarities between academic journal and trade publications. In fact, it is common to talk about the gap between the academic and the professional worlds, yet the factual evidence of such gap at least in international public relations research is often missing and claims are largely based on anecdotal evidence. At the same time, such a gap, if exists, is an issue that deserves careful consideration and understanding of the reasons for its existence as well as possible influence on...
the practice and research in international public relations. Thus, the following part of the report presents the comparison data between academic journal and trade publications.

Although the peak for academic journal publications about international public relations falls on the recent years (2001-2004) with about 35 articles each year (and 2005 is likely to repeat or surpass this achievement because just in the spring 2005 there were 10 articles published in academic journals), the peak of trade publications is observed in 1992. Even more, 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993 years are clearly more internationally focused than the subsequent years based on trade publications. The explanation to this phenomenon might be the fall of Communist systems around the world in the early nineties and thus new opportunities opening for the professionals and growing interest to these countries that resulted in increased amount of trade publications. Academic publications; however, require time as academic scholarship needs to be developed first in such countries (or students from such countries need to be educated first abroad) and only then scholarly publications can appear after a somewhat lengthy peer review process.

At the same time, 1992 sees a certain increase in academic publication as well compared with 1990-1991 or 1993-1999. This can probably be explained by increased interest to international topics among scholars and thus more submissions and better acceptance rates of such publications. For more details, see graph 22.

The comparison of articles’ authorship does not present unexpected results: the majority of trade articles (almost 80%) are written by professionals while faculty members are more involved in academic publications. It is, however, somewhat more unexpected that professionals are also quite involved in academic publications: in fact, professionals together with assistant professors are the two leading categories of authorship of academic journal publications each authoring

![Graph 22](image-url)
about 20 percent of publications. Another finding of this comparison is the fact that full professors although less involved in academic journal publications than associate or assistant professors are more involved in trade publications. For more details, see graph 23.

Graph 23.

It is also not a surprise that the majority of authors of both academic journal and trade publications live in the United States or the United Kingdom. The comparison of authorship, however, reveals some countries with predominately one or the other type of scholarship. For example, South Korea is among the leaders among academic journal authorship but it does have very few authors in trade publications. The similar situation is with the Netherlands which produce much authorship in academic journals but significantly less in trade publications. Some countries are the opposite. For example, the authors from the Russian Federation produced six trade publications but not a single academic journal publication. For more details, see graph 24.

The geographic focus of both academic journals and trade publications is quite similar: about 30 percent of them are focused on more than one region. The leading single region under study is Western Europe (29% and 22%, respectively), followed by Asia (22% and 17%, respectively). The disproportions are found in the research on Africa: while eight percent of trade publications focus on this continent it is a focus of only two percent of all academic publications. Similar disproportion, but to a lesser extent is found in research on Eastern Europe: with just four percent of academic publications it has a focus of eight percent of trade publications. The complete comparison is presented on graph 25.
The following graphs present comparisons of the focus of academic journal and trade publications. Among introspective publications (see graph 26), the topics of profession and pedagogy are equally researched in academic journals and trade publications. At the same time, such topics as women issues and social responsibility are exclusively focus of academic
publications. They are neither academic journal nor trade articles focused on image/reputation/impression management.

Graph 26.

Practice-application articles are less balanced between academic journal and trade publications. In fact, only topic of management decision-making equally captures attention of academic journal and trade publications, while all other topics have certain disproportion into one of the other side. For instance, contextualized comparative research and organizational communications are mainly a focus of trade publications while such topics as legal issues, new communication technologies and applied research are all concentrated in academic publications (see graph 27).

Graph 27.
Theory-development articles are almost non-existent in trade publications; in fact, only two theoretical perspectives exceed one percent mark: critical/cultural theories and ethics/social responsibility theories (see graph 28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph 28.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, contextualized research variables are somewhat equally distributed across academic
The geographic reach of publications in academic and trade journals is quite similar. Indeed, the majority of scholarship in both types of publications is regional. In other words, the scholarship focused on practices in one country or one region of the world (57% and 55%, respectively). The numbers are also practically the same for comparative (11% for both types of publications) and global (15% and 14%, respectively) research. The only slight difference is found in international articles, where academic publications have 17 percent and trade publications 21 percent (see graph 30).

Graph 29.

