Public Relations Journal Vol. 5, No. 3
ISSN 1942-4604

NOT CONFORMED TO THIS WORLD: How U.S. Religion Communicators Describe Public Relations

Douglas F. Cannon, Ph.D., APR

Religion public relations represents one of the oldest communication specializations in the United States. Executives from mainline U.S. Protestant denominations formed the Religious Publicity Council in November 1929. That was seven years before the National Association of Accredited Publicity Directors—oldest forerunner of the Public Relations Society of America—was established (Broom, 2009; Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979). The council's original purpose was to promote publication of religion news in major U.S. newspapers (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979). That group continues today—with an expanded purpose and membership—as the interfaith Religion Communicators Council. The council's longevity is evidence of the persistent connection between public relations and organized religion in the United States.

Despite religion public relations' long history, few scholars have examined how U.S. faith groups use communication to manage relationships (Tilson, 2001, 2004, 2006). This study probes how religion communicators understand public relations. Specifically, this project sees how well communicators and leaders representing U.S. faith groups think measures of the four public relations models in Excellence Theory (Grunig, 1992; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002) apply to their organizations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

U.S. Christian churches—both local congregations and denominations—have used mass media publicity and advertising for promotion since the late 19th century (Curtis, 2001; Moore, 1994; Reisner, 1913; Stelzler, 1908). Presbyterian pastor Charles Stelzle wrote the first modern book on church media use, *Principles of Successful Church Advertising*, in 1908 (Moore, 1994; Reisner, 1913). By the time Edward L. Bernays (1923) wrote the first book on public relations (Broom, 2009; Cutlip, 1994; Newsom, Turk & Krunkeberg, 2007), at least two other books on church media use had been published: *Church Publicity* by Methodist pastor Christian F. Reisner in 1913 and *Handbook of Church Advertising* by Methodist pastor Francis H. Case in 1921. These early works argued that advertising and publicity—terms used interchangeably—could boost church attendance, increase giving and reach people for Christ (Campaign for church advertising and publicity, 1916; Case, 1921; Reisner, 1913; Stelzler, 1908).

Bernays acknowledged these early 20th century church publicity efforts in his 1928 work, *Propaganda*:

> Many churches have made paid advertising and organized propaganda part of their regular activities. They have developed church advertising

> committees, which make use of newspapers and the billboard, as well as of the pamphlet. Many denominations maintain their own periodicals. The Methodist Board of Publication and Information systematically gives announcements and releases to the press and the magazines. (Bernays, 1928, p. 150)

Not all Christian leaders in the early 20th century agreed that churches should advertise or use mass media. Some preachers associated media use with World War I propaganda efforts and classified promotional messages as manipulative tools of the devil (Pritchett & Pritchett, 1999). Within this context, communication executives from several mainline Protestant denominations met in Washington in 1929 to form what is today the Religion Communicators Council (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979).

From the beginning, council members debated the proper approach to fashioning mass media messages. Should their mission be to inform (educate) or transform (persuade/influence) people in the audiences they wanted to reach? Should religion communicators operate as promoters, advocates, mediators, in-house journalists or public information providers (Broom, 2009; Craig, 1988; Cutlip & Center, 1952, 1958, 1964, 1971, 1978; Cutlip, Center & Broom, 1985, 1994, 2000, 2005; De Vries, 1976; Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979; Stoody, 1959; Wilbur, 1969, 1982)? The council's various names since 1929 reflected shifting opinions about how members understood what they did.

The organization was chartered as the Religious Publicity Council. The group's constitution said the council's purpose was "to bring together religious publicity representatives for interchange of ideas and experiences, for conference on common problems and for such cooperative effort as may develop" (*Manual*, 1930, p. 7). Membership was open "to those who are the officially appointed publicity representatives of religious organizations" (*Manual*, 1930, p. 7). M.E. McIntosh, one of the organizers and editor in the calendar service department at the Board of Mission Cooperation for the Northern Baptist Convention, defined religious publicity as "any broadcast message, printed or spoken, that is about religions or religious organizations" (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979, p. 10). Of the 29 charter members, 19 had "publicity" in their titles. Four were editors, and the others were executives in evangelism, Christian education or missions (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979).

Winfred Elson, a Lutheran publicity executive and another council organizer, distinguished church publicity from promotion and public relations. Publicity, Elson said, sought to create a favorable feeling about a church with the general public. Promotion sought prayers, financial contributions and volunteer service from church members. Public relations involved strategic planning in light of public opinion to direct promotion and publicity (Peterson, 1946).

In 1949 the Religious Publicity Council became the National Religious Publicity Council. That change reflected the expanding membership of more than 300 in places beyond New York City and Washington but not a change in purpose. Many members, however, were dissatisfied with the use of "publicity" in the title. They saw their work as "public relations," the broader and more systematic approach to communication that Elson described, not "publicity" (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979).

Two understandings of public relations seemed to influence the post World War II debate about proper approaches to religion communication. Those differences reflected how two public relations pioneers, Ivy Ledbetter Lee and Bernays, approached their work.

Lee, for many historians the "father of public relations" (Cutlip, 1994; Ewen, 1998; Olasky, 1987; Tye, 1998), was a publicist. Lee joined with Colonel George F. Parker, an old-time political operative and press agent, in 1904 to open nation's third publicity bureau. A former newspaper editor, Lee saw his role as telling the stories of his clients (usually corporations) through publicity, a communication function. Lee made no effort to outline a coherent philosophy for his work. He told a 1927 public transit commission hearing that he had never found a satisfactory term to describe what he did. He considered his activities an art, not a science. Lee reportedly told Bernays that the things Lee did in publicity work would die with him (Cutlip, 1994).

Bernays was more systematic. He established his agency in 1919 and described himself as a "counsel on public relations," not a publicist. For him the work involved much more than communication (Bernays, 1923, 1952; Cutlip, 1994; Newsom, Turk & Krunkeberg, 2007). He said:

> Public relations facilitates adjustments and accommodation to the times. … The objective-minded public relations man helps his client adjust to the contemporary situation or helps the public adjust to it.
>
> Public relations activity brings to human maladjustment the skill and point of view of a technician with expert knowledge of how human relationships function. Maladjustments in many fields—commerce, industry, religion and government—are based on misunderstandings of realities and communication...Conflict that is based on misunderstanding, ignorance and apathy is unnecessary and wasteful. (Bernays, 1952, p. 9).

