

HOW PUBLIC RELATIONS PROFESSIONALISM
INFLUENCES CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY:
A SURVEY OF PRACTITIONERS

by

SOOYEON KIM

(Under the Direction of Bryan Reber)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to explore how public relations practitioners' professionalism is associated with their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. The quantitative on-line survey was completed by 289 respondents drawn from the national sample of Public Relations Society of America (PRSA). The result revealed that practitioners with high professionalism have more positive attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. Additionally, practitioners' longer permanence of job and larger PR department's size affect their professionalism positively. Female practitioners have more positive attitudes towards corporate social responsibility than male practitioners, and older practitioners have more positive attitudes towards corporate social responsibility than younger practitioners. This study suggests ways for practitioners to improve their professionalism by focusing on their roles in giving an organization direction for being socially responsible.

INDEX WORDS: Public relations, Public relations practitioners, Professionalism, Corporate social responsibility, Public relations roles, Ethics

HOW PUBLIC RELATIONS PROFESSIONALISM
INFLUENCES CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY:
A SURVEY OF PRACTITIONERS

by

SOOYEON KIM

B. A., Ewha Womans University, South Korea, 2001

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2006

© 2006

SOOYEON KIM

All Rights Reserved

HOW PUBLIC RELATIONS PROFESSIONALISM
INFLUENCES CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY:
A SURVEY OF PRACTITIONERS

by

SOOYEON KIM

Major Professor: Bryan Reber

Committee: Jeff Springston
Spencer Tinkham

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2006

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must first acknowledge the help provided to me by the members of my thesis committee. My thanks first go to my advisor, Dr. Bryan Reber, in that his academic advice and warm trust encouraged me all the time particularly as an international student. His advice gave me great energy to pursue my thesis study. I deeply appreciate to Dr. Spencer Tinkham for his invaluable advice with data analysis, which gave me a good direction to go. I express my great thanks to Dr. Jeff Springston for his attention to detail. I greatly appreciate having the chance to study public relations as a master's student at the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication.

Finally my biggest thanks go to my mother's endless support and father's trust in me. I would like to express my gratitude for my grandparents' trust, love, and patience that I realized when I left Seoul. I must express my regret and love for my grandmother who passed away while I was in Athens. My two best friends in Seoul, Yoochun and Sina, both contributed to my successful master's degree in the U.S. Their hearty love and encouragement for me have always given me the energy to smile. I also thank my friends and colleagues at UGA who helped me a lot.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Professionalism of Public Relations	4
The Professional Status of PR Practitioners	6
Corporate Social Responsibility	8
Corporate Social Responsibility and Public Relations	10
3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES	15
Statement of the Problem	15
Research Questions and Hypotheses	16
4 METHODOLOGY	18
Subjects	18
Survey Instrument	18
Scales for Defining Professionalism	19
Scales for Defining Attitudes towards CSR	21
Procedure	22

5	RESULTS	24
	Response Rates	24
	Description of Subjects	25
	Comparing the Sample with the Public Relations Profession	29
	Some Items Recoded for Proper Valence	30
	Frequency Distribution of Professionalism and CSR Items	30
	Verification of Items Expressed in Abstract Sentences	34
	Results of Factor Analysis	35
	Construction of Measures	39
	The Relationship between Professionalism and Attitudes towards CSR	40
	Duration of Practice Affects Professionalism	43
	PR Departments' Size Affects Professionalism	45
	Gender Affects Practitioners' Attitudes towards CSR	46
	Age Affects Practitioners' Attitudes towards CSR	46
6	DISCUSSION	48
	Results of Hypotheses Testing	48
	Practitioners' Professional Status	53
	Practitioners' Attitudes towards CSR	55
	Importance of Top Managers' Role	57
	Validity/Limitation of This Study	57
	More Research Is Needed	56
	REFERENCES	60

APPENDICES	67
A SURVEY INSTRUMENT	68
B CONSENT FORM.....	75
C E-MAIL COVER LETTER	77
D E-MAIL FIRST FOLLOW UP	79
E E-MAIL SECOND FOLLOW UP	80
F PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS TABLE FOR PROFESSIONALISM VARIABLES	81
G PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS TABLE FOR CSR VARIABLES	82

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Items for Practitioners’ Professionalism.....	19
Table 2: Items for Practitioners’ Attitudes towards CSR	21
Table 3: Frequencies of Gender, Age, Highest Degree, and Major.....	26
Table 4: Frequencies of the Length of PR Practice, and the Length of Role and Practice in a current organization.....	27
Table 5: Frequencies of Title, Organization Type, and Annual Revenues of Organizations	28
Table 6: Frequencies of Organization’s and PR Department’s Size.....	29
Table 7: Comparison of PR Profession and the Sample	30
Table 8: Frequencies and Means for Professionalism Items	31
Table 9: Frequencies and Means for CSR Items	32
Table 10: Professionalism Dimensions (Varimax-rotated principal factor)	36
Table 11: CSR Dimensions (Varimax-rotated principal factor).....	38
Table 12: The Regression Analysis for Professionalism Predicting Attitudes towards CSR	40
Table 13: Professionalism Levels and CSR Difference	42
Table 14: Proportion of Respondents at Three Levels of Professionalism and Attitudes towards CSR	43
Table 15: Duration of Practice in Public Relations and Professionalism Difference.....	44
Table 16: Duration at Present Organization and Professionalism Difference	44
Table 17: Duration of Current Role and Professionalism Difference.....	45

Table 18: PR Departments' Size and Professionalism Difference	45
Table 19: Gender and CSR Difference	46
Table 20: Age and CSR Difference	47

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study contends that public relations (PR) is a professional occupation. Grunig and Hunt (1984) state that “The majority of public relations practitioners since Ivy Lee and Edward Bernays changed the field in the early 1900s have argued, however, that public relations must become a profession” (p. 63). However, there have been many studies that have argued that public relations is suffering from low standards of professionalism (Cameron, Sallot, & Weaver-Lariscy, 1996; Van Ruler, 2005; Sallot, Cameron, & Weaver-Lariscy, 1997; Wylie, 1994). Public relations practitioners must achieve professional status to implement their professional values effectively.

Although there are currently few concrete professional standards and a low level of professionalism in public relations, public relations is becoming one of the fastest growing industries in the United States. The Public Relations Society of America (2000a) defines PR as a “twentieth century phenomenon” (p. 4) and states that it is a relatively young profession currently enjoying its “golden age” (p. 4). Mogel (2002) also notes that “twenty-first-century PR is on a roll... The Institute for PR Research and Education estimates that there are approximately 250,000-300,000 people employed in PR and public affairs” (p. 7) in the United States.

According to Grunig and Hunt (1984), importance to society and a common code of ethics are core professional values. Grunig (2000) also states that public relations has not yet been valued by society, which is also a prerequisite of professionalism in the field. Boynton

(2002) understands that professionalism and social responsibility are the main focus of the primary foundations of public relations ethics literature. Considering the fact that professionalism and the role of adding to the common good—namely, corporate social responsibility—are very closely intertwined, it can be assumed that one of the primary reasons for PR’s lack of professionalism is the assertion that social responsibility is not valued among PR practitioners.