Graph 30.
IV. CONCLUSIONS

The research in international public relations experienced a rise in the early nineties, especially in 1992. It might be connected with the break-up of the Soviet Union in December 1991 and sudden opening of new foreign markets not only in former USSR republics but also in other former socialist countries. Changes from Eastern Europe spread all over the world and made people talk about the new era of globalization and the formerly divided world becoming one world. It is, however, peculiar that after 1992 academic journals and trade publications experienced different tendencies. While academic publications were on an increase that resulted in explosive growth in the twenty-first century, trade publications went down after 1992 and stayed on a somewhat steady level since then. The book chapters, however, appeared later and experienced its growth together with the second growth wave of academic journal publications at the beginning of the XXI century. This might be explained by a more complex process of book publishing and the need to accumulate some knowledge before a book publication. An alternative explanation for the growing number of publications about international/global public relations may be the increased number of students from all over the world attending graduate programs and receiving doctoral degrees in mainly U.S. and U.K. universities, the increased number faculty traveling and conducting research or expands with peer institutions and colleagues worldwide, and the arrival of functional Internet communication and other new or enhanced communication and computer technologies in the second half of the 1990s.

Another finding concerning the international public relations body of knowledge is the fact that truly international collaboration among authors is seldom. The majority of trade, academic journal articles and book chapters are written by one author. Even if a group of authors participates in the creation of an article, they are more likely to be from the same country rather than from different countries. Only 17 percent of book chapters, one tenth of academic journal publications and only three percent of trade publications were authored by researchers or professionals from more than one country. However, such international cooperation might be beneficial both for practitioners and for the scholars and thus should be encouraged. Cooperative work is advisable to capture the complexity of public relations in more than one location, which augment the complexity of the practice cross-nationally. The increased international collaboration for book chapters might be explained by the authorship mix; the dominant author type of the book chapters is full professors, in other words, scholars who established themselves in international academic community and have contacts around the world. While the authors of academic journal articles are assistant professors who are under the pressure to produce scholarly publications quick and also do not have time, resources and contacts internationally. Professionals, authoring academic journal or trade articles are also under stress of their professional careers, lack contacts in international academic and often rely on own experience, as a result team work in trade publications is rare.

The collaboration between the professional and the academic world, however, is better than between different countries. In fact, the two most prolific groups of academic journal authors are assistant professors and professional consultants, with 21 percent of all publications each. Such cooperation in international public relations research is a positive phenomenon and might suggest that professionals value and participate in academic research as well as academics rely on professionals and target their research to professional needs.
The majority of the international public relations scholarship is concentrated in the United States. In fact, out of five leading organizations with the most publications in academic journals, four are U.S. universities: University of Missouri, University of Florida, Rutgers University and University of Maryland. These schools are also among the leading places in traditional public relations research as well and as such it might be suggested they are well suited to lead international public relations research as well.

The two countries that researchers most often focus their attention on are the United States and the United Kingdom. It is understandable because the United States is often used in comparative studies for measuring public relations practices in other countries. The United Kingdom is the second largest for public relations activities and also has well-developed public relations educational programs, as well as professional and student associations.

Overall, the two most researched macro-regions by the United Nations classifications are Europe and Asia. They lead in all types of scholarship: book chapters, academic journal and trade articles. Among the sub-regions, Western Europe and Eastern Asia are the most researched; however, among the book chapters, Eastern Europe jumps ahead of Eastern Asia, largely due to publications about the Russian Federation that has six book chapters, yet it lacks academic journal or trade publications. The European leadership in the international public relations body of knowledge is not surprising considering it is strong positions in public relations practice and education. The second best researched region is Asia, a region of tremendous growth and the one that has many of students in public relations programs abroad.

The international public relations research is mostly consumed with the issues of the profession and the pedagogy. It however largely ignores such issues as image/reputation/impression, social responsibilities or women issues. When authors describe practices of public relations, most attention is given to implementing specific public relations programs or campaigns. This is true both for academic journal and trade publications. The organizational communications and contextualized research although well described in trade publications are under-represented in academic journals.

The worst situation is with the theory-development publications. The trade publications and book chapters almost completely ignore public relations theory, but academic journal publications on the subject also quite modest in terms of theory development. Only such theoretical areas as excellence study, organizational communications, ethics/social responsibility and contextualized research have four or five percent of all articles expanding on them. Some theories are simply ignored: complexity theory, game theory, situational theory, fundraising, risk communications or women studies.

