Working Paper
Series

How Important is Professionalism in Public Relations Management?

Dr. Carol Steiner
School of Management

RMIT
BUSINESS

How Important is Professionalism in Public Relations Management?

Dr Carol Steiner
School of Management

RMIT
BUSINESS

Dr Carol Steiner can be contacted as follows:
Phone: 9925 1353
Email: Carol.steiner@rmit.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Last year in *Public Relations Review* Kruckeberg argued for the need for professional-isation of public relations. This article uses Heideggerian philosophy, Kuhnian paradigm theory and social studies of knowledge to suggest that professionalism could transform a heterogeneous, flexible, dynamic, communication-centred occupation into a routine science characterised by paradigmatic protocols and techniques and prescribed values and beliefs. I argue that the uniformity of thought and conformity of behaviour that underpin professionalism can increase the gulf between PR theory and practice, diminish the richness of experiences and undermine the identity of PR professionals.

INTRODUCTION

Last year Kruckeberg offered his view of the future of PR education, arguing that PR is a specialised professional occupation with its own set of values and beliefs. He argued that PR should not be seen as a subset of other specialisations such as journalism/mass communications, business, speech/communication, social or behavioural sciences or liberal arts. Rather, PR should be its own academic and professional specialisation, and PR education should be pedagogically unencumbered by its placement in any specialist academic unit.[1] He writes, "Public relations is an occupation that requires its own identity as well as clearly defined professional parameters."[2] In contrast, at about the same time, a special issue of the *Australian Journal of Communication* (*AJC*) was devoted to articles arguing that PR researchers should embrace the paradigms and discourses of social and cultural theory and other disciplines because orthodox PR theory was often seen as academically weak and irrelevant by scholars in the academic units that offered PR courses.[3]

In this article, I suggest that both Kruckeberg's and the *AJC*'s perspectives bode ill for professional education of public relations practitioners. I suggest this because, from my Heideggerian standpoint, both perspectives advocate professionalising PR by embracing a Kuhnian paradigm or operating in "the dream worlds of science."[4] Embracing a professional paradigm threatens to transform a heterogeneous, flexible, communication-centred occupation into a science characterised by paradigmatic protocols and techniques as well as prescribed values and beliefs.

The urge to establish a professional paradigm for public relations, whether it be a unique one or one shared with other academic specialties, suggests that public relations educators are unwittingly captured and influenced by a very powerful and pervasive paradigm, the technicity paradigm on which all "scientific" paradigms are based. "Technicity" is Heidegger's term (*Technik* in German). He refers to our period in history as "the epoch of technicity," a time of rationalism, anthropocentric scientism, research and specialisation that characterise the technicity paradigm.[5]

I ask whether Kruckeberg and other advocates of PR professionalism understand all the dimensions of professionalism, especially those that threaten the freedom of PR academics and practitioners and that might limit the learning experiences and job pros-

pects of PR students. I look at professionalism in PR education from the perspectives of Heideggerian philosophy and recent social studies of knowledge and science. I advocate careful reflection and debate on the desirability and appropriateness of professionalism in PR.

THE PUBLIC WORLD

As Kuhn pointed out in his formulation of the notion of paradigms, paradigm worlds are "different worlds,"[6] different from each other as Kruckeberg recognises, but also different from the ordinary world in which non-specialists operate. Heidegger called this "ordinary" world in which non-specialists operate "the public world," the world open to the public rather than to specialists.

Interestingly, Heidegger characterised the public world as the world of "wearers and users," in other words, as the world of commerce,[7] although he didn't understand commerce in the crass way it is practised today. He was thinking of commerce as conducted in the old fashioned community bazaar or craft exchange. Still, I suggest it is fitting that the ordinary and popular public world of commerce should be the world of public relations because I think public relations should operate in the context of its publics and its clients rather than in its own little world. Those who argue for a stronger practical focus on the "real" world in PR education probably share this view.[8]

Operating in a specialised paradigm world makes it difficult to understand the public world and to relate to the people who live there. Also, operating in a paradigm world creates a rift between theory and practice that doesn't have to (really shouldn't) exist in public relations. But that gulf is likely to get bigger if, in the pursuit of professionalism, a PR paradigm increases its influence on PR education.

I suggest that if we reflect more deeply on what it means to "have a professional paradigm," we will come to the conclusion that it is less important to have and teach a professionally prescribed collection of beliefs and values as Kruckeberg argues and more important to have our own individual beliefs and values and to teach our students to respect their own diverse and unique beliefs and values and those of their clients and publics who live in the public world. I suggest that public relations practitioners who operate in the public world and relate individually to publics as aggregates of indivi-duals are more likely to produce publishable news releases, to organise successful

events, and to connect meaningfully with stakeholders because such practitioners share the world of their publics and can understand them more sensitively and humanely, as fellow human beings, not as abstract constructs from some professional dream world.