Bernays called the public relations counsel an "applied social scientist" (Ewen, 1998, p. 10). The counsel studied "the public mind" with "the aid of practical and psychological tests and surveys" (Bernays, 1923, pp. 52, 53). The counsel was "a consultant both in interpreting the public to his client and in helping to interpret his client to the public" (Bernays, 1923, p. 57). The counsel recommended strategic actions to address misalignments between organizations and their publics (Bernays, 1952). In that way the counsel helped "to mould the action of his client as well as to mould public opinion. (Bernays, 1923, p. 57). Bernays said the counselor's job was not to create positive images for his clients. His job was to fashion and project a credible rendition of reality (Ewen, 1998). Influencing public opinion was usually done through mass communication. Bernays, a nephew of Sigmund Freud, believed that mass media messages delivered to the right publics had the power to influence human behavior (Bernays, 1923, 1928, 1952, 1955).

Vance Packard (1957) blasted Bernays in *The Hidden Persuaders* as one of the "symbol manipulators" trying to shape public thought during the mid 20th century. Packard said advertisers, public relations practitioners, political campaign planners and professional fundraisers were using "mass psychoanalysis" to discover how to control American commercial, social and political decisions. These persuaders preyed on the hidden subconscious desires of unwary consumer-citizens through "depth" motivation research. That research allowed manipulators to herd members of the passive mass audience like sheep into buying things they did not need, worrying about manufactured concerns and voting for prepackaged political candidates (Packard, 1957, p. 266).

The association of public relations with "hidden persuaders" prompted some church communicators during the period to shy away from public relations as Bernays described and practiced it. For example, Ralph Stoody, "dean of church public relations" (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979, p. 38), wrote in his 1959 *Handbook of Church Public Relations*:

> Forget the pompous and complex approach to the subject. Among professionals in the general field may be those who aspire to be "propagandistic manipulators" or "engineers of consent," but this type of practitioner is extremely rare. In general, PR people seem sincerely committed to standards of truth and good taste and to objectives that are in accordance with public welfare. (Stoody, 1959, p. 10)

The references to propaganda and engineering consent appear to be allusions to Bernays' published work: *Propaganda* (1928) and *The Engineering of Consent* (1955).

Stoody tried to set himself apart from Bernays and other "hidden persuaders" by defining religious public relations as "doing whatever contributes toward making a church deserve and receive the confidence and cooperation of increasing numbers of people—in still simpler form: making friends for Christ and his Church" (Stoody, 1959, p. 10).

The official Religious Public Relations Council history, published in 1979 to mark the group's golden anniversary, doesn't mention Bernays. The history recognizes Lee, the "son of a Georgia (Methodist) minister," as the father of public relations (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979, p. 5). Furthermore, the organizational history claims an indirect link to Lee through Parker, his first partner. From 1913 to 1919 Parker served as secretary for press and publicity for the Committee of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church and was known to many of the council's founders (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979). Parker died in New York in 1928, the year before RCC was founded, at age 80 (Cutlip, 1994; Cutlip, Center & Broom, 2000).

Following the 1949 name change to National Religious Publicity Council, debate continued among religion communicators about what they did and what they should call their organization. NRPC members instructed their board in 1962 to determine a more appropriate name. A survey showed that most council members said their work was public relations administration. Therefore, the board recommended Religious Public Relations Council as the new name. It was adopted in 1963 (Dugan, Nannes & Stross, 1979).

The 1963 change did not end the name discussion or debate about what religion communicators should do. While senior church executives in RPRC saw their work as "public relations" during the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, a growing number of members considered themselves religious journalists. They conceived of themselves as watchdogs on the church rather than advocates or promoters. For example, James Lee Young, a member of the RPRC board of governors, resigned in June 1982 as editor of the *Rocky Mountain Baptist Record* because of reported "censorship." Superiors told him not to print information about plans for a closed session of the Colorado Baptist Convention executive committee and to clear all stories about the panel with its chair. Young, who had edited the convention-owned weekly for five years, said he left his post because he did not think Baptist leaders should be telling him what to do. He considered himself an independent journalist (RPRC People, 1982).

The Rev. James C. Suggs, founding president of RPRC's Central Indiana Chapter in 1962, voiced disdain for "religious hucksterism" in the keynote address to the Indianapolis group's silver anniversary celebration in 1987. "An old issue in religious communication that is nagging me (and at least some of you) is the important distinction between news and publicity," he said. (Integrity in religious public relations stressed, 1987, p. 3).

From 1962 to 1997, members like Young and Suggs grew more and more dissatisfied with "public relations" in the council name. In response, Shirley Struchen, 1997 council president, appointed a task group to study a change (Struchen, 1998). A survey of members found that few still had "public relations" in their titles. At least a fourth were "directors of communications" (Name change, 1998). Consequently, the task group proposed changing the name to Religion Communicators Council. The 1998 national meeting passed the change with only two dissenting votes (Members agree to name change, 1998).

Talk about the council name in RCC publications generally stopped after 1998. Black (2002) found “communications” was the most common job title used among council members. The group’s name reflected that.

Three of the four public relations models developed by Grunig and Hunt (1984) reflected the different approaches to religion communication discussed over the past 80 years. The models, further explained in Grunig & Grunig (1992), present distinct ways of conceptualizing and practicing public relations:

+ **Press agentry/publicity model**: One-way transmission of promotional information from an organization—primarily through mass media—to a generally undefined audience. Truth and accuracy are not factors. No audience research is involved.

+ **Public information model**: One-way transmission of factual, newsworthy information from an organization to news media outlets for dissemination to users of those outlets. News releases reflect journalistic news values. The journalistic norms of truth and accuracy are accepted. No audience research is involved.

+ **Two-way asymmetrical model**: An organization takes actions and disseminates specifically crafted messages based on audience research to achieve a specific goal. The focus is on persuading target groups to behave as the organization wants. Information collected on audiences is not used to modify the goals, policies or actions of the organization. Research simply guides message crafting.

+ **Two-way symmetrical model**: An organization determines actions that promote understanding and reduce conflicts with key publics based on audience research. Information collected on audiences influences what an organization does and says.

The press agentry/publicity model represents the promotional emphasis discussed in the early years of RCC. The public information model exemplifies the journalistic approach advocated over the past 40 years by Stoody, Young and Suggs. Parkard (1957) criticized the two-way asymmetrical approach, making it suspect among religion communicators. The fourth approach—two-way symmetrical—was described by Bernays (1952). But the symmetrical idea of a public influencing a faith organization as much as it influenced the public doesn’t seem to have been part of the RCC debate.