Bowen (2005) noted, “As the ethical conscience of the organization, public relations practitioners should be well versed in both moral philosophy and ethics” (p. 192) and emphasized the role of the public relations practitioner as an ethical decision-maker. However, in reality individual practitioners’ professionalism and ethical concerns will vary depending on their individualistic, organizational, and societal dimensions. According to Wright (1989), “Central to the importance of ethics in American public relations is the reality that, most of the time, practitioners have the voluntary choice of whether to be ethical or not” (p. 3).

Boynton (2002) inquired into professionalism and social responsibility profoundly and reached the following conclusion regarding the relationship between professionalism and social responsibility of public relations practitioners:

Social responsibility is considered both an element and an outcome of professionalism, which points to the potential duality of these concepts. That is, socially responsible behavior is both a professional attribute and a valued course of action for public relations practitioners. (p. 256)

It is clear that the relationship between professionalism and social responsibility is significant. This study examines the current status of professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility of public relations practitioners. This study also explores how

practitioners' professionalism explains their concerns and views about corporate social responsibility.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Professionalism of Public Relations

The use of professionalism in the public relations field is generally linked to the expression of a need to improve the status of PR as an occupation. Wright's (1981) criteria for a profession include intellectualism, a code of ethics, a comprehensive self-governing organization, greater emphasis on public service than on self-interests, performance of a unique and essential service based on a substantial body of knowledge, broad autonomy, and having practitioners guided by altruism. He concludes that legal certification of practitioners will make it possible for public relations to attain a true professional status. Wylie (1994) states, "I agree that public relations should become a profession and that it can. But, it will not get there through self-anointment, or self-proclamation. Let us take the orderly, established steps to become an acknowledged profession" (p. 3).

Wilcox, Cameron, Ault, and Agee (2003) define professionalism in public relations:

The most important thing is for the individual to act like a professional in the field.

This means that a practitioner should have:

- A sense of independence
- A sense of responsibility to society and the public interest
- Manifest concern for the competence and honor of the profession as a whole

- A highest loyalty to the standards of the profession and fellow professionals than to the employer of the moment. The reference point in all public relations activity must be the standards of the profession and not those of the client or the employer. (p. 67)

Generally, the necessary infrastructure to be a true profession—a body of knowledge, codes of ethics, and certification—are explained as the characteristics of a profession (Cutlip, Center, & Broom, 1994; Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Wylie, 1994).

In an attempt to establish public relations' legitimacy, public relations practitioners sought to improve their professional status, and the growth of public relations required negotiating social approval and a license for public relations practitioners (Bivins, 1993; Piezka & L'Etang, 2001). Galitzine (1960) argues that the philosophy of public relations is a policy of social responsibility. Bivins (1993) notes the following:

As the practice of public relations attempts to become the profession of public relations, clarification of its ethical obligation to serve the public interest is vital if it is to accomplish its goal and if it is to be accepted as a legitimate profession by society. (p. 117)

He also emphasizes the public interest in defining professionalism, stating, "It is important to note that although serving the public interest is not necessarily a criterion used to define professionalism, it is the most often cited of the values of professionalism" (p. 117). Therefore, attaining professionalism in public relations depends largely on acting in a socially responsible manner. Sharpe (1986) writes the following:

Standards for the performance of public relations must be stated in terms of the overall public interest and welfare, but at the same time must protect the right of the organization, individual or special-interest group to seek public understanding and support. (p. 17)

Professional standards of public relations should be in the same context of maintaining an organization's long-range stability and harmony with the changing social environment.

On the other hand, Van Ruler (2005) points out the different views of professionalism between scholars and practitioners. Many scholars are clear about professionalism in emphasizing rational intelligence or education (Ehling, 1992; Hainsworth, 1993; Kruckeberg, 1998; Pieczka & L'Etang, 2001); practitioners, however, often do not respect education or knowledge, but value mentality (Van Ruler, 2005). Van Ruler concludes that scholars must admit that emotional knowledge, as well as rational knowledge, is needed.

Professionalism of public relations is often defined as a multidimensional construct (David, 2004; Dozier, Grunig, & Grunig, 1995; Lages & Simkin, 2003). Dozier, Grunig, and Grunig (1995) conceptualize three spheres of communication excellence: knowledge core, shared expectations, and participative culture. David (2004) views the reconciliation of values between an organization and its publics as a three-way compromise between individual, organizational, and social values. Similarly, Lages and Simkin (2003) attempt to develop a scale for measuring professionalism in a holistic way by examining the core constructs of public relations at the practitioner, consultancy, and industry levels. David (2004) also explains that the strength of ethical values of public relations practitioners differs, depending on the culture of an organization. The corporate citizenship or responsibility is affected by individual, organizational, and social values.

The Professional Status of PR Practitioners

Generally, the issue of professionalism in public relations branches into two areas. One area focuses on the discussion of public relations as an occupation that should be licensed or

accredited as a profession, and the other branch explores the presence of professionalism among the people practicing public relations (Hill & White, 2000).

The following empirical studies in the public relations literature indicate that professional standards in public relations do not exist among PR practitioners and educators. According to Cameron, Sallot, and Weaver-Lariscy (1996), the level of current standards of practitioners is split on most items, meaning that public relations practitioners do not have shared professional standards. Sallot, Cameron, and Weaver-Lariscy (1997) conclude that educators are a bit further ahead of practitioners in forging opinions about performance standards in public relations. However, the consistent differences in opinion, combined with large neutral responses for both educators and practitioners, suggest that no concrete professional standards exist. Sallot, Cameron, and Weaver-Lariscy (1998) conclude that practitioners predominantly view their peers collectively as somewhat unprofessional and unenlightened in comparison to their own personal self-images. Finally, this result also suggests that there is little consensus about professional standards in the field. These results suggest that building consensus or having confidence in professional standards has a long way to go.

Ehling (1992) also noticed a low level of professionalism in public relations:

In the words of Cutlip et al. (1985), public relations still is seen as an unsavory activity committed to cluttering the mass media with the debris of pseudo-events and phony phrases leading to channels of communication being corroded with cynicism and credibility gaps. (p. 457)

Grunig (2000) mentioned, “Most people seem to view public relations as a mysterious hidden persuader working for the rich and powerful to deceive and take advantage of the less powerful”

(p. 23). These results indicate that public relations professionalism is not shown to people outside of the public relations field; thus, it is important for public relations to develop professionalism.

Corporate Social Responsibility

As Grunig and Hunt (1984) recognized, corporate social responsibility has been studied more actively in marketing as an excellent strategic tool (e.g., Brown & Dacin, 1997; Drumwright, 1994; Menon & Menon, 1997) than in public relations. From the perspective of marketing, the main social responsibility of business is economic (Carroll, 1979), and corporate social responsibility is understood as the profitable investment, with the focus usually on the consumers. Maignan and Ferrell (2001) explain one perspective of marketing whereby the corporate citizenship is understood as a form of consumer marketing, noting that “corporate citizenship is likely to be acknowledged by businesses as a worthwhile investment if its activities clearly trigger consumers’ active support” (p. 460).