THE TECHNICITY PARADIGM

At the root of the epoch of technicity lies a belief in rationality as a solution to almost every problem, but especially to problems of control.[9] The belief in rationality leads to anthropocentrism and scientism. The epoch of technicity is characterised by "research," a special way of making, acquiring and evaluating knowledge based on specialisation, efficiency of knowledge production and detachment of what is studied from its usual context so that researchers can focus on the area of special interest and be most efficient.[10] Detachment is the source of the "different worlds" that constitute specialist paradigms.

Rationalism

Heidegger suggests that the seeds of technicity were sown by Plato when Plato changed the meaning of the word, "idea" (*eidos*). Heidegger says "idea" used to refer to the *visible* aspect of something, but that Plato

> extracts of this word...something utterly extraordinary: that it names what precisely is not and never will be perceivable with physical eyes...[idea] names and is also that which constitutes the essence in the audible, the tastable, the tactile, in everything that is in any way accessible.[11]

When "idea" no longer refers to the concrete phenomenon that appears but to the *invisible form* of it, then our own experience becomes questionable and we need a higher source to validate our experience. Descartes provided this in the convenient form of self-certifying rationality. No longer could knowledge emerge from some mysterious but pure revelation of reality. Now knowledge could emerge only when some knowing subject thought it. Not only did we now have access to self-confirming certainty through our newly discovered rational minds; we also had created a powerfully generative nexus of subject (mind) and object (idea) that constituted an efficient closed system that excluded concrete phenomena and replaced it with abstract, rational constructs.

Our inheritance from Plato and Descartes, via a coterie of other rationalist thinkers including the phenomenologist Husserl, is a belief in "rational" thinking that

> (a)   deprecates "unsupported" (irrational) common sense and individual experience,

> (b)   denies the existence of phenomena that do not conform to the rationalist account of the world, and

> (c)   dismisses any thinking that departs from rationalism's methodological prescriptions.

This is Heidegger's description of science, Kuhn's description of paradigmatic science, and modern social studies of knowledge's description of science.[12] But the description also fits the notion of professionalism which leads me to my interpretation of professionalism as a form of rationalism and science.

Anthropocentric Scientism

"Anthropocentric" refers to the belief that, at its heart, knowledge is a *human* creation, whether that belief takes the form of orthodox realism that believes people *discover* reality, or orthodox constructivism that believes people *create* "reality," or some intermediate hybrid of these positions, like the belief that people *negotiate* meaning. Hence, anthropocentricism is not confined to laboratory and field sciences or social sciences. It takes in all specialist disciplines, including communication studies and other humanities and business disciplines that believe in people as knowledge makers.[13]

The scientism comes in not just because people count and measure empirical pheno-mena but because, from their standpoint of belief in one people-centred scenario of knowledge production or another, an entire schema of operation emerges that determines their research. Heidegger calls such a schema "the rule and law of science" and says science requires "binding adherence" to that rule and law.[14] Kuhn calls this schema a paradigm. People who don't toe the paradigm line (accept the schema) are considered incompetent and unreliable outsiders; to be an insider is to understand and *accept* the rule and law of one's paradigm.[15] The *rule of science* refers to the prescription of a domain, a set of practices and an attitude to the world. The *law of science* manages the match between the rule of science and the knowledge emerging

from that rule, ensuring that the rule adjusts so that it is never too out of sync with what is known. Kuhn discusses the rule and law of science in terms of how "normal science" deals with minor anomalies between paradigm-sanctioned "facts" and emerging, contrary ones. The rule and law of science (paradigms) create a closed system of knowledge making that permits what Hacking calls "the self-vindication of science."[16]

While this closed system facilitates efficient knowledge production and the professionalism (uniformity and conformity) that Kruckeberg and others long for, it also excludes and rejects experience and understanding that doesn't fit the schema, and it requires that paradigm struggles occur in the pursuit of uniform thinking and conformist behaviour. People like Kruckeberg and others are seeking to establish a PR education paradigm that can be the basis for accreditation and subsequent "professionalisation" of the public relations discipline.[17] Other scholars are interested in establishing a theoretical or practical paradigm for public relations.[18] PR journals are the sites for the paradigm tussles that characterise the struggle for paradigm supremacy. These paradigm struggles over what knowledge is important and how it should be passed on are characteristic of the scientism of the technicity paradigm because they reflect a desire for control over PR knowledge, over what students learn and over how practitioners operate. Such control is the basis for professionalism (uniformity and conformity), but I wonder whether it is appropriate or even achievable in a field that many argue should be devoted to accommodating rather than controlling diverse human and social relations.[19]