Grunig developed four questionnaire items in 1976 to measure activities relating to each model. He used those 16 items in a survey of 216 organizations in the Baltimore-Washington area. Public relations practitioners responded by indicating on a five-point Likert scale how well each statement described the way their organization conducted public relations. Grunig factor-analyzed responses to develop indices of symmetrical and asymmetrical practices. Grunig expanded measures to eight items per model for a 1984 study. Practitioners again responded on a five-point Likert scale to indicate how well each item described what their organization did. Grunig averaged responses to provide an index for each model. Six other studies between 1984 and 1986 by Grunig's colleagues and graduate students at the University of Maryland refined the questionnaire items and model indices. Average Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the four scales across the seven studies were 0.62 for press agentry/publicity, 0.53 for public information, 0.57 for two-way asymmetrical and 0.59 for two-way symmetrical (Grunig & Grunig, 1992).

For later Excellence surveys in 327 organizations, Grunig sought to boost index reliability closer to 0.80, a common goal for alphas in social science research. He reduced the scale for each model to four items that registered high inter-item correlations in the earlier research. He changed the response mode from a Likert scale to an open-ended fractionation scale. In that scale, zero equaled "does not describe"; 100 represented "average"; 50 represented "half the average"; 200 represented "twice the average"; and anything above 200 represented "as high as you want to go." Results using the fractionation scale yielded reliability coefficients of 0.78 for press agentry/publicity, 0.60 for public information, 0.81 for two-way asymmetrical and 0.76 for two-way symmetrical (Grunig & Grunig, 1992).

Grunig and Grunig (1992) acknowledged the consistently low reliability coefficient for the public information index in the foundational research. They attributed that to items describing information dissemination. That function was common to all models. Nevertheless, Excellence surveys continued to use that suspect four-item index (Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002).

Grunig and his colleagues began surveying the 327 organizations in the Excellence study in 1991. The purposive sample included 168 corporations, 64 nonprofit organizations (but few faith-related), 59 government agencies and 36 associations. Participating organizations came from the United States (*n*=237), Canada (*n*=57) and the United Kingdom (*n*=33). The stated research goal was to reach *analytical* rather than *statistical* generalizations. Scholars compared empirical findings to previously developed theory and models (Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002).

Top communicators in each organization received a 21-page paper-and-pencil questionnaire asking for 313 responses. Chief executives received a seven-page questionnaire asking for 96 responses. Up to 20 employees in each organization received a different seven-page questionnaire asking for 116 responses. Of the 327 organizations involved in the study, 316 returned communicator questionnaires, 292 returned chief executive surveys and 281 returned employee instruments (Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002). Results provided comparative data on what communicators, chief executives and employees thought about public relations practices represented by the models.

Grunig and Hunt (1984) originally presented the four models as normative concepts. The press agentry/publicity, public information and two-way asymmetricial models were based on historical analyses of how practitioners did or described public relations. The two-way symmetrical model presented how the authors thought public relations should be practiced (Grunig & Grunig, 1992). Excellence survey results showed the four models were positive as well (Grunig & Grunig, 1992; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002). Organizations practiced all four models of public relations, depending on the situation. All four approaches could contribute to organizational objectives. (Botan & Hazelton, 2006; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002). Nevertheless, Grunig and his colleagues have suggested that two-way symmetrical, two-way asymmetrical or a combination of the two approaches—dubbed the “mixed motives model”—would allow public relations to make the most effective contribution to an organizational (Grunig & Grunig, 1992; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002).

Further research in the United States and abroad confirmed that the four models did describe general public relations practice (Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002; Grunig, Grunig, Sriamesh, Huang & Lyra, 1995; Kim & Hon, 1998). Many educators embraced the models as useful teaching and research tools. The models fit well with reality, described practitioners’ experience and provided a conceptual foundation for analyzing public relations practice (Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002).

Other scholars found the four models wanting. Cheney and Christensen (2001) said they were largely idealized and based “managerial accounts and self reports” (p. 180). Other critics focused primarily on the two-way symmetrical model as utopian and too idealistic (Cameron, 1997; Cancel, Mitrook & Cameron, 1999; L’Etang, 1995, 1996a, 1996b; Moloney, 1997; Pieczka, 1995; 1996a, 1996b; Van der Meiden, 1993; Yarbrough, Cameron, Sallot, & McWilliams, 1998). Critics ignored, however, that long before Grunig and Hunt (1984), Bernays (1923, 1952) had described public relations practice in symmetrical terms.

In continuing research since 1991, Grunig and his colleagues have identified three dimensions underlying the four positive models. Organizational communication is either (1) one-way or two-way (research based), (2) symmetrical or asymmetrical and (3) mediated or interpersonal (Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002). Other scholars (Haung, 2004; Rhee, 2002; Sha, 1999, 2005) have considered the mediated and interpersonal dimensions independently. From research in Asia, Huang (2004) cited another dimension: social activity. She maintained that social connections were different from interpersonal communication.

Grunig (2006) said he wanted his scholarship to institutionalize public relations as a “bridging activity” evaluated on how well it cultivated short- and long-term relationships that contributed to reaching organizational goals. “Eventually, I believe we will be able to show that the total value, the ROI [return on investment], of public relations develops through the intangible assets that relationships provide to organizations,” he said (p. 166). “I now believe that the concept of relationship cultivation strategies is the heir to the models of public relations and the two-way symmetrical model” (p. 168).

In assessing the scope of public relations scholarship, Botan and Taylor (2004) identified Excellence Theory (Dozier, Grunig & Grunig, 1995; Grunig, 1992; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002) as the leading approach. Botan and Hazelton (2006) said the Excellence work "has probably done more to develop public relations theory and scholarship than any other single school of thought" (p. 6). Excellence Theory provided the dominant paradigm for research from 1991 to 2006. Based on that, this project sought to extend that paradigm to religion communication. Considering the history of religion communication in the United States, research on models of public relations in Excellence Theory and Excellence survey results, this research tried to answer the following questions:

RQ1: Which approach to public relations represented by the four models do religion communications most agree with?
RQ2: How much do religion communicators and faith group leaders agree on practices used to measure the four models of public relations in Excellence Theory?
RQ3: How well do religion communicators know what their supervisors think about practices in the four models of public relations?

METHOD

This study used data from two surveys to answer the three research questions. The surveys were done in phases. Questionnaires replicated items used by Grunig, Grunig and Dozier (2002) in their research among 327 secular organizations. The first survey collected responses in late 2006 and early 2007 from RCC members. The second questionnaire went in early 2008 to top executives of faith groups represented by religion communicators who responded to the first survey.

Phase 1: Survey of Religion Communicators

E-mail invitations were sent to the 479 communicators with e-mail addresses on file in the RCC membership database as of October 1, 2006. No random sampling was involved. Messages asked RCC members to go to SurveyMonkey.com to complete a 142-question Web-based survey. Responses were collected online from October 1 through December 31, 2006. Additional responses were accepted from members attending the April 2007 RCC National Convention in Louisville, Kentucky. Louisville respondents had been part of the original sampling frame but had not participated. They completed a self-administered paper-and-pencil version of the questionnaire.