The concept of social responsibility began to evolve during the 1960s in response to society’s changing social values (Buchholz, 1982; Chrisman & Carroll, 1984). Kelly (2001) describes this concept: “The concept of social responsibility simply means that organizations act as good citizens. It is rooted in systems theory in that organizations are interdependent with people and other organizations in their environment” (p. 285).

“The rise of corporate social responsibility in the late 1970s and early 1980s coincided with the increased concern for a corporation’s image” (Clark, 2000). In the 1980s many articles argued that the role of social responsibility was increasing and that public relations practitioners were being called upon to execute successful programs of social responsibility (Dennis, 1981 & 1982; Tilson & Vance, 1985).

Charitable contributions have been considered to be the oldest form of corporate social behavior (Tilson & Vance, 1985). Corporate social responsibility has been related to ethical codes, corporate philanthropy, community relations programs, and law-abiding actions (Wood, 1991). Social responsibility is the development of processes to evaluate stakeholder and environmental demands and the implementation of programs to manage social issues (Thomas & Simerly, 1994). Reder (1995) established several criteria to rate socially responsible corporations. According to his criteria, a socially responsible corporation should provide steady employment, design company facilities that maximize social benefit, offer goods and services needed by the community, improve quality of life in the community, pay its fair share of taxes, behave ethically, have adequate emergency procedures and equipment, encourage employees to be good citizens, and contribute to the community philanthropically. The examples of social responsibility programs of businesses to meet their discretionary responsibilities include providing work-family programs, offering pleasant work aesthetics, and giving donations to charities (Maignan & Ferrell, 2001).

A business exists at the pleasure of society, and its behavior must be guided by society (Wartick & Cochran, 1985). Carroll (1991) suggests that corporate social responsibility encompasses economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities. Heath (1997) emphasizes results from corporate social responsibility, stating that “by achieving high standards of corporate responsibility through fostered mutual relationships, issues managers can attract stakes and avoid costly conflict. Good performance is a bottom-line issue” (p. 123). Maignan and Ferrell (2001) suggest that corporate social responsibility may be positive for both external and internal marketing, employee relations in terms of public relations, and understanding corporate citizenship as having good potential for a marketing instrument. Werther Jr. and Chandler (2005)

view strategic corporate social responsibility as a global brand insurance against management lapses.

On the other hand, some public relations studies point out the term *corporate social responsibility* as a limited term from public relations' perspectives (Fitzpatrick & Gauthier, 2001; Grunig & Hunt, 1984). Grunig and Hunt (1984) prefer to use the term *public responsibility*, rather than *social responsibility*. Fitzpatrick and Gauthier (2001) propose the term *public conscience* instead of *social conscience* because the term *social conscience* confuses the role of public relations. PRSA (2003) also demonstrated, "We didn't want to be called Corporate Social Responsibility. If you're in a non-profit, you have to adhere to the same level of ethics and standards. We want all sectors to come together as equal partners" (p. 8).

Corporate Social Responsibility and Public Relations

In the early days of public relations' development, there was a strong emphasis on the role of PR in implementing social responsibility among leading practitioners. Arthur Page, a founding father of corporate public relations, said that all businesses in a democratic society begin with public permission and exist by public approval. He defined a standard for organizational performance of conducting public relations as if the whole company depended on it. He also stressed honest, open, and purposeful communication and the importance of listening in achieving communications (Griswold, 1967). In the mid 1970s, Harold Burson, one of the founders of Burson-Marsteller, began advocating that the role of a public relations executive is to provide qualitative evaluation of social trends, which will help the practitioner develop policies leading to a formal corporate response (Burson, 1974). At the 1980 meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism at Boston University, Edward L. Bernays noted that, "Public

relations is the practice of social responsibility. It holds the key to America's future" (Stone, 2005, p. 31).

Grunig and Hunt (1984) note that "public, or social, responsibility has become a major reason for an organization to have a public relations function" (p. 48) and that "...public responsibility is a basic tenet of public relations. If the organization does not need to be responsible to its publics, it also does not need a public relations function" (p. 52). Later, L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Dozier (2002) also valued social responsibility for the organization's effectiveness. Public responsibility is understood as a basic, and sometimes synonymous, concept of public relations.

However, many researchers propose clear, specific standards of ethics and social responsibility (Bivins, 1992; Bowen, 2005; Olasky, 1985 & 1986; Sharpe, 1986). After reviewing the PRSA code of professional standards, Olasky (1985 & 1986) concluded that responsibility to the public remains indefinable and that public relations watchers are needed. Bivins (1992) tries to adopt a systems model for ethical decision-making for practitioners. Bowen (2005) also recommends the Kantian model for ethical decision-making and symmetrical communication results. Sharpe (1986) presents some guidelines for the development of standards in terms of public interest and welfare.

A number of articles state that with the guidance of public relations practitioners, companies can successfully execute programs of social responsibility and emphasize the role of consciences in the decision-making of PR practitioners. According to Dennis (1981 & 1982), social responsibility and contributions programs are usually administered by a company's public affairs, public relations, corporate communications, community or urban affairs department. Tilson and Vance (1985) state, "Obviously, a competent staff is an essential part of a

contributions program and can play an important role in counseling top management on contributions decisions and ensuring that the program maintains high professional standards” (p. 27). Judd’s (1989) research indicates that public relations practitioners view themselves as the consciences of their organizations. Fully 65% of the respondents indicated that responsibility to society is more important than responsibility to employers or clients. Ryan’s (1986) research indicates that members of PRSA and the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC) strongly believe that socially responsible action is good for companies, society, and individual practitioners. Choi (2005) emphasized the role of public relations practitioners as the conscience of the organization that builds ethical relationships with publics.

Heath and Ryan (1989) examined the necessity of codes of corporate social responsibility and the involvement of public relations practitioners with developing standards like the following:

Corporations must find personnel who can offer insights into the values that should guide the corporation, who are sensitive to values issues, and who can serve as links to various elements of the environment. Talented, well-educated public relations practitioners can help corporate leaders by teaching them ethical standards. (p. 23)

This study sprang from the premise that public relations practitioners should have ethical standards, and the researchers discovered that most corporations that were sampled have some kind of written or unwritten code of social responsibility. However, this study concluded that practitioners do not often contribute to discussions of social responsibility.

Heath (1997) assigns one chapter of his book to “corporate responsibility” and emphasizes the role of issues communicators for corporate responsibility, which is the basis of mutual interests and strategic management. Heath states that “one of the most difficult tasks of

issues managers is convincing executives that policies must be changed when they are at odds with stakeholder opinion” (p. 125). However, Kruckeberg and Starck (1988) point out that “Public relations practitioners do not understand their most important role in society. That role is to serve not only their clients but society at large” (p. 12). Bivins (1993), however, indicates that the profession of public relations does little to formalize the doctrine of public service for individual practitioners.