Research

"Research," as a manifestation of the epoch of technicity, is distinguished from "scholarship" as a way of acquiring knowledge.[20] Research involves the frantic accumulation of specialist knowledge for its own sake, as the basis for expertise and for the power to control the territory defined as the specialist discipline. Research is paradigm-serving rather than altruistic. To facilitate the accumulation of specialist knowledge, research relies on agreed and controllable methods for gathering and evaluating knowledge, to permit division of labour and a faster aggregation of a body of knowledge valuable to the discipline.[21]

The most effective way to improve the efficiency of research is to narrow the field of study and increase the numbers of knowledge-makers who can work cooperatively on the task. The most effective way to do the former is to detach (physically or conceptually) the objects of study from their complicated contexts. This is the essence of the reductivism that characterises Western research in the epoch of technicity. To enable more people to work cooperatively in the same discipline, it is necessary to render their diversity uniform or immaterial to the work. This is the origin of the myth of objectivity as an aim and prescription for effective knowledge making.

Reductivism and objectivity are two often unacknowledged values behind the push for professionalism. Professionalism requires reducing one's focus to a specialised domain and prescribing how it is to be seen. Kuhn called this a paradigm's "world view" and suggested it actually defines the reality recognised by a discipline.[22] In just the articles cited so far, it is interesting to note that articles arguing from an academic perspective invariably focus on a single theory to the exclusion of others[23] while articles describing practitioner perspectives have multiple foci and seem more holistic and inclusive.[24] Even the issue of the *Australian Journal of Communication*, which was arguing that public relations needed to be open to multiple perspectives,[25] was filled with articles that each advocated only one perspective or theory.[26]

The reductivism of professionalism is apparent in the many articles already cited that focus on PR skills and techniques that need to be developed. Focusing on skills and techniques is much easier than grappling with the complex and diverse beliefs, values and assumptions that defy reduction (and easy teaching) but that students will encounter when they venture into the "real world" of public relations practice.

Professionalism also requires objectivity because objectivity is essential to generalised prescriptions of uniform behaviour. Without such prescriptions, what do academics teach? Without prescribed uniform behaviour, how can there be professionalism? Of course, most PR academics deny the possibility of objectivity. By acknowledging and embracing their own subjectivity instead, they imagine they have escaped the myth of objectivity. But they are simply on the other side of the same coin.

The aim of objectivity in "scientific" research is to enable the efficient production of *generalisable* knowledge by eliminating the most unreliable variable, the "subject position." In science, knowledge can only be sanctioned if it can be replicated by

anyone, anywhere, using the same sanctioned methods. The individual scientist is irrelevant and immaterial to the knowledge produced. While scientistic researchers persist in this belief, most other researchers, especially postmodern humanities researchers, no longer believe in the possibility of such absolute replication. Yet many still seem to believe in the generalisability of their subjective knowledge, much to the amusement or dismay of scientistic researchers. Believing in the generalisability of their own subjective experiences means they believe their own experiences to be the same as those of others whom they expect will see things their way. An interest in generalising one's subjective experiences into prescriptions for professionalism represents postmodernity's unique and ironic refinement of "objective" research under the influence of the technicity paradigm.

Specialisation

Professionalisation begins with specialisation. Both are responses to a desire for control that characterises the technicity paradigm. It is easier to control the small and simple than the big and complex. In rendering phenomena manageable through reductive specialisation, the domain of interest narrows. In mastering a narrow domain of interest, the possibility of prescriptions for uniform thinking and behavioural conformity – for professionalism -- increase. But specialisation and professionalism come at a cost. From my Heideggerian perspective, both reduce the richness of our experiences and insights and both diminish us as human beings. This happens because specialisation and professionalism detach us from the holistic public world and confine us to a specialised dream world that Heidegger calls "deficient" because it has lost some of its complexity.

Heidegger described a holistic, concrete world constituted by all life experiences, even the mundane and fleeting, and both personal experiences and those handed down by others through education and socialisation. This is the public world. In the public world, the phenomena of all these experiences (the *stuff* of them) are linked together to create their significance, to create the concrete, pre-rational world of our experience. The concreteness of phenomena depends on their connectedness to other phenomena; this connectedness constitutes their significance. The connectedness of the holistic public world is undermined by *thematisation* which detaches phenomena (and people)

from their places within its context. Thematisation makes phenomena and experience less concrete and more abstract. It also makes them less significant.