Phase 2: Survey of Faith Group Leaders

A self-administered paper-and-pencil questionnaire went by mail in January 2008 to 87 faith group executives. The 73 questions replicated items used by Grunig, Grunig and Dozier (2002) and were similar to ones that religion communicators answered in the 2006-07 survey. Survey recipients headed organizations represented by RCC members who responded to the 2006-07 survey. All senior managers were non-communicators.

Research Question 1

RQ1 asked how much religion communicators would favor each public relations model (Grunig & Grunig, 1992; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002; Grunig & Hunt, 1984). To answer that question, composite mean responses for each model were calculated and compared. Grunig, Grunig and Dozier (2002) provided four statements to measure each model. RCC members responded to the 16 statements about the four public relations models on a five-point Likert scale. Responses were (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (4) agree and (5) strongly agree. Composite means were calculated for each model. Means higher than 3.50 were judged to show agreement. Those from 2.51 to 3.49 were taken to show neither agreement nor disagreement (generally neutral opinions). Those below 2.50 were rated as showing disagreement. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients were computed for each model scale. Alphas from the RCC study were compared to those reported by Grunig, Grunig and Dozier (2002).

Research Question 2

RQ2 asked how much religion communicators and faith group leaders agreed about practices described in the four models (Grunig & Grunig, 1992; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002; Grunig & Hunt, 1984). To answer that question, a comparison of means was again used. RCC members and faith group leaders both responded to 16 statements about the four public relations models. Both groups gave answers on a five-point Likert scale. Means were calculated for responses to each of the 16 statements by RCC members and their faith group leaders. Agreement and disagreement were judged in the same ways as in RQ1. Independent samples *t* tests of means were run. They checked for statistically significant differences in mean responses from communicators and leaders. In addition, Pearson's correlations were computed. They checked how closely mean responses to the 16 statements from the two groups were associated.

Research Question 3

RQ3 asked how well RCC members knew what their supervisors thought about public relations practices in the four models. To investigate that, another comparison of means was used. RCC members were asked to predict how their supervisors would respond to the 16 statements about the four public relations models used in RQ2. Those predictions were on a five-point Likert scale.

Means were calculated for how RCC members predicted their senior leaders would answer the 16 statements and compared to what faith group executives actually said. Composite means were calculated for predictions about each model. Agreement and disagreement were judged in the same way as in RQs 1 and 2.

Independent samples *t* tests of means were run. They checked for statistically significant differences in what communicators predicted and what leaders actually said. Pearson's correlations were computed. They checked how closely mean responses to the 16 statements from the two groups were associated.

RESULTS

One-hundred-seventy of 479 Religion Communicator Council members responded to the initial online survey between October 1 and December 31, 2006. Fifteen more RCC members from the original list responded to a paper-and-pencil version of the questionnaire in April 2007. Response rate was 39%.

Respondents came from at least 22 of the 32 faith groups represented in RCC during 2006. The breakdown was 147 (79.5 %) Christian (Protestant and Roman Catholic) and 15 (8%) non-Christian. Twenty-three (12.5 %) did not specify a faith group.

Nearly 20% of RCC respondents worked for national-level faith organizations, such as denominational agencies or organizational headquarters. Another 21% worked for regional judicatories, such as synods, dioceses, conferences or state conventions. Nine percent served local entities, usually individual congregations or temples. Thirty-four percent had jobs with other faith-related agencies. Those included children's or retirement homes, colleges, religious publications or special organizations, such as religious orders, men's fellowships and anti-hunger agencies. Fifteen percent did not indicate where they worked.

Two-thirds of respondents (65%) said they reported directly to the chief executive. Thirty-six percent said they were members of the senior management executive team. The most common position titles were "director" (46%), "vice president" (8%), "manager" (8%), "coordinator" (7%) and "specialist" (7%). Forty-six percent of survey respondents had "communications" in their job designations. "Public information" or "media relations" were the second most popular designations at 10%. "Public relations" was used in 7% of titles. "Marketing" and "editor" each accounted for 5% of titles. No other title category was higher than 3%.

Sixty-nine percent of RCC respondents were women. Median age for communicators was 49. Ages ranged from 23 to 92.

In the second survey, 29 of the 87 faith group leaders contacted in January 2008 returned paper questionnaires by mail before May 31. Those replies represented a 33% response rate. Respondents came from 10 Christian groups.

Forty-one percent of leaders headed regional judicatories. Twenty-four percent led faith-related organizations, such as religious orders, ecumenical associations or seminaries. Seventeen percent ran denominational agencies, and another 17% were denominational chief executives. Their most common titles were "bishop" or "general secretary" (41%), "president" or "chief executive officer" (28%) and "executive director" (21%).

Fifteen of the 29 leaders (52%) were men. Ages ranged from 43 to 74. Median age was 59.5.

Research Question 1

RQ1 asked which public relations model religion communicators would favor. Table 1 shows that religion communicators agree most with measures of the two-way symmetrical model and disagree most with statements about the public information model. But low Cronbach's alpha coefficients for all four models raised suspicion about the reliability of the measurement scales in this sample. Grunig and Grunig (1992) had reported reliability coefficients for communicators of 0.59 for the two-way symmetrical model, 0.57 for the two-way asymmetrical model, 0.62 for the press agentry/publicity model, and 0.53 for the public information model using a five-point Likert scale. With the fractionalization scale, they reported 0.76 for the two-way symmetrical model, 0.81 for the two-way asymmetrical model, 0.60 for the public information model and 0.78 for the press agentry/publicity model. Grunig, Grunig & Dozier (2002) reported alphas for results among communicators in 316 Excellence studies of 0.72 for the two-way symmetrical model, 0.70 for the two-way asymmetrical model, 0.56 for the public information model and 0.78 for the press agentry/publicity model.

TABLE 1

Mean agreement by RCC members with four models of public relations

Model	Mean [a]	Alpha
Two-way symmetrical	3.62	.62
Two-way asymmetrical	3.49	.55
Press agentry/publicity	2.71	.54
Public information	2.52	.24

Note: Responses were 1 "Strongly disagree," 2 "Disagree," 3 "Neither agree nor disagree," 4 "Agree," 5 "Strongly agree."

[a] *n*=116

In this study, alphas among religion communicators were 0.62 for the two-way symmetrical model, 0.55 for the two-way asymmetrical model, 0.24 for the public information model and 0.54 for the press agentry/publicity model. Alphas lower than 0.60 prompted questions about whether the responses were reliably measuring the same concept. Low inter-item correlations showed that RCC members did not agree that the four statements about the public information model (correlations for all items less than 0.30), the two-way asymmetrical model (correlations for two items less than 0.30) and the press agentry/publicity model (correlations for two items less than 0.40) were describing a specific way to practice public relations. Only the four statements about the two-way symmetrical model had acceptable (>.40) inter-item correlations (Leech, Barrett & Morgan, 2008). Those results indicated that RCC members saw those statements going together.