In contextualized research itself, not all environmental variables are equally studied: most attention is given to cultural environment while legal environment and activism are rarely mentioned. Although, legal research and research on the issues of activism seems to be more challenging and complicated than on issues of cultural differences, these areas are nevertheless extremely important and should be pursued more.
It is also rather disappointing that what we used to call international research for almost 30 percent is not international at all. Indeed, when a U.S. scholar studies public relations practices in the United States, we do not even attempt to call it an international research. However, if an Australian scholar writes an article about public relations practices in Australia, we would not be surprised to see it published in international section of the journal. Such ethnocentric approach to defining international public relations is outdated in the modern century. At the same time, as we explained above, it would be premature, if not harmful, to delete all such articles focused on public relations practices abroad from the international public relations body of knowledge, because they provide important information regarding the countries we do not know much about. Thus, it becomes important to suggest a clear and yet comprehensive classification of international public relations scholarship. In it, we label such articles as regional since they focus on public relations practices in a certain geographic region (country, continent or similar). Such articles are the majority in the modern body of knowledge among academic journal and trade publications as well as among book chapters (57%, 55% and 79%, respectively). But among academic journal and trade publications there are also articles truly international and they are almost one fifth of all articles, and another 15 percent of articles are concerned with global issues (see the methodology section for definitions of the different public relations geographical scopes). The least published area is comparative research probably due to the fact that it is seldom to find an international team of researchers working together. Only 11 percent of articles compare public relations practices in different parts of the world. Among the book chapters both global scope and international scope produce less than one tenth of all publications each, and the least represented is also comparative type with only four percent of publications.