On the other hand, Clark (2000), in separating and comparing corporate social responsibility and public relations by reviewing their origins, theories, processes, and primary responsibilities, concludes that they are quite similar in these respects, but that effective communication methods are mostly absent from the social responsibility literature. Fitzpatrick (2002a) examined the PRSA’s historical codes of ethics and found that in 1988 the provision regarding service to the public interest became the first article.

The majority of studies that have focused on corporate social responsibility in public relations have explored social responsibility activities. Heath and Ryan (1989) defined public relations’ role in corporate social responsibility as image building, moral rectitude, and monitoring and responding. Esrock and Leichty (1998) understood the central elements of social responsibility in Web pages as maintaining fair and honest business practices, maintaining product safety and reliability, taking care of employees, and improving environmental records. Stone (2005) understood public responsibility from the perspective of crisis management: mandatory responsibility, assumed responsibility, and discretionary responsibility.

Currently there are some studies emphasizing the practical role of corporate social responsibility in public relations. David (2004) presents the professional values, practice, and pragmatics (3Ps) model as a framework to evaluate professional values and the practice of public

relations within the context of situational pragmatics. David (2004) emphasizes the proactive role of corporate citizenship or social responsibility for a crisis as a reputation management as follows:

Besides the obvious and direct advantages such as a strong sense of community and common good, strong values in an organization can also create positive perceptions among external publics and consumers. The perception in the public eye that an organization has strong values and is socially responsible can be interpreted as social insurance. This area of study has emerged as reputation management which is currently an active area of research. At one time or another, every organization is likely to face a crisis. During the crisis, the core value assets of an organization play a vital role (pp. 197-198).

David, Kline, and Dai (2005) emphasize practicing publicity and press agency functions of PR, noting that awareness of corporate social responsibility initiatives may positively effect corporate identity and purchase intention.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Statement of the Problem

Daugherty (2001) emphasized the role of corporate social responsibility by stating that “Futurists predict that organizations will be judged more on their social policies than on their delivery of products and services, and key publics will become more influential” (p. 389). Judd (1989) points out social responsibility as a possible indicator of professionalism and a means of increasing the credibility of public relations. Clark (2000) also indicates that professional, ethical, and socially responsible public relations can be “real” public relations.

Many public relations studies have revealed that public relations has low professionalism among practitioners and little respect from the public (Cameron, Sallot, & Weaver-Lariscy, 1996; Van Ruler, 2005; Sallot, Cameron, & Weaver-Lariscy, 1997; Wylie, 1994). This study tries to find the reason for the low professionalism among public relations practitioners by specifically focusing on their perception of corporate social responsibility. This study will also help to reveal the public relations’ current level of professionalism and practitioners’ perceptions of corporate social responsibility.

Since the 1970s, Wright has focused his research on the professionalism, ethics, and social responsibility of practitioners in public relations. Wright (1976) theorized the positive relationship between the level of social responsibility of public relations and the role of public

relations in decision making. Wright (1979) tried to see the positive relationship between professionalism and social responsibility in public relations using quantitative methodology, although he found no specific relationship between professionalism and social responsibility. However, his study showed that many practitioners want to be more professional and socially responsible than they are in their present situations. There have been no other empirical studies tying professionalism and corporate social responsibility in public relations.

Even though the previous study showed no correlation between professionalism and social responsibility, the present study tries to reexamine the relationship between professionalism and social responsibility using different measures in a new millennium. Professionalism and social responsibility are closely associated, and there is enough potential for practitioners to improve their professionalism by playing an active role in making their corporations or organizations more socially responsible.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Drawing on the foundation from the literature review, the following research questions and hypotheses are offered. This study explores the relationship between practitioners' professionalism and their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility in public relations. This study attempts to find the positive relationship between practitioners' professionalism and their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility.

RQ1: Is there a relationship between practitioners' professionalism and their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility in public relations?

Hypothesis 1: Practitioners with a high level of professionalism will have attitudes of a high level of corporate social responsibility.

Hypothesis 2: Practitioners with a low level of professionalism will have attitudes of a low level of corporate social responsibility.

Hypothesis 3: Practitioners with high professionalism will have attitudes of higher levels of corporate social responsibility than those with low professionalism.

In addition, this research will explore the following research questions:

RQ2: What demographic characteristics are relevant to practitioners' high level of professionalism?

RQ3: What demographic characteristics are relevant to practitioners' positive attitudes towards corporate social responsibility?

This study will seek to answer these questions and test the hypotheses through a national survey of randomly selected public relations practitioners.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

For this study, an online survey was conducted. The population of this study was public relations practitioners across the country. Systematic random sampling was used to select 1,836 public relations practitioners from *The Blue Book*, which includes Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) members' contact address. For the systematic random sampling, every eighth practitioner in every chapter was selected. The sampling process was developed to select about 2,000 practitioners. However, because the population of this study is only the public relations practitioners, if the eighth member from each chapter was found out to be an educator, this case was deleted and the next eighth member was selected.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument is a 48-item, self-administered questionnaire containing primarily closed-ended questions. The survey instrument includes 20 items to measure professionalism, 14 items to measure social responsibility, 12 demographic items, and two open-ended questions. For the professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility measures, the response choices consist of modified Likert scales ranging from 1= "Strongly disagree" to 7= "Strongly agree." The 12 demographic questions are about the length of practitioners' public relations practice, the length of role and practice in their current organization, the title of their present

position, their organization’s revenue and size, the PR department’s size, their education degree and major, group affiliation, gender, and age, as well as two open-ended questions that allow respondents to express their opinions on PR’s role in their organization’s social responsibility and the survey.

Scales for Defining Professionalism

For this study the scale developed from Lages and Simkin (2003) was selected to assess professionalism because it is a holistic method of examining the core constructs of public relations at the practitioner, consultancy, and industry levels. Having practitioners evaluate professionalism only at the individual level can have limitations as a self-evaluated method. Ehling (1992) also argues that professionalism is not self-evident. This chosen “PR-ness” scale provides the objective criteria because it considers organizational and societal levels.

A total of 20 items is used to measure public relations practitioners’ professionalism. The items are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Items for Practitioners’ Professionalism

Question No.	Description
1	I set strategic goals often.
2	I set quantifiable objectives often.
3	I decide on communications policy often.
4	I consider myself a long time employee in my organization.
5	I have been in my current role for a long time.
6	My clients/company ask the agency/PR department to get involved in their strategic planning.
7	My clients/company ask for communications programs that go beyond media relations.
8	My company is considered a profit leader in our industry.
9	My company has a large executive staff.
10	I think that PRSA contributes to professionalism.
11	I think that PRSA has membership benefits.
12	I think that the public relations industry has a clear code of ethics.
13	I think that the public relations industry has clear standards of performance.
14	I evaluate PR graduates’ overall preparation as excellent.

15	I evaluate PR graduates' management skills as excellent.
16	I evaluate PR graduates' strategic thinking as excellent.
17	Formal qualifications should be compulsory to be a PR practitioner.
18	Academic training is important for PR practitioners.
19	I feel like I have to compete with the marketing agency/people.
20	I feel like I have to compete with the advertising agency/people.