Because of the erratic ways religion communicators connected the 16 statements, an exploratory principal axis factor analysis was run with varimax rotation. This factor analysis looked for new, unobserved statistical relationships among responses from RCC members. The goal was to see how religion communicators might group the 16 items describing the four models differently from the original factoring reported by Grunig and Grunig (1992). Such groupings might yield more reliable scales for the faith-community sample. Furthermore, factors might help explain whether religion communicators understood public relations functions differently from their secular counterparts.

Data from RCC members generally satisfied assumptions about independent sampling, normality, linear relationships between variable pairs and variables being correlated at moderate rates. Table 2 shows factor loadings. The analysis identified four factors. These factors remixed 12 of the 16 measures and dropped four, three from the public information model and one from the press agentry/publicity model. The omitted measures were:

+ The success of a communication program can be determined from the number of people who attend an event or who use products or services (a measure of the press agentry/publicity model).
+ In communication, nearly everyone is so busy writing news stories or producing publications that there is no time to do research (a measure of the public information model).
+ Communication is more a neutral disseminator of information than an advocate for the organization or a mediator between management and publics (a measure of the public information model).
+ Keeping a clipping file is about the only way to determine the success of communication (a measure of the public information model).

After rotation, the four factors accounted for 37.04% of variance (13.43 in the first, 8.59 in the second, 7.85 in the third and 7.18 in the fourth).

Factor 1 showed a strong emphasis on advance research as a basis for planning communication efforts and follow-up research as a basis for evaluating results—particularly attitude changes. This factor focused on how an organization could learn about publics so it could successfully influence them. This research factor combined three two-way asymmetrical measures with one two-way symmetrical measure.

Factor 2 emphasized persuasion through publicity. The factor combined three measures (two from press agentry/publicity with one from two-way asymmetrical). Organizations used communication to seek publicity. Publicity was the purpose of public relations. The goal of public relations was to get publics to behave the way the organization wants.

Factor 3 emphasized mutual influence. The focus was on using communication to build two-way understanding, mediate conflicts between organizations and publics, and let publics influence the organization as much as it influences them. Factor 3 combined three measures from the two-way symmetrical model.

Factor 4 emphasized using media relations to get positive news coverage. The factor combined a measure from the public information model with one from the press. agentry/publicity model. The focus was on getting accurate, positive information about the organization into the news and avoiding bad publicity.

Table 2
Factor loading for RCC member responses to measures of public relations models

	Factor Loading				
Measure	1	2	3	4	Com-munality
Before beginning a communication program, one should do research to determine public attitudes toward the organization and how they might be changed. **(2A)**	.85				.57
Before starting a communication program, survey or informal research should be done to find out how much management and our publics understand each other. **(2S)**	.80				.58
Before starting a communication program, one should look at attitude surveys to make sure the organization and its policies are described in ways our publics would be most likely to accept. **(2A)**	.58				.40
After completing a communication program, research should be done to determine how effective it has been in changing people's attitudes. **(2A)**	.43				.29
The purpose of communication is, quite simply, to get publicity for this organization. **(PA)**		.68			.34
In communication the broad goal is to persuade publics to behave as the organization wants them to behave. **(2A)**		.58			.37
For this organization public relations and publicity mean essentially the same thing. **(PA)**		.48			.24
The purpose of communication is to develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and the publics the organization affects. **(2S)**			.62		.29
Communication should provide mediation for the organization—to help management and publics negotiate conflicts. **(2S)**			.60		.40
The purpose of communication is to change attitudes and behaviors of management as much as it is to change the attitudes and behaviors of publics. **(2S)**			.40		.26
In communication accurate information should be disseminated, but unfavorable information should not be volunteered. **(PI)**				.70	.41
In communication one mostly attempts to get favorable publicity into the media and to keep unfavorable publicity out. **(PA)**				.63	.47
Eigenvalues	2.15	1.37	1.26	1.15	
% of variance	13.43	8.59	7.85	7.18	

Note: Loadings <.40 are omitted
PA=Press agentry/publicity, PI=Public information, 2A=Two-way asymmetrical, 2S=Two-way symmetrical

The four factors did give additional insights into how RCC members understood public relations functions. Religion communicators did not link statements about public relations practices the way Excellence scholars did. That indicated RCC members did not always agree with the way each model described its approach to public relations. RCC members saw little need for tasks associated with the public information model. Religion communicators appeared to consider research (a key component of both two-way models) and publicity more tools of persuasion than relationship building. RCC members did recognize three mutual-influence statements from the two-way symmetrical model as one approach to public relations.

But the four factors did not solve the scale problem. Only Factors 1 and 4 had truly acceptable reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha=0.75 for Factor 1, 0.71 for Factor 4). But with only two elements, Factor 4 would not provide a useable scale (Jaccard & Wan, 1996). Coefficients were 0.59 for both Factors 2 and 3—just below the 0.60 acceptable level (Leech, Barrett & Morgan, 2008). Deleting items from either scale did not improve the alphas for Factor 2 or 3. Inter-item correlations ran at or just below the generally acceptable 0.40 level (Leech, Barrett & Morgan, 2008). As a unit, therefore, these four factors did not provide any better basis for further data analysis of RQ1 than the original models.

Research Question 2

RQ2 asked how much RCC members and faith group leaders agreed about practices described in the four models (Grunig & Grunig, 1992; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002; Grunig & Hunt, 1984). Columns 1 and 3 of Table 3 show generally consistent views on the 16 statements describing public relations practices (r=.99, p<.05). *T* tests of independent samples showed no differences at the p<.05 level of significance between religion communicators and faith group executives concerning any of the four models. Responses from the two groups correlated significantly for the two-way asymmetrical (r=.97, p<.05) and public information (r=.99, p<.05) models. Agreement approached significance for the two-way symmetrical model (r=.94, p=.055).

Research Question 3

RQ3 asked how well religion communicators could predict what their supervisors thought about public relations practices in the four models of public relations. Columns 2 and 3 of Table 3 show that RCC members were off the mark in most cases. Communicators generally underestimated leader support for the two-way symmetrical and two-way asymmetrical models and overestimated agreement with the press agentry/publicity and public information models. Predictions were significantly different from reality for the public information model (t = +4.45, df = 6, p<.01). The correlation of the 16 predictions by communicators to the 16 statements by leaders—while not significant at the p<.05 level—was negative (r=-.73). Correlation of predictions and what leaders said for the press agentry/publicity model were also negative (r=-.39, p=ns). Communicators thought faith group leaders would consider attendance at events the primary indicator of communication success, publicity the purpose of public relations and getting good news into the press the primary objective. Top executives generally disagreed with all those ideas.