Thematisation is the rationalist mechanism for delimiting domains (or themes) of disciplinary interest. It reduces how much of the holistic world we experience because thematisation determines how open we are to the holistic world, how much we are prepared to consider significant. Researchers (unlike scholars) are usually open only to experiences that fit the pre-determined paradigm parameters of their research specialty. These parameters effectively detach phenomena from their holistic context by rendering other phenomena in that context insignificant or irrelevant to the research task. This rationalist reduction simplifies the phenomena of interest to make them easier to study, but it diminishes their concreteness by ignoring their full contextuality, often substituting a paradigm-specific, rationally constructed context in its place. This is the essence of *abstraction* -- taking something away from its rich, concrete context, reducing and simplifying it, and often "throwing a signification"[27] (a new rationally constructed context) over the deficient abstraction. This is how researchers create abstract theory on which professionalism is often based.

For example, public relations researchers (and even some practitioners) regularly reduce people to abstract stakeholders by detaching them from their holistic context which includes experiences and phenomena unrelated to the PR organisation or PR matters. They then place these abstractions into their rationally delimited context of a PR issue or problem. In this, there is no difference between postmodern PR researchers and scientistically-oriented PR researchers. Different paradigms and aims, perhaps, but the same professional detachment (abstraction). I believe this detachment is the source of the perceived gulf between theory and practice, between academic PR and PR practice. Kruckeberg's push for professionalism has the potential to increase that gulf if the domain of PR education is thematised to remove it from the worlds of journalism/ mass communications, business, speech/communication, social or behavioural sciences or liberal arts, and especially if PR education is thematised to further remove it from the public world of PR practice in the pursuit of professionalism.

Besides reducing the rich significance of the world, thematisation also *reduces researchers* (and even practising professionals) who feel compelled to conform to the

parameters and interests of their professional discipline, to confine their interests and efforts to their specialised, abstract, professional world. This is so because, in a Heideggerian scheme, *we are the world we experience*. Without a concrete world to fill our lives with meaning, we are an empty space, what Heidegger calls "the there." Interestingly, Heidegger claims the world does not have meaning; it has only significance. Only people have meaning. Only people can be meaning-ful, full of the significance of the world.[28] When we are filled with a thematically reduced world of significance, a rationally constructed, deficient, abstract, professional world, *we* are less meaningful. When we thematise, we *reduce ourselves* to a discipline-defined professional identity. We become merely PR researchers or PR professionals rather than whole and diverse individuals with a more meaningful identity and a more significant world in which to exist.[29]

Researchers are also reduced in another way by thematisation. To be human, in a Heideggerian scheme, is to be *in-the-world*, to be involved with the holistic world from a *unique* place in it. Each person has the existential potential to experience the world from their unique perspective. But when people create abstract worlds through identification with a discipline or profession, their unique place in the public world disappears and is replaced by a generic place in a dream world. Their individual experiences are transformed into generic experiences sanctioned by their professional paradigms. This loss of a uniquely personal role or place in experiences is acknowlededged in paradigm beliefs in objectivity or at least in the generalisability of knowledge. This loss represents another surrender of personal identity in favour of a professional identity. Professionals are prepared to surrender their will and judgement to a collective will or judgement. In conforming to paradigm-sanctioned beliefs, values and behaviour, professionals give up their uniqueness.

Perhaps this wouldn't be perceived as a great loss by PR academics like Kruckeberg, or it might be seen as a small price to pay. After all, PR researchers are no different than other researchers in wanting to have their insights and experiences accepted as generalisable knowledge that becomes definitive of professionalism. Also, as a function of academic career structures, it is important to been seen as thinking and acting as a PR academic does. And as educators charged with indoctrinating students into the PR paradigm, it is helpful to have a clear and uncontentious idea of the skills, techniques and values graduates need to be defined as PR professionals.

But I see a real danger of defining PR professionals in terms of generic skills, techniques and values rather than in terms of the complex world in which they participate as individuals. In the face of generic, toolbox definitions of the PR occupation, how do individual PR graduates distinguish themselves from each other in pursuit of their career aspirations? And is it appropriate for any educators to be advocating approaches that are more likely to encourage mindless compliance than critical and creative thinking? These are the dangers of professionalism.