This study uses measurement scales of “PR-ness” developed by Lages and Simkin (2003).

This “PR-ness” scale consists of nine measurement scales with constructs at different measurement levels: two constructs for the individual PR practitioner level, two constructs for the consultancy level, and five constructs for the industry level. The nine measurement scales are managerial public relations, permanence of job, strategic needs from clients, organization size, trade body contribution, industry standards, quality of PR graduates, importance of qualifications, and competition. At the individual PR practitioner level, Q1 through Q3 are the measures for managerial public relations, and Q4 and Q5 are measures for permanence of job. At the consultancy level, Q6 and Q7 are measures for strategic needs from clients, and Q8 and Q9 are measures for PR agency size. Finally, at the industry level, Q10 and Q11 are measures for trade body contribution, Q12 and Q13 are measures for industry standard, Q14 through Q16 are measures for quality of PR graduates, Q17 and Q18 are measures for importance of qualifications, and Q19 and Q20 are measures for competitions.

For this study, the measures from Lages and Simkin (2003) were modified as closed-ended declarative sentences. Originally, Lages and Simkin’s (2003) measures were expressed as phrases like “frequency setting strategic goals.” The original phrases were changed to close-ended declarative sentences such as, “I set strategic goals often.” The other items changed similarly. In both Q10 and Q11, “PRSA” was used as the representative of trade body in the U.S. considering the fact that the sample for this study is PRSA members. Therefore, “contribution of

the Institute of Public Relations (IPR) to professionalism” was modified to Q10 “I think that PRSA contributes to professionalism,” and “trade body membership benefits” was modified to Q11 “I think that PRSA has membership benefits.” The response choices consist of modified Likert scales, ranging from 1=“Strongly disagree” to 7=“Strongly agree.”

Scales for Defining Attitudes towards CSR

This study uses the corporate social responsibility (CSR) measures from Ryan (1986), which measured public relations practitioners’ views of corporate social responsibility. This measure was chosen for this study because this study attempts to find out the attitudes of public relations practitioners towards corporate social responsibility. A total of 14 items were used to measure the public relations practitioners’ attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. The items are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Items for Practitioners’ Attitudes towards CSR

Question No.	Description
1	Developing programs that are good for society is both good business and good citizenship.
2	The pursuit of social goals strengthens a corporation’s ability to earn a fair profit.
3	A corporation that is socially responsible over a long time period is more credible with the public than one that is not.
4	Corporate social responsibility must stem from a firm, deep-seated conviction of management that it is important for corporations to act in the public interest.
5	Management in an organization that wants to be socially responsible must act consistently in the public’s best interest, and not just when it is convenient to do so.
6	Management must act socially responsibly, regardless of how those actions influence profit.
7	It is all right for an individual to have one ethical standard in his or her private life and a different standard in business affairs.
8	Public relations practitioners should act as the consciences of the corporations for which they work.
9	Public relations practitioners should be deeply involved in helping management define a corporation’s social role.
10	Public relations practitioners must avoid putting corporate obedience ahead of personal conscience.

- 11 Public relations practitioners must work hard to insure that corporate secrecy is not used to hide corporate misconduct.
- 12 Corporations must try to calculate the social impacts of major decisions before implementing policies or taking actions.
- 13 A socially responsible public relations staff presents several sides of an issue and provides an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions when it disseminates information.
- 14 Presenting all sides of an issue and providing an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions is the job of the news media, not of public relations.
-

This study uses the social responsibility measures from Ryan (1986), who measured public relations practitioners' views of corporate social responsibility. This study used the same scales as Ryan's (1986) study. Q1 through Q3 are scales for answers to the research question, "Do public relations practitioners think corporations improve their ability to achieve their traditional goal (making a profit) by establishing a more contemporary goal (acting socially responsible)?" Q4 through Q7 are scales for answers to the research question, "Do public relations practitioners think it is important for social responsibility to stem from deep-seated convictions and for management to act consistently?" Finally, Q8 through Q14 are scales for answers to the research question, "Do public relations practitioners think they have an important role in ensuring that corporations are socially responsible?" The response choices consisted of modified Likert scales, ranging from 1= "Strongly disagree" to 7= "Strongly agree."

Procedure

Pilot Study

A pilot study is essential for designing an Internet questionnaire to find out whether what the researcher planned is what actually happened (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003). For this project a pilot study was conducted with local PR practitioners. Cover letter emails were sent to 13 practitioners, who were introduced by an acquaintance of the professor, on Feb. 6 and Feb. 13,

2006. Finally seven responses were collected. A pilot study showed no specific problems of questionnaire design, wording, or procedure.

Survey

Professional online survey software was used as this study's instrument. Cover letter emails for the population included the online survey address <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?A=111181554E11722>. The recipients had the choice to either refuse further invitation emails or to agree to participate in the survey. The consent form of the survey was presented on the first page of the survey.

A total of three cover letter emails were sent to the population within three weeks. The first cover letter email was sent to the total population of 1,836 practitioners on Feb. 20, 2006. After a week, the second cover letter email was sent out on Feb. 27, 2006, and the third cover letter was sent out on Mar. 6, 2006. The practitioners who declined to participate were excluded from receiving the second and third emails. Copies of the online survey, cover letter email, consent form, and two follow-up emails are included in the appendix.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

Response Rates

Of the total 1,836 addresses of the sample, 1,621 turned out to be possible respondents. Another 215 email addresses failed to reach respondents because of technical problems, dead email addresses, respondents' out of office reply, etc. For the first week, the total number of responses was 124. The total number was 107 for the second week and 82 for the third week. Finally, the total number of responses was 313. However, of the total 313 respondents, 289 respondents completed the survey while 24 left it partially completed. Therefore, the final number of respondents was 289, providing a response rate of 17.8% from an eligible sample of 1,621. Among the population, 123 practitioners declined to participate in the survey and 1,185 did not respond to the three invitation emails.

Description of Subjects

Descriptive analyses were conducted for the cross-sectional survey data to explore demographic profiles of the sample: the length of participants' public relations practice, the length of role and practice in their current organization, the title of their present position, their organization's revenue and size, the PR department's size, their education degree and major, group affiliation, gender, and age.

In general, according to the largest percentages of each item, the average survey respondent has a BA in journalism and mass communications, was a female director in the 30 to 39 age group, and has six to ten years of PR practice and one to two years practice in her current position and in her current corporation. The respondents typically worked for a corporation of fewer than 50 employees with annual revenues of less than \$1 million, and the size of the PR department was two to three PR practitioners.