TABLE 3
Means for responses by RCC members and faith group leaders for each measure of public relations models and correlations between groups

Model & measures	1. RCC members	2. Percep-tions of leaders' views	3. Leaders' view	*r* RCC to leaders	*r* Percep-tion to leaders
2-way symmetrical model[a]				*r*= .94	*r*= .80
The purpose of communication is to develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and the publics the organization affects.	3.97	3.87	4.18		
Before starting a communication program, survey or informal research should be done to find out how much management and our publics understand each other.	3.80	2.96	3.72		
Communication should provide mediation for the organization—to help management and publics negotiate conflicts.	3.43	2.97	2.81		
The purpose of communication is to change attitudes and behaviors of management as much as it is to change the attitudes and behaviors of publics.	3.27	2.46	3.00		
Mean for 2-way symmetrical model	3.62	3.07	3.43		
2-way asymmetrical model[b]				*r*= .97*	*r*= .44
After completing a communication program, research should be done to determine how effective it has been in changing people's attitudes.	3.97	3.21	3.86		
Before beginning a communication program, one should do research to determine public attitudes toward the organization and how they might be changed.	3.72	3.05	3.34		
Before starting a communication program, one should look at attitude surveys to make sure the organization and its policies are described in ways our publics would be most likely to accept.	3.57	2.95	3.07		
In communication the broad goal is to persuade publics to behave as the organization wants them to behave.	2.69	3.09	2.36		
Mean for 2-way asymmetrical model	3.49	3.08	3.16		
Press agentry/publicity model[c]				*r*= .78	*r*= -.39
In communication one mostly attempts to get favorable publicity into the media and to keep unfavorable publicity out.	3.04	3.40	2.41		
The success of a communication program can be determined from the number of people who attend an event or who use products or services.	2.83	3.58	2.79		
For this organization public relations and publicity	2.76	3.46	2.57		

mean essentially the same thing.					
The purpose of communication is, quite simply, to get publicity for this organization.	2.20	3.02	2.86		
Mean for press agentry/publicity model	2.71	3.37	2.66		

Public information model[d]				*r*= .99**	*r*= .76
In communication, nearly everyone is so busy writing news stories or producing publications that there is no time to do research.	2.94	2.92	3.00		
In communication accurate information should be disseminated, but unfavorable information should not be volunteered.	2.78	3.63	2.79		
Communication is more a neutral disseminator of information than an advocate for the organization or a mediator between management and publics.	2.43	2.69	2.39		
Keeping a clipping file is about the only way to determine the success of communication.	1.94	2.26	1.93		
Mean for public information model	2.52	2.88	2.53		

Note: Responses were 1 “Strongly disagree,” 2 “Disagree,” 3 “Neither agree nor disagree,” 4 “Agree,” 5 “Strongly agree.”
[a] *n*=116 for RCC members, 117 for Perceptions of leaders’ views, 29 for Leaders’ views.
[b] *n*=116 for RCC members, 114 for Perceptions of leaders’ views, 29 for Leaders’ views.
[c] *n*=117 for RCC members, 116 for Perceptions of leaders’ views, 29 for Leaders’ views.
[d] *n*=115 for RCC members, 114 for Perceptions of leaders’ views, 29 for Leaders’ views.
*p<.05
**p<.01

DISCUSSION

Results from this research suggest that religion communicators are a distinct subgroup of U.S. public relations practitioners. RCC members—who represent one of the oldest specializations in the field—don't appear to understand public relations practice the way Excellence scholars, the four Excellence Theory models or their secular counterparts in earlier surveys do. In biblical terms, they do not conform to the secular public relations world. RCC members in this study don't agree that all statements in the models go together to characterize distinct approaches to public relations. Since earlier research showed these measures to be consistently reliable (Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002), nothing suggested that they should fail here. Something else, therefore, must account for the differences. Those differences probably relate to the religion communicators themselves.

Some distinctions between RCC members and secular communicators were expected. That's because of differences in the Excellence samples and the RCC group. Grunig, Grunig and Dozier (2002) surveyed only top communicators in an organization. RCC respondents included top communicators and practitioners at other levels. Two-thirds of RCC respondents had executive titles and said they reported directly to the chief executive of their organization. Other religion communicators either filled lower positions or did not say what their jobs were. Those lower-level communicators could have different views from their managers of what public relations involves.

At first glance, distinctions between secular and religion communicators appear consistent with the resistance to the "hidden persuaders" approach to public relations (Packard, 1957) seen in RPRC/RCC newsletters over the past 40 years. But a factor analysis of the 16 measures for the models gives another perspective. It suggests that RCC members may not really be the in-house journalists they think they are. Contrary to what RCC history would seem to predict, religion communicators showed their weakest support for the public information model (*M*=2.52 on a five-point Likert scale). That most journalistic model is the one Stoody, Young, Suggs and others in RPRC/RCC newsletters seemed to have advocated over the past 40 years. The factor analysis did not load three public information measures into any grouping. Only a public information statement about disseminating accurate information but not volunteering unfavorable information seemed credible to religion communicators. It appeared in one factor. Religion communicators associated statements about research and publicity more with persuasion than relationship building or reporting. That reflected a promotional approach to public relations. RCC members gave slightly stronger support (*M*=2.71)—although still a neutral rating—to statements about the press agentry/publicity model than they did to the public information model (*M*=2.52)—just outside the disagreement range. The factor analysis loaded three of the four press agentry/publicity measures into factors. Two were grouped with a measure from the two-way asymmetrical model. That factor emphasized persuasion through publicity. The other joined the lone public information measure in a two-item factor emphasizing the quest for positive news coverage.

To be sure, the low reliability coefficients for the four public information measures in this and earlier studies make survey results suspect. In fact, insufficient Cronbach's alpha ratings since the first uses of these measures raise questions about the credibility of the public information scale throughout the Excellence scholarship. Grunig and Grunig (1992) acknowledged the low reliability coefficient for the public information index. They attributed low alphas to items describing information dissemination. That function is common to all models. But Excellence surveys have continued using the suspect index. Later studies do not mention any attempts to improve it (Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002). By replicating the scale, this study was saddled with the same reliability problem.