International public relations scholarship as presented in books and academic journals relies primarily on quantitative methodologies. In contrast, trade pieces are primarily commentary or position articles that do not rely on primary data. Among all types of publications, the U.S. literature is the most referred to. The authors mostly rely on multidisciplinary public relations literature, although business-related and communication-related literature is also used.
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APPENDIX A: CODING SHEET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Label</th>
<th>Value Labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Identification Number</td>
<td>101-999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| JOURNAL       | Journal Name       | 01 = Communication World  
|               |                  | 02 = Communication Yearbook  
|               |                  | 03 = International Public Relations Review  
|               |                  | 04 = Journal of Business Communication  
|               |                  | 05 = Journal of Business Strategies  
|               |                  | 06 = Journal of Communication  
|               |                  | 07 = Journal of Communication Management  
|               |                  | 08 = Journal of International Business Studies  
|               |                  | 09 = Journal of Organization Behavior  
|               |                  | 10 = Journal of Public Affairs  
|               |                  | 11 = Journal of Public Relations Research  
|               |                  | 12 = Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly  
|               |                  | 13 = Journalism Educator  
|               |                  | 14 = Journalism Monographs  
|               |                  | 15 = Journalism Studies  
|               |                  | 16 = Management Communication Quarterly  
|               |                  | 17 = Public Relations Journal  
|               |                  | 18 = Public Relations Quarterly  
|               |                  | 19 = Public Relations Review  
|               |                  | 20 = IPRA Frontline  
|               |                  | 21 = Book chapters  
|               |                  | 22 = Institute Online  |
| JOURNALT      | Journal Type      | 1 = Trade  
|               |                  | 2 = Academic  |
| YEAR          | Publication Year  | 1994-2005  |
| AUTHORN1      | Author Name 1     |             |
| AUTHORN2      | Author Name 2     |             |
| AUTHORN3      | Author Name 3     |             |
| AUTHORN4      | Author Name 4     |             |
| AUTHORN5      | Author Name 5     |             |
| AUTHORR1      | Author Rank 1     | 01 = Assistant Professor  
|               |                  | 02 = Associate Professor  
|               |                  | 03 = Full Professor  
|               |                  | 04 = Faculty Administrator  
|               |                  | 05 = Other Faculty  
|               |                  | 06 = Principal Lecturer  
|               |                  | 07 = Senior Lecturer  
|               |                  | 08 = Masters Student  
|               |                  | 09 = Doctoral Student-Candidate  
|               |                  | 10 = Professional-Consultant  
|               |                  | 11 = Undergraduate Student  
|               |                  | 99 = Missing  |
| AUTHORR2      | Author Rank 2     | 01 = Assistant Professor  
|               |                  | 02 = Associate Professor  
|               |                  | 03 = Full Professor  
|               |                  | 04 = Faculty Administrator  
|               |                  | 05 = Other Faculty  
|               |                  | 06 = Principal Lecturer  
|               |                  | 07 = Senior Lecturer  
|               |                  | 08 = Masters Student  
|               |                  | 09 = Doctoral Student-Candidate  
|               |                  | 10 = Professional-Consultant  
|               |                  | 11 = Undergraduate Student  
<p>|               |                  | 99 = Missing  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Rank 3</th>
<th>Author Rank 4</th>
<th>Author Rank 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 = Assistant Professor</td>
<td>01 = Assistant Professor</td>
<td>01 = Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 = Associate Professor</td>
<td>02 = Associate Professor</td>
<td>02 = Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 = Full Professor</td>
<td>03 = Full Professor</td>
<td>03 = Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 = Faculty Administrator</td>
<td>04 = Faculty Administrator</td>
<td>04 = Faculty Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 = Other Faculty</td>
<td>05 = Other Faculty</td>
<td>05 = Other Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 = Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>06 = Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>06 = Principal Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 = Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>07 = Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>07 = Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 = Masters Student</td>
<td>08 = Masters Student</td>
<td>08 = Masters Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 = Doctoral Student-Candidate</td>
<td>09 = Doctoral Student-Candidate</td>
<td>09 = Doctoral Student-Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 = Professional-Consultant</td>
<td>10 = Professional-Consultant</td>
<td>10 = Professional-Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 = Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>11 = Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>11 = Undergraduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 = Missing</td>
<td>99 = Missing</td>
<td>99 = Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Institution 1</th>
<th>Author Institution 2</th>
<th>Author Institution 3</th>
<th>Author Institution 4</th>
<th>Author Institution 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORN   Number of Authors</td>
<td>1 = Solo Authorship</td>
<td>2 = Multiple Authorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORM  Authorship Mix</td>
<td>1 = Solo Faculty</td>
<td>2 = Faculty Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Faculty – Graduate Student</td>
<td>4 = Graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Faculty – Professional</td>
<td>6 = Professional-Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINENT</td>
<td>Continent Article Focuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01 = Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02 = Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 = Central Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04 = Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 = Latin America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06 = Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07 = North America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08 = North Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09 = South Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 = Oceania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 = Western Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 = Global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY1</th>
<th>Country 1 Article Focuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY2</td>
<td>Country 2 Article Focuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY3</td>
<td>Country 3 Article Focuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY4</td>
<td>Country 4 Article Focuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY5</td>
<td>Country 5 Article Focuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY6</td>
<td>Country 6 Article Focuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY7</td>
<td>Country 7 Article Focuses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACHLART1PE</th>
<th>Scholarship Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=Pedagogy-Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART1ET</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART1SO</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART1HT</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART1TP</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=The Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART1IR</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=Image-Reputation-Impression MGMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART1SR</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=Scholarly Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART1W</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART1OT</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introspective=Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2MD</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice-Application=Management-decision making-problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2IC</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice-Application=Implementing programs-campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2AR</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice-Application=Applied research issues-methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2OC</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice-Application=Organizational communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2SI</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice-Application=Social issues-issues management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2NC</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice-Application=New communication technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2LI</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2CR</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crisis response-communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2IM</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2IR</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2CO</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextualized research-one country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2CC</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextualized research-comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2EP</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLART2OT</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTRT</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTRC</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTET</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory-Symmetrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTRU</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetorical Underpinnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTFR</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTWS</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTGD</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender-Diversity-Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTAA</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic vs. Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTOC</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTST</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situational Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTES</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics &amp; Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTSI</td>
<td>Scholarship Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Issues-Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTPR</td>
<td>Scholarship Type: Theory Development - Public Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTCT</td>
<td>Scholarship Type: Theory Development - Contingency Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTCR</td>
<td>Scholarship Type: Theory Development - Crisis Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTPO</td>
<td>Scholarship Type: Theory Development - Public Opinion-Persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTCL</td>
<td>Scholarship Type: Theory Development - Critical-Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTCM</td>
<td>Scholarship Type: Theory Development - Complexity Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHLARTGS</td>
<td>Scholarship Type: Theory Development - General Social Science Theory</td>
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