I suspect PR practitioners (unlike most researchers) would *not* be eager to have their practices adopted by their competitors, thereby diminishing any competitive advantage they have based on their unique approaches to PR practice. A push for professionalism always involves a degree of homogenisation and a reduction in diversity, which is probably desirable in professions like medicine or law which are mostly based on empirical science or centuries of convention, respectively. But mandated conformity does not sit well within the capitalist paradigm to which most businesses (including PR consultancies) subscribe. Even the business paradigm has shifted away from "scientific" management to leadership and diversity management, both of which are concerned with encouraging unconventional behaviour, creativity and personal empowerment in both managers and staff.[30]

And how can the pursuit of theoretical, practical, educational and personal uniformity and conformity that characterises professionalism be appropriate for communicators who must be sensitive to the diversity of others and in tune with their own uniqueness? The pursuit of professionalism conflicts with the PR profession's belief in the desirability of diversity, the inevitability of different interpretations of the same event or message, and the importance of thinking and acting freely or even in one's own interests. Why can't PR education continue to reflect the heterogeneity of PR theory and practice? Who actually values professional uniformity and conformity? How will professional uniformity and conformity make PR theory, practice or education better for academics, students, practitioners or clients?

CLOSING REMARKS

I believe this article has issued a philosophical challenge to Kruckeberg and others who see professionalism as desirable. In a sense, this desire is understandable because we traditionally equate professionalism with mastery or efficiency or effectiveness, the prime values of the epoch of technicity. But I hope this article has shown that professionalism can also involve a narrowing of vision, a denial of human capacities like intuition, feeling and creativity, a restriction on interpretive and operational freedom, and an imposition of an identity that denies the value of human uniqueness. If we don't reflect more deeply on what we are asking for when we seek to professionalise public relations, we might lose sight of the complexity and diversity that characterise PR projects, and we might deny ourselves the personal and creative challenges that make PR work so enjoyable. Embracing professionalism can transform our untidy and interesting occupation into a mechanistic one characterised by inappropriately prescriptive protocols and techniques that can be applied mindlessly. The more mindlessly compliant one is, the more professional one becomes. In the end, someone creates an expert system to replace you!

NOTES

1.   Dean Kruckeberg, "The Future of PR Education: Some Recommendations," *Public Relations Review* 24(2) (Summer 1998), pp. 235-248.

2.   Ibid., p. 235.

3.   Shirley Leitch and Gael Walker, "Editorial: Public Relations on the Edge," *Australian Journal of Communication* 24(2) (April 1997), pp. vii-ix.

4.   Martin Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, Albert Hofstadter (trans.), (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), pp. 52-55. (Original published 1975)

5.   Martin Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology, " in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays,* William Lovitt (trans.), (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), pp. 3-35. (Original published 1954)

6.   Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 111-135.

7.   Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, Joan Stambaugh (trans.), (Albany: SUNY Press, 1996), p. 66. (Original published 1927, first translation 1962)

8.   For example, see Suzanne D. Sparks and Patrice Conwell, "Teaching Public Relations -- Does Practice or Theory Prepare Practitioners?" *Public Relations Quarterly* 43(1) (Spring 1998), pp.41-44; Donald F. Schwartz, Paul Yarbrough and M. Therese Shakra, "Does Public Relations Education Make the Grade?, *Public Relations Journal* 48(9) (September 1992), pp. 18-25; Jim VanLeuven, "Practitioners Talk About the State of PR Education," *Public Relations Review* 15(1) (Spring 1989), pp.5-11; Gay Wakefield and Laura Perkins Cottone, "Knowledge and Skills Required by Public Relations Employers," *Public Relations Review* 13(3) (Fall, 1987), pp. 24-32.

9.   Martin Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology," op. cit.

10.   Martin Heidegger, "The Age of the World Picture, " in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays,* op.cit., pp. 115-154. (Original published 1952) and Heidegger, *Being and Time*, op. cit. pp. 186-196.

11.   Martin Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology," op. cit., p. 20.

12.   For example, Andrew Pickering, " The Mangle of Practice: Agency and Emergence in the Sociology of Science, *American Journal of Sociology* 99(3), 1993, pp. 559-589; Bruno Latour, *Science in Action,* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1987); and Michael Lynch, *Scientific Practices and Ordinary Action*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

13.   For examples of anthropcentrism, see Judy Motion, "Technologising the Self – An Art of Public Relations," *Australian Journal of Communication*, op. cit., pp. 1-16; Mary Anne Moffitt, "Collapsing and Integrating Concepts of 'Public' and 'Image' into a New Theory," *Public Relations Review* 20(2) (Summer 1994), pp. 159-170; Shirley Leitch and D. Neilson, "Reframing Public Relations: New Directions for Theory and Practice," *Australian Journal of Communication*, op. cit., pp. 17-32.

14.   Martin Heidegger, "The Age of the World Picture," op. cit.

15.   Thomas S. Kuhn, op. cit.

16.   Ian Hacking, "The Self-Vindication of the Laboratory Sciences, " in Andrew Pickering (ed.),   *Science as Practice and Culture*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 29-64.