Among the public relations practitioners who responded, 202 (69.9%) were female and 85 (29.4%) were male. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics issued in January 2005, <http://www.census.gov/prod/2005pubs/06statab/labor.pdf>, female public relations practitioners make up 61.1% of public relations practitioners, similar to the female ratio of the sample in this study. Eighty-one respondents (28.0%) were in the 30-39 age group, 69 (23.9%) were in the 40-49 age group, 60 (20.8%) were in the 50-59 age group, and 55 (19.0%) were in the 20-29 age group. Almost all of the practitioners were college graduates. One hundred eighty-one (62.6%) had bachelor's degrees, 97 (33.6%) had master's degrees, and four (1.4%) had doctoral degrees. Regarding major, there were 122 (42.2%) practitioners who majored in journalism and mass communications; 57 (19.7%) majored in public relations. Business majors accounted for 39 (13.5%) of the respondents and English majors accounted for 21 (7.3%). Other majors, such as speech communication, politics, and psychology, were identified by 49 (16.9%).

Table 3. Frequencies of Gender, Age, Highest Degree, and Major

		Frequency (%)
Gender	Female	202 (69.9%)
	Male	85 (29.4%)
Age	20-29	55 (19.0%)
	30-39	81 (28.0%)
	40-49	69 (23.9%)
	50-59	60 (20.8%)
	60-69	20 (6.9%)
	Over 70	3 (1.0%)
Highest degree	College graduate	181 (62.6%)
	Master's degree	97 (33.6%)
	Some college	5 (1.7%)
	Doctoral degree	4 (1.4%)
	High school graduate	1 (0.3%)
	Other	1 (0.3%)
Major	Journalism & Mass communications	122 (42.2%)
	Public relations	57 (19.7%)
	Business	39 (13.5%)
	English	21 (7.3%)
	Other	49 (16.9%)

Fifty-two (18.0%) have worked in public relations for six to ten years and 50 (17.3%) worked in the profession for three to five years. Forty-three (14.9%) have worked in public relations for 11 to 15 years. Regarding the length of practitioners' current role in their organizations, more than one third of practitioners ($n=115$ or 39.8%) have worked for one to two years. Another about one third of practitioners ($n=87$ or 30.1%) have worked for three to five years in the same position in their current organizations. Regarding the length of practice in their current organizations, about one third of the practitioners ($n=92$ or 31.8%) have worked for one to two years and 77 (26.6%) have worked for three to five years in their current organizations.

Table 4. Frequencies of the Length of PR Practice, and the Length of Role and Practice in a current organization

	The Length of Public Relations Practice	The Length of Current Role in Organization	The Length of Practice in a Current Organization
1-2 years	18 (6.2%)	115 (39.8%)	92 (31.8%)
3-5 years	50 (17.3%)	87 (30.1%)	77 (26.6%)
6-10 years	52 (18.0%)	43 (14.9%)	57 (19.7%)
11-15 years	43 (14.9%)	25 (8.7%)	22 (7.6%)
16-20 years	33 (11.4%)	9 (3.1%)	17 (5.9%)
21-25 years	33 (11.4%)	6 (2.1%)	14 (4.8%)
26-30 years	36 (12.5%)	1 (.3%)	8 (2.8%)
More than 30 years	23 (8.0%)		

Regarding the title, almost a quarter of the respondents were directors ($n=77$ or 26.6%). CEOs accounted for 38 (13.1%) and vice presidents for 35 (12.1%). Thirty-seven (12.8%) were managers; 32 (11.1%) were communication specialists. Public relations specialists accounted for 22 (7.6%). Regarding the organization type, 78 (27.0%) worked in a corporation and 64 (22.1%) worked in a public relations agency. Forty (13.8%) worked in a non-profit organization and 26 (9.0%) worked in government. Regarding the practitioners' organization's annual revenues, 47 (16.3%) responded that their organizations' revenues are under \$1 million and 42 (14.5%) responded more than \$1 billion. Thirty-three (11.4%) respondents' organizations' revenues were from \$1 million to \$5 million. However, 64 (22.1%) did not reply to this question item because of unwillingness to disclose their organizations' revenues or because they represented government agencies or non-profit organizations, which have no revenues.

Table 5. Frequencies of Title, Organization Type, and Annual Revenues of Organizations

	Frequency (%)
Title	
Director	77 (26.6%)
CEO/President/Owner	38 (13.1%)
Manager	37 (12.8%)
Vice President	35 (12.1%)
Communication Specialist	32 (11.1%)
Public Relations Specialist	22 (7.6%)
Account Executive	11 (3.8%)
Senior Account Executive	9 (3.1%)
Marketing Director	6 (2.1%)
Assistant Account Executive	4 (1.4%)
Other	20 (6.9%)
Organization Type	
Corporation	78 (27.0%)
Public Relations Agency	64 (22.1%)
Non-profit Organization	40 (13.8%)
Government	26 (9.0%)
Education-related Organization	22 (7.6%)
Health-related Organization	16 (5.5%)
Independent PR Consultant	14 (4.8%)
Other	28 (9.7%)
Annual Revenues	
Under 1 million	47 (16.3%)
1-5 million	33 (11.4%)
5-10 million	22 (7.6%)
10-50 million	27 (9.3%)
50-100 million	19 (6.6%)
100-500 million	23 (8.0%)
500-1 billion	12 (4.2%)
More than 1 billion	42 (14.5%)
Other	64 (22.1%)

About one third of the practitioners ($n=91$ or 31.5%) worked in organizations of under 50 employees and 51 (17.6%) worked in organizations of 1,000 to 5,000 employees. Thirty-three (11.4%) worked in organizations of 50 to 100 employees and 33 (11.4%) worked in organizations of 100-500 employees. Regarding practitioners' PR departments' size, almost a quarter of the practitioners ($n=65$ or 22.5%) worked in the PR department of two to three practitioners and 57 (19.7%) worked as a sole practitioner.

Table 6. Frequencies of Organization's and PR Department's Size

	Frequency (%)
Organization's Size	
Under 50	91 (31.5%)
50-100	33 (11.4%)
100-500	33 (11.4%)
500-1,000	20 (6.9%)
1,000-5,000	51 (17.6%)
5,000-10,000	15 (5.2%)
10,000-25,000	19 (6.6%)
25,000-50,000	7 (2.4%)
50,000-75,000	3 (1.0%)
75,000-100,000	2 (0.7%)
More than 100,000	11 (3.8%)
PR Department's Size	
1	57 (19.7%)
2-3	65 (22.5%)
4-5	39 (13.5%)
6-10	37 (12.8%)
11-20	29 (10.0%)
More than 20	35 (12.1%)

Comparing the Sample with the Public Relations Profession

According to the 2006 PR Week, the general demographic information of the current PR profession was obtained. The comparison between the general PR profession and the sample was made to check the validity of the sample in this study. As shown in Table 7, gender ratio of the sample was similar to PR profession with more female practitioners than male practitioners. Regarding the organization type, there were about 20% fewer PR practitioners from public relations agencies and 15% more PR practitioners from "other" classification fields in the sample of this study than the general PR profession. However, the distributions in corporation, government, non-profit, and independent PR consultant were similar with less than 6% difference in the most varied category. In comparison with the general PR profession, the distributions of the length of PR practice of the sample in this study were similar with less than

8% difference between categories. Generally, the sample in this study is shown having similar trend with the general PR profession as noted in PR Week.