Nevertheless, this study began with the assumption that the Excellence models were sound. Among communicators from 316 secular organizations in the Excellence surveys, the four models of public relations first presented in Grunig and Hunt (1984) proved to be reliable representations of how practitioners did their work. Grunig, Grunig & Dozier (2002) reported Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for results from communicators in 316 Excellence studies of 0.72 for the two-way symmetrical model, 0.70 for the two-way asymmetrical model, 0.56 for the public information model and 0.78 for the press agentry/publicity model.

Alphas in this study were much lower than in the Excellence results. Nevertheless, findings from this limited sample didn't appear to justify questioning the longstanding reliability of measures for the models. Low inter-item correlations showed that RCC members didn't agree that the four statements about the two-way asymmetrical, public information and press agentry/publicity models went together to describe specific ways to practice public relations.

Religion communicators do recognize mutual-influence statements from the two-way symmetrical model as a unified approach to public relations. RCC members support those statements (M=3.62). That result appears reliable (Cronbach's alpha 0.62). Religion communicators tend to support statements about the two-way asymmetrical model (M=3.49). Both two-way models represent Bernays' approach to public relations. Further, both two-way models present practices that Grunig (1992) and Grunig, Grunig and Dozier (2002) say are most likely to advance organizational goals. Support for two-way concepts among RCC members is noteworthy. Those concepts weren't common in earlier debates about proper approaches to religion communication.

The most unexpected finding in this study is that RCC members don't know how their supervisors understand public relations. When asked to predict how their leaders would respond to the 16 measures for the models, communicators overestimated support for the press agentry/publicity and public information approaches. Communicators underestimated support for the two-way symmetrical and asymmetrical models. Communicators thought faith group leaders would consider attendance at events a primary indicator of public relations success, publicity the purpose of public relations and getting good news coverage the primary objective of communication work. Top executives generally disagreed with those ideas and were much more interested in researched-based efforts to establish relationships.

That disconnect doesn't speak too well for the public relations competencies of religion communicators. Senior leaders should be a priority public for them. Furthermore, communicators have little excuse for not knowing what their leaders think. Proximity alone should provide such intelligence. Thirty-six percent of survey respondents said they were on their organization's senior management team. Two-thirds said they reported directly to their organization's chief executive. With that type of direct access, how could communicators not know what their bosses thought about public relations? This misunderstanding suggests a new research question: Why don't religion communicators know what their bosses think? That question deserves further investigation. Depth interviews with faith group executives might reveal their thinking in more detail.

This limited study presents a snapshot of what some religion communicators thought about public relations in 2006-2007. Results from faith group leaders provide a second snapshot. It shows what executives who supervise those communicators thought about public relations in 2008. These survey results establish benchmarks for future research. The 16 statements about public relations models in this study measured only how much religion communicators agreed or disagreed with various descriptions of public relations practices. Responses do not indicate if RCC members actually did their work in the ways described. Future research should explore how closely daily religion communication practice does or does not match language in the survey responses used in this study.

Low reliability coefficients among RCC responses indicate that the longstanding Excellence survey statements may not describe how religion communicators understand public relations. That may be particularly true in today's fast-changing environment of social media. Results from this study suggest that RCC members may acknowledge and favor Excellence concepts—especially research-based two-way communication. But they may or may not put those principles into practice. Depth-interview, participant-observation or case-study approaches may be more appropriate methods than survey research to probe questions about actual daily practices.

Additional future research might examine how practitioners from other specialized public relations organizations compared to those in the Excellence studies. Those groups might include the Agricultural Relations Council, National Association of Government

Communicators and the National School Public Relations Association. Religion communicators themselves could be studied by faith groups (i.e., Baptist Communicators Association, Episcopal Communicators, Presbyterian Communicators, United Methodist Association of Communicators).

Grunig, Grunig and Dozier (2002) have suggested yet another line of research. It would probe the three communication dimensions underlying the four models: one-way or two-way, symmetrical or asymmetrical and mediated or interpersonal. Such research moves beyond the four classic public relations models. It would require new methods and might avoid some of the measurement problems associated with the Excellence questionnaires.

CONCLUSION

Despite its limitations, this study has begun filling the void in scholarship on how faith groups use communication to manage relationships. By replicating parts of the work of Grunig and his colleagues, the project has expanded the Excellence public relations body of knowledge to include a new area—religion communication. Results from this study suggest that religion communicators are a distinct subgroup of U.S. public relations practitioners. Furthermore, religion communicators appear to understand public relations differently from the way the four Excellence models describe it. RCC members do not conform to the views of the secular public relations world.

Religion communicators overestimate their supervisors' support for the press agentry/publicity and public information models of public relations. Communicators underestimate support for the two-way symmetrical and asymmetrical models. Their answers about practices represented by the public relations models appear to contradict their self image as "communicators," not public relations practitioners.

The communication environment has changed in the brief time since the snapshots in this study were taken. That evolving environment offers still other opportunities for research. Social media, for instance, have become much more important public relations tools since the data in this study were collected. Capabilities of social media change how organizations can relate to various publics. Those interactive relationships fit the two-way symmetrical and asymmetrical models more closely than the one-way public information or press agentry/publicity models. Emerging tools, such as social networks, blogs, online video and Twitter, may force religion communicators to change their approaches to public relations practice.

REFERENCES

Bernays, E.L. (1923). *Crystallizing public opinion*. New York: Boni and Liveright Publishers.

Bernays, E.L. (1928). *Propaganda*. New York: H. Liveright.

Bernays, E.L. (1952). *Public relations*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Bernays, E. L. (1955). The theory and practice of public relations: A resume. In E.L. Bernays (Ed.), *The engineering of consent* (pp. 3-25). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Black, R.D. (2002). Highlights of membership survey. *Counselor*, Spring, 8.

Botan, C.H., & Hazelton, V. (Eds.) (2006). *Public relations theory II*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Botan, C.H., & Taylor, M. (2004). Public relations: State of the field. *Journal of Communication*, *54*, 645-661.

Broom, G.M. (2009). *Cutlip & Center's Effective public relations* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.

Campaign for church advertising and publicity (September 1916). *Current Opinion*, 61:3, 184-185.

Cameron, G.T. (1997). The contingency theory of conflict management in public relations. In *Proceedings of the conference of two-way communication* (pp. 27-48). Oslo: Norwegian Central Government Information Service.

Cancel, A.E., Mitrook, M.A., & Cameron, G.T. (1999). Testing the contingency theory of accommodation in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *9*, 31-63.

Case, F.H. (1921). *Handbook of church advertising*. New York: Abingdon Press.

Cheney, G., & Christensen, L.T. (2001). Public relations as contested terrain: A critical response. In R.L. Health (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 167-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Craig, F.A. (1988). The challenge of religious public relations. In J.H. Steele (Ed.), *Religious public relations handbook* (pp. 2-6). New York: Religious Public Relations Council Inc.