17.   Brad E. Hainsworth, "Commentary: Professionalim in Public Relations" *Public Relations Review* 19(4) (Winter 1993), pp.311-314; Albert Waker, "Public Relations Education: 1983 Survey and Report," *Public Relations Review* 10(1) (Spring 1984), pp. 18-29; Albert Walker, "Where to Anchor Public Relations Education? The Problem Persists," *Public Relations Quarterly* (Fall 1989), pp. 22-25; Dirk C. Gibson, "Public Relations Education in a Time of Change," *Public Relations Quarterly* (Fall 1987), pp. 25-31; Lisa Prepon, "Schools of Thought on Education," *Public Relations Journal* 49(11) (November 1993),

pp. 12-19; Richard A. Falb, "The Place of Public Relations in Higher Education: Another Opinion," *Public Relations Review* 18(1) (Spring 1992), pp. 97-101.

18.   Shirley Leitch and D. Neilson, *op. cit.;* Kirk Hallahan, "The Paradigm Struggle and Public Relations Practice," *Public Relations Review* 19(2) (Summer 1993), pp. 197-205; Kerry Tucker and Rus Shortridge, "Behavioral Principles in Public Relations," *Public Relations Journal* 50(8) (October/November 1994), pp. 56-57; Gay Wakefield and Laura Perkins Cottone, "Public Relations Executives' Perceptions of Disciplinary Emphases Important to Public Relations Practice for the 1990s," *Public Relations Review* 18(1) (Spring 1992), pp. 67-78; D. McKie, "Shifting Paradigms: Public Relations Beyond Rats, Stats and 1950's Science," *Australian Journal of Communication*, op. cit., pp. 81-96; Roy V. Leeper, "Moral Objectivity, Jurgen Habermas's Discourse Ethics, and Public Relations," *Public Relations Review* 22(2) (Summer 1996), pp. 133-150; Dirk C. Gibson, "The Communication Continuum: A Theory of Public Relations," *Public Relations Review* 17(2) (Summer 1991), pp. 175-183; Pamela J. Creedon, "Acknowledging the Infrasystem: A Critical Feminist Analysis of Systems Theory," *Public Relations Review* 19(2) (Summer 1993), pp. 157-166; Gael Walker, "Public Relations Practitioners' Use of Research, Measurement and Evaluation," *Australian Journal of Communication*, op. cit., pp. 97-113.

19.   Greg Leichty and Jeff Springston, "Reconsidering Public Relations Models," *Public Relations Review* 19(4) (Winter 1993), pp. 327-339; James E. Grunig, "Image and Substance: From Symbolic to Behavioural Relationships," *Public Relations Review* 19(2) (Summer 1993), pp. 121-139; Priscilla Murphy, "The Limits of Symmetry: A Game Theory Approach to Symmetric and Asymmetric Public Relations," *Public Relations Research Annual*, Vol. 3 (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates, 1991), pp. 115-131; James E. Grunig and Larissa A. Grunig, "Models of Public Relations and Communication," in *Excellence in Public Relations and Communications Management*, James E. Grunig (ed.), (Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates, 1994), pp. 285-325.

20.   Martin Heidegger, "Science and Reflection," in *the Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, op. cit., pp. 155-182. (Original published 1954)

21..   Martin Heidegger, "The Age of the World Picture," *op. cit.*

22.   Kuhn, op. cit., pp. 111-135.

23.   For example, Leeper on discourse ethics, Creedon on systems theory, Murphy on games theory and Moffitt on image, all op. cit.

24.   For example, Wakefield and Cottone, VanLeuven, Propon, Schwartz et al., all op. cit.

25.   Shirley Leitch and Gael Walker, op. cit.

26.   For example, McKie on chaos, complexity and catastrophe theory; Motion on Foucault, L'Etang on truth, Piecszka on ethnomethodology, and Heath on rhetorical theory. McKie and Motion, op cit.; Jacqueline L'Etang, "Public Relations and the Rhetorical Dilemma," *Australian Journal of Communication (AJC)*, op. cit., pp. 33-53; M. Pieczka, "Understanding in Public Relations," *AJC*, op. cit., pp. 65-79; Robert Heath, "Legitimate 'Perspectives' in Public Relations Practice: A Rhetorical Solution," *AJC*, op. cit., pp. 55-64.

27.   Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, *op. cit.,* p.140.

28.   Ibid., p. 142.

29.   For a moving account of reduced identity as experienced by a communication researcher, see A. P. Bochner, "It's About Time: Narrative and the Divided Self," *Qualitative Inquiry* 3(4) 1997, pp. 418-438.