Table 7. Comparison of PR Profession with the Sample

	PR Profession	The Sample
Gender		
	Male	29.4%
	Female	69.9%
Organization Type		
	Public Relations Agency	22.1%
	Corporation	27.0%
	Government	9.0%
	Non-profit Organization	13.8%
	Independent PR Consultant	4.8%
	Other	22.8%
The Length of PR Practice		
	1-2 years	6.2%
	3-5 years	17.3%
	6-10 years	18.0%
	11-15 years	14.9%
	16-20 years	11.4%
	More than 20 years	31.9%

Some Items Recoded for Proper Valence

The results of some items were recoded for proper valence, positive or negative. The results of items seven and 14 in the corporate social responsibility scale were recoded (i.e., 1=7, 2=6). This recoding helps statistical uniformity with other items in the corporate social responsibility scale.

Frequency Distribution of Professionalism and CSR Items

As shown in Table 8, the highest mean among professionalism measures was item seven ($M=6.04$, $SD=1.24$), the strategic needs beyond the media relations from clients, and the lowest mean was item 15 ($M=3.80$, $SD=1.08$), the evaluation of graduates' management skills. The

overall mean value for the 20 professionalism measures was average level ($M=4.93$, $SD=.79$).

The grand mean of practitioner level items, item one to five, was calculated as 5.31 and the grand mean of consultancy level items, item five to nine, was calculated as 4.99. The grand mean of industry level items, item 10 to 20, was calculated as 4.73. According to those results, public relations practitioners' identification of practitioner level items of professionalism was the highest among three dimensional items.

Table 8. Frequencies and Means for Professionalism Items

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. I set strategic goals often.	1	2	4	5	53	142	82	5.98	.93
2. I set quantifiable objectives often.	3	3	12	13	81	120	57	5.61	1.14
3. I decide on communications policy often.	3	10	12	26	63	109	65	5.51	1.33
4. I consider myself a long time employee in my organization.	12	42	21	41	32	54	87	4.90	1.95
5. I have been in my current role for a long time.	14	53	37	24	38	51	68	4.56	2.00
6. My clients/company ask the agency/PR department to get involved in their strategic planning.	4	11	13	19	68	96	74	5.53	1.39
7. My clients/company ask for communications programs that go beyond media relations.	3	5	9	11	32	100	127	6.04	1.24
8. My company is considered a profit leader in our industry.	33	20	15	89	26	50	53	4.46	1.91
9. My company has a large executive staff.	51	43	33	31	42	50	36	3.92	2.08
10. I think that PRSA contributes to professionalism.	2	2	5	21	58	105	90	5.85	1.12
11. I think that PRSA has membership benefits.	1	3	3	20	70	105	85	5.82	1.07
12. I think that the public relations industry has a clear code of ethics.	3	7	17	34	64	97	67	5.45	1.34
13. I think that the public relations industry has clear standards of performance.	9	19	34	52	77	73	24	4.68	1.50
14. I evaluate PR graduates' overall preparation as excellent.	5	9	50	132	59	28	2	4.13	1.05
15. I evaluate PR graduates' management skills as excellent.	6	27	64	129	40	19		3.80	1.08
16. I evaluate PR graduates' strategic	7	27	56	131	44	18	3	3.85	1.13

thinking as excellent.

17. Formal qualifications should be compulsory to be a PR practitioner.	8	19	41	47	92	57	25	4.62	1.47
18. Academic training is important for PR practitioners.	4	3	11	19	74	103	73	5.64	1.23
19. I feel like I have to compete with the marketing agency/people.	17	39	53	37	65	52	23	4.20	1.71
20. I feel like I have to compete with the advertising agency/people.	20	45	53	49	54	47	21	4.03	1.71

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Neutral, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly agree

As demonstrated in Table 9, the highest mean among corporate social responsibility (CSR) measures was item one ($M=6.39$, $SD=.70$), developing programs that are good for society is both good business and good citizenship, and the lowest mean was item 14 ($M=4.50$, $SD=1.96$), presenting all sides of an issue and providing an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions is not only the job of news media, but also public relations. The overall mean for the attitudes of corporate social responsibility was slightly positive ($M=5.76$, $SD=.55$). The grand mean of the importance of contemporary goals, item one to three, was calculated as 6.14 and the grand mean of the importance of deep-seated conviction, item four to seven, was calculated as 5.81. The grand mean of the realization of an important role, item eight to 14, was calculated as 5.58. Therefore, public relations practitioners' identification of the importance of contemporary goals was the highest among three categories in scales.

Table 9. Frequencies and Means for CSR Items

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Developing programs that are good for society is both good business and good citizenship.				5	22	117	145	6.39	.70
2. The pursuit of social goals strengthens a corporation's ability to earn a fair profit.	1	2	4	33	60	117	71	5.72	1.08
3. A corporation that is socially responsible over a long time period is more credible with the public than one that is not.	1	1	3	10	21	101	152	6.32	.93

4. Corporate social responsibility must stem from a firm, deep-seated conviction of management that it is important for corporations to act in the public interest.	1	2	2	8	31	115	130	6.22	.94
5. Management in an organization that wants to be socially responsible must act consistently in the public's best interest, and not just when it is convenient to do so.			3	13	14	106	152	6.36	.85
6. Management must act socially responsibly, regardless of how those actions influence profit.	4	6	15	21	65	102	74	5.57	1.33
7.* It is not all right for an individual to have one ethical standard in his or her private life and a different standard in business affairs.	8	23	29	33	58	62	75	5.07	1.72
8. Public relations practitioners should act as the consciences of the corporations for which they work.	7	5	11	9	77	106	64	5.52	1.32
9. Public relations practitioners should be deeply involved in helping management define a corporation's social role.	1		3	12	52	123	97	6.02	.93
10. Public relations practitioners must avoid putting corporate obedience ahead of personal conscience.	8	6	20	40	55	95	63	5.32	1.47
11. Public relations practitioners must work hard to insure that corporate secrecy is not used to hide corporate misconduct.	2	2	5	16	29	108	126	6.11	1.09
12. Corporations must try to calculate the social impacts of major decisions before implementing policies or taking actions.	1		2	13	51	128	93	6.02	.91
13. A socially responsible public relations staff presents several sides of an issue and provides an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions when it disseminates information.	3	12	17	27	43	105	79	5.54	1.44
14.* Presenting all sides of an issue and providing an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions is not only the job of the news media, but also public relations.	27	36	33	26	52	65	49	4.50	1.96

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Neutral, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly agree

* Items seven and 14 were restated for the proper valence with other items in this table.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient tables for professionalism and corporate social responsibility variables are included in appendix.

Verification of Items Expressed in Abstract Sentences

Items four, five, eight, and nine in the professionalism scale were expressed in abstract expressions, and checked with concrete answers in demographic questions with the correlation analysis. Because the demographic items were categorical variables, the mean value of each categorical variable was represented and used for analysis (e.g., 3-5 years=4 years). In the case of the first and last category variables, which have no mean values, the presented values were represented (e.g., under 50=50). The purpose of this analysis is not to find meaningful results but to verify whether the results are reliable.