Curtis, S. (2001). *A consuming faith: The social gospel and modern American culture*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Cutlip, S.M. (1994). *The unseen power: Public relations. A history*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., Publishers.

Cutlip, S.M., & Center, A.H. (1952). *Effective public relations*. New York: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Cutlip, S.M., & Center, A.H. (1958), *Effective public relations* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Cutlip, S.M., & Center, A.H. (1964). *Effective public relations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Cutlip, S.M., & Center, A.H. (1971). *Effective public relations* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Cutlip, S.M., & Center, A.H. (1978). *Effective public relations* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Cutlip, S.M., Center, A.H., & Broom, G.M. (1985). *Effective public relations* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Cutlip, S.M., Center, A.H., & Broom, G.M. (1994). *Effective public relations* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Cutlip, S.M., Center, A.H., & Broom, G.M. (2000). *Effective public relations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Cutlip, S.M., Center, A.H., & Broom, G.M. (2005). *Effective public relations* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

De Vries, C. (1976). Put public relations to work for your congregation. In W.C. Fields (Ed.), *Religious public relations handbook* (pp. 1-3). New York: Religious Public Relations Council Inc.

Dozier, D.M., Grunig, L.A., & Grunig, J.E. (1995). *Manager's guide to excellence in public relations and communication management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Dugan, G., Nannes, C.H., & Stross, R.M. (1979). *RPRC: A 50-year reflection*. New York: Religious Public Relations Council.

Ewen, S. (1996). *PR!: A social history of spin*. New York: Basic Books.

Grunig, L.A., Grunig, J.E., & Dozier, D.M. (2002). *Excellent public relations and effective organizations*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Grunig, J.E. (Ed.) (1992). *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

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

Grunig, J.E., & Grunig, L.A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. In J.E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 285-326). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Grunig, J.E., Grunig, L.A., Sriramesh, K., Huang, Y.H., & Lyra, A. (1995). Models of public relations in an international setting. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *7*, 163-186.

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

Huang, Y.H. (2004). PRSA: Scale development for exploiting the cross-cultural impetus of public relations strategies. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, *81*:2, 307-326.

Integrity in religious public relations stressed (1987). *RPRC Counselor*, Fall, 3.

Jaccard, J., & Wan, C.K. (1996). *LISREL approaches to interaction effects in multiple regression*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Kim, Y., & Hon, L.C. (1998). Craft and professional models of public relations and their relations to job satisfaction among Korean public relations practitioners. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *10*, 155-176.

L'Etang, J. (1995, July). Clio among the patriarchs: Historical and social scientific approaches to public relations: A methodological critique. Paper presented at Second International Public Relations Symposium, Bled, Slovenia.

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

L'Etang, J. (1996b). Public relations and rhetoric. In J. L'Etang & M. Pieczka (Eds.), *Critical perspective in public relations* (pp. 106-123). London: International Thomson Business Press.

Leech, N.L., Barrett, K.C., & Morgan, G.A. (2008). *SPSS for intermediate statistics: Use and interpretation* (3rd ed.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Maloney, K. (1997). Teaching organizational communication as public relations in UK universities. *Corporate Communication: An International Journal*, *2*, 138-142.

Manual 1930-1931 (1930). New York: Religious Publicity Council.

Members agree to change name (1998). *Counselor*, Summer, 1.

Moore, R.L. (1994). *Selling God: American religion in the marketplace of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Name change (1998). *RPRC Counselor*, Spring, 6.

Newsom, D., Turk, J.V., & Kruckeberg, D. (2007). *This is PR: The realities of public relations* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Olasky, M. (1987). *Corporate public relations: A new historical perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Packard, V. (1957). *The hidden persuaders*. New York: David McKay Co. Inc.

Peterson, L. (1946). Church develops public relations. *The Quill*, 34:4 (July-August), 8-10.

Pieczka, M. (1995, July). Symmetry in communication and public relations. Paper presented at Second International Public Relations Symposium, Bled, Slovenia.

Pieczka, M. (1996a). Paradigms, systems theory and public relations. In J. L'Etang & M. Pieczka (Eds.), *Critical perspective in public relations* (pp. 124-156). London: International Thomson Business Press.

Pieczka, M. (1996b). Public opinion and public relations. In J. L'Etang & M. Pieczka (Eds.), *Critical perspective in public relations* (pp. 54-64). London: International Thomson Business Press.

Pritchett, T.K., & Pritchett, B.M. (1999). How the use of the historical perspective could benefit the study of church marketing. Retrieved June 4, 2007, from http://www.saber.uca.edu/research/sma/1999/09.pdf.

Reisner, C.F. (1913). *Church publicity: The modern way to compel them to come in*. New York: Methodist Book Concern.

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

RPRC people (1982). *RPRC Counselor*, Summer, 7.

Sha, B-L. (1999, June). *Symmetry and conservation: Applying Noether's Theorem to public relations*. Paper presented to the Second International Interdisciplinary Public Relations Research Conference, College Park, MD.

Sha, B-L. (2005, August). *The death of the models: A meta-analysis of modern dimensions of public relations*. Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual convention, San Antonio, TX.

Stelzle, C. (1908). *Principles of successful church advertising*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co.

Stoody, R. (1959). *A handbook of church public relations*. New York: Abingdon Press.

Struchen, S.W. (1998). Much to do, celebrate. *RPRC Counselor*, Fall, 2.

Tilson, D.J. (2001). Religious tourism, public relations and church-state partnerships. *Public Relations Quarterly*, *46*:3, 35-39.

Tilson, D.J. (2004). Strategic communication: Promoting your faith community in good faith. In J.R. Peck (Ed.), *Speaking faith: The essential handbook for religion communicators* (pp. 83-111) (7th ed.). Dallas: UMR Communications Inc.

Tilson, D.J. (2006). Public relations. In D.A. Stout (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion, communication and media* (pp. 362-366). New York: Routledge.

Tye, L. (1998). *The father of spin: Edward Bernays & the birth of public relations*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

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

Wilbur, M.C. (1969). The 'what' and 'why' of church public relations. In J.C. Suggs (Ed.), *Handbook on church public relations* (pp. 1-4). New York: Religious Public Relations Council Inc.

Wilbur, M.C. (1982). The art of public relations. In C. DeVries (Ed.), *Religious public relations handbook* (pp. 1-4). New York: Religious Public Relations Council Inc.

Yarbrough, C.R., Cameron, G.T., Sallot, L.M., & McWilliams, A. (1998). Tough calls to make: Contingency theory and the Centennial Olympic Games. *Journal of Communication Management*, *3*, 39-56.