30.   See, for example, Carol J. Steiner and Paul Gaskin, "Educating Leaders: From the Abstract and Rational to the Concrete and Personal," *Journal of Leadership Studies* 5(2) (Spring 1998), pp. 83-102; J. Katzenbach, "Change Leaders," *McKinsey Quarterly* 1 (1996), pp. 148-163; John Forster and Michael Browne, *Principles of Strategic Management,* (South Melbourne: Macmillan, 1996); G. Spreitzer and R. Quinn, "Empowering Middle Managers

to Be Transformational Leaders," *Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences*, 32, (Spring 1996) pp. 237-261; M. Story, "The Secrets of Successful Empowerment," *National Productivity Review*, 14(3) (Fall 1995), pp. 81-90; J. Kouzes and B. Posner, *the Leadership Challenge: How to Keep Getting Extraordinary Things Done in Organisations,* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,1995).

Other RMIT Business Working Papers

1992

Barrett, M., *Strategic Implications of International Countertrade*, WP 92/01.

Thandi, H.S., *A Case for Increasing Australian Trade with Malaysia*, WP 92/02.

Thandi, H.S., *Some Conceptual Designs to Facilitate the Generation and Integration of International Trade Research*, WP 92/03.

Thandi, H.S., *Malaysian Macrolights for the Investor*, WP 92/04.

Thandi, H.S., *NAFTA - Boon or Bane?: Some Initial Reactions*, WP 92/05.

1993

Thandi, H.S., *Self Disclosure Perceptions Among Students of Management*, WP 93/01.

Thandi, H.S., *Competitive Directions for Australia*, WP 93/02.

Thandi, H.S., *Culture-Strategy Integration in the Management of Corporate Strategy*, WP 93/03.

Subanidja, S. & Thandi, H.S., *Logistical Implications of Surplus Rice in Indonesia - A Historical Perspective*, WP 93/04.

Wu, C.L., *On Producer's Surplus*, WP 93/05.

Jackson, M., *Unauthorised Release of Government Information*, WP 93/06.

Jackson, M., Incidence of Computer Misuse - Fact or Fiction?, WP 93/07.

Beaumont, N., *The Use of an Automated Storage and Retrieval System (AS/RS) at the State Library of Victoria*, WP 93/08.

Morley, C., *An Experiment to Investigate the Effect of Prices on Tourism Demand*, WP 93/09.

Morley, C., *Analysis of Experimental Data on Individual's Choice of Destination*, WP 93/10.

Morley, C., *The Use of CPI for Tourism Prices in Demand Modelling*, WP 93/11.

Ainworth, M., *The Value of Management Education: Views of Graduates on the Benefits of Doing an MBA*, WP 93/12.

Vitols, M., *Some Criticisms of the Health Capital Model: Responses to Symptoms*, WP 93/13.

Marks, L., *Marketing and the Public Sector Library: Some Unresolved Issues*, WP 93/14.

Jackson, M., *Protection of the Proprietary Information of Organisations in the Asia-Pacific Region*, WP 93/15.

1994

Morley, C., *A Comparison of Three Methods for Estimating Tourism Demand Models*, WP 94/01.

Mottram, K., *Management Coaching Process*, WP 94/02.

Wright, K. & Benito, M.A., *Sales Remuneration: Some Sins of Omission and Commission*, WP 94/03.

Morley, C., *Beyond the MBA: Professional Doctorates in Business*, WP 94/04.

1995

Morley, C., *Tourism Demand: Characteristics, Segmentation and Aggregation*, WP 95/01.

Morley, C., *Data Bias in the Estimation of Airfare Elasticities*, WP 95/02.

Morley, C., *Estimating Tourism Demand Models*, WP 95/03.

Jackson, M. & Bos, A., *The Effect of Management Education on Women's' Careers: The RMIT Experience*, WP 95/04.

Callaghan, B. & Jackson, M., *Accounting Professionals: Current Attitudes to Banks*, WP 95/05.

Jackson, M. & O'Connor, R., *Research Planning and Management in Non-traditional Research Discipline Areas*, WP 95/06.

Callaghan, B. & Dunwoodie, K., *How Large Are Cultural Values Differences in the 90's?*, WP 95/07.

Morley, C. & Willis, Q.F., *Managerial Theory and Economic Rationalism: An Argument in Response to Karpin*, WP 95/08.

Morley, C., *Diffusion Models of Tourism: International Tourism to Australia*, WP 95/09.

1996

Scarlett, B., *An Enterprise Management Understanding of Social Differentiation*, WP 96/1.

Slade, P., *Technological Change in New Zealand Sawmilling*, WP 96/2.

Mathews, C. & Davey, B., *The Collection and Analysis of Environmental Information in the Top 150 Australian Companies: Some Preliminary Results*, WP 96/3.

Kangsanant, V., *The Commercialisation of New High Technology Products by Small Firms in the Information Technology Industry*, WP 96/4.

Slade, P., *Employment Relations: New Paradigm or Old Ideology*, WP 96/5.

1997

Jackson, M. & O'Connor, R., *Staff Mobility Programs in Australian Universities*, WP 97/1.

Morley, C.L., *An Econometric-Product Growth Model of Tourism to Australia*, WP 97/2.

Callaghan, W.M. & Dunwoodie, K., *A Comparison of Decision Making Approaches used by Australian and Malaysian Managers*, WP 97/3.

Martin, W.J. & Chishti, M.A., *Content and Context in Information Management: The Experience of Two Melbourne-Based Organisations*, WP 97/4.

Chishti, M.A., Martin, W.J. and Jacoby, J., *Information Technology Enabled Organisational Change: A Survey of Australian Practices*, WP 97/5.

Scarlet, B., *Beyond Excellence: In Search of Enterprise Effectiveness*, WP 97/6.

O'Neill, M., Bellamy, S., Jackson, M. and Morley, C., *An Analysis of Female Participation and Progression in the Accounting Profession in Australia*, WP 97/7

Holian, R. & Martin, S., *Ethical Issues and Decision Making in Organisations*, WP 97/8.

1998

Scarlett, B.L., *Business Goals*, WP 98/1.

Scarlett, B.L., *A Typology of Enterprise Effectiveness Models*, WP 98/2.

Lombardo, R.W., *Unravelling the Mysteries of Ellwood's Basic Mortgage Equity Capitalisation Model*, WP 98/3.

Woolley, R.L., *International Accounting Standards and Economic Growth: An Empirical Investigation of their Relationship in Asia*, WP 98/4.

Caddick, M., Moore, S. & Management Research Team, *Adding Value: Using Customer Feedback: An Exploratory Research Project Examining the Use of Customer Feedback by Victorian Local Government Organisations*, WP 98/5.

1999

Scarlett, B.L., *A Cross Cultural Comparison of Business Goals*, WP 99/1.

Parratt, E. & Holian, R., *ISO 9000 Certification: Is it worth it?,* WP 99/2.

Morley, C., *Estimating Integrated Time Series and Other Problems in Modelling Tourism Demand*, WP 3/99.

Morley, C., *How Professional? The Role of the University in Professional Doctorates*, WP 4/99.

Ellingworth, R., *When the Will to Change is not Enough? An Action Research Case Study from the Finance Industry*, WP 5/99.

Boucher, C., *Leaders with Disabilities: Still a Splendid Deception*, WP 6/99.

Boucher, C. & Gardner, I., *Beyond Male Stereotypes in Management Practice*, WP 7/99.

Boucher, C., *A Description of Modernism and Postmodernism in the Context of Organisation Studies and Thinking about Management*, WP 8/99.

Kimber, D., *Values Based Strategies and Planning for Global Organisations*, WP 9/99.

Watty, K., & Terzioglu, B., *Performance Measures Employed by Australian Subsidiaries of US Service Multinational Companies: An Empirical Survey*, WP 99/10.

Scarlett, B.L, *A Delphi Study of the Business Goals of Australian Stockbrocking Firms*, WP 99/11.

Faux, J., *Environmental Financial Information and the Public Accounts and Estimates Committee of the Parliament of Victoria: Research Opportunities*, WP 99/12.

Gill, C., *Use of Hard and Soft Models of HRM to Illustrate the Gap Between Rhetoric and Reality in Workforce Management*, WP 99/13.

Steiner, C., *Unifying Research and Practice Through Concrete, Personal Knowing*, WP 99/14.

Steiner, C., *How Important is Professionalism in Public Relations Management?,* WP 99/15.

Steiner, C., *Educating Science Workers for an Innovating Work Environment*, WP 99/16.

Steiner, C., & Black, L., *Australian PR Professionals in Corporate Strategic Planning: Educational Implications*, WP 99/17.

Sheldrake, P., & Hurley, J., *The Good Manager in a World of Change*, WP 99/18.

Paderno, F., *A Study of Art and Design Small Business Practices to Determine the Attributes needed for Operating a Successful Small Business*, WP 99/19.

O'Shannassy, T., *Lessons from the Evolution of the Strategy Paradigm*, WP 99/20.

O'Shannassy, T., *Strategic Thinking: A Continuum of Views and Conceptualisation*s WP 99/21.