Item four is “I consider myself a long time employee in my organization.” This item was examined with item two in the demographic questions, which asked how many years the practitioner had worked in the present organization. The correlation between two variables were $r=.60$ at the .01 level ($p=.00$). The second item, item five is “I have been in my current role for a long time.” This item was examined with item four in the demographic questions, which asked how many years the practitioner had the current position. The correlation between two variables was $r=.61$ at the .01 level ($p=.00$). The third item, item eight is “My company is considered a profit leader in our industry.” This item was examined with item five in the demographic questions, which asked what your organization’s annual revenues are. The correlation between two variables was $r=.29$ at the .01 level ($p=.00$). The final item, item nine is “My company has a large executive staff.” This item is examined with item six in the demographic questions, which asked how many employees there are in your organization. The correlation between two

variables was $r=.34$ at the .01 level ($p=.00$). While all four items showed a correlation significantly, the results showed that practitioners responded to the first two items which asked about individual practitioner's practice more reliably than the last two items which asked about their organizations' situation.

Results of Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was conducted to find out how many factors are found in professionalism and corporate social responsibility measures and to compare the result with the original studies, which this study derived measures from. In original studies, professionalism measures have nine dimensional measurement levels and corporate social responsibility measures have three dimensional measurement levels.

First of all, 20 professionalism items were analyzed using principal component factor analyses – eigenvalue and variance. These criteria indicate an eight-component solution explaining 76.9% of the total variance, is appropriate. The first eight eigenvalues were 3.3, 3.0, 2.0, 1.9, 1.5, 1.4, 1.2, and 1.1. Secondly, the first factor explained 16.3% of the variance, the second factor 15.0%, the third 10.0%, the fourth 9.3%, the fifth 7.6%, the sixth factor 7.0%, the seventh factor 6.1%, and the eighth factor 5.6%, for a total of 76.9% of variance explained. The first factor includes Q14 to Q16, the second factor includes Q10 to Q13, the third factor includes Q1 to Q3, the fourth factor includes Q19 to Q20, the fifth factor includes Q4 to Q5, the sixth factor includes Q6 to Q7, the seventh factor includes Q8 to Q9, and the eighth factor includes Q17 to Q18.

Table 10. Professionalism Dimensions (Varimax-rotated principal factor)

Item #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15. Evaluation of PR graduates' management skills	.918	.040	-.087	.033	-.025	-.017	.068	-.002
16. Evaluation of PR graduates' strategic thinking	.906	.021	-.003	.036	-.102	-.040	.007	-.018
14. Evaluation of PR graduates' overall preparation	.809	.224	-.035	.058	-.030	.016	.072	.040
10. Contribution of PRSA to professionalism	.019	.870	.050	.011	-.028	-.129	-.097	-.002
11. PRSA membership benefits	-.010	.865	.096	-.083	.017	-.101	-.052	.008
12. Existence of a clear code of ethics	.117	.695	-.069	.110	.044	.165	.112	.090
13. Existence of clear standards of performance	.378	.634	.040	.022	-.018	.173	.120	.159
1. Frequency setting strategic goals	-.076	-.015	.873	-.007	.031	.121	.054	.125
2. Frequency setting quantifiable objectives	-.015	.070	.873	.041	.032	.083	.009	.083
3. Frequency deciding on communication policy	-.035	.051	.598	-.101	.286	.223	.036	-.148
19. Competition from marketing people	.047	.061	-.020	.955	-.001	-.030	.023	.063
20. Competition from advertising people	.071	-.019	-.012	.955	.011	-.048	.078	.026
5. Years in current role	-.093	-.022	.109	.035	.934	.037	-.008	.041
4. Years in present organization	-.053	.037	.110	-.018	.932	.127	.022	.003
7. Clients' ask for communication beyond PR	-.021	.015	.112	-.037	.102	.875	.020	.020
6. Clients' ask for get involving in strategic planning	-.003	.002	.240	-.039	.063	.838	-.059	.054
9. Number of executive staff	.058	.090	-.120	.087	-.044	-.083	.853	-.021
8. Turnover of the company	.082	-.068	.223	.010	.063	.053	.831	-.007
17. Necessity of formal qualifications	.081	.108	.070	-.055	-.001	.038	.014	.841
18. Importance of academic training for PR	-.053	.045	.025	.138	.032	.026	-.039	.826
Eigenvalue	3.3	3.0	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.1
Variance	16.3%	15.0%	10.0%	9.3%	7.6%	7.0%	6.1%	5.6%

Item # explanations were abbreviated for a table.

Originally, Lages and Simkin's (2003) study, which developed the professionalism scale this study used, has nine factors: quality of PR graduates, trade body contribution, industry standard, managerial public relations, competition, permanence of job, strategic needs from clients, corporation size, and importance of qualifications. In comparison with the original study, this study found one dimensional difference. In Lages and Simkin's (2003) study, Q10 and Q11, the measures for trade body contribution, and Q12 and Q13, the measures for industry standard, were separated, though they were united as one factor in this study. Generally, the factor analysis found similar dimensions to the original study.

Second, 14 corporate social responsibility (CSR) items were analyzed using principal component factor analyses – eigenvalue and variance. These criteria indicate a four-component solution explaining 58.6% of the total variance, is appropriate. The first four eigenvalues were 4.2, 1.5, 1.2, and 1.2. Secondly, the first factor explained 30.3% of the variance, the second factor 10.7%, the third 8.8%, and the fourth 8.7 %, for a total of 58.6% of variance explained. As shown in Table 10, four factors were found; the first factor includes Q1 to Q6, the second factor includes Q8, Q9, Q11, and Q12, the third factor includes Q13 and Q14, and the fourth factor includes Q7 and Q10.

Table 11. CSR Dimensions (Varimax-rotated principal factor)

Item #	1	2	3	4
3. A corporation that is socially responsible over a long time period is more credible with the public than one that is not.	.802	.180	.021	-.009
2. The pursuit of social goals strengthens a corporation's ability to earn a fair profit.	.745	.183	.098	-.030
4. Corporate social responsibility must stem from a firm, deep-seated conviction of management that it is important for corporations to act in the public interest.	.724	.195	.181	.128
1. Developing programs that are good for society is both good business and good citizenship.	.688	.015	-.089	.082
5. Management in an organization that wants to be socially responsible must act consistently in the public's best interest, and not just when it is convenient to do so.	.665	.178	.075	.312
6. Management must act socially responsibly, regardless of how those actions influence profit.	.379	.244	.348	.332
8. Public relations practitioners should act as the consciences of the corporations for which they work.	-.010	.707	.064	-.108
9. Public relations practitioners should be deeply involved in helping management define a corporation's social role.	.297	.679	.008	.014
12. Corporations must try to calculate the social impacts of major decisions before implementing policies or taking actions.	.327	.569	.067	.122
11. Public relations practitioners must work hard to insure that corporate secrecy is not used to hide corporate misconduct.	.178	.569	.172	.327
13. A socially responsible public relations staff presents several sides of an issue and provides an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions when it disseminates information.	.095	.203	.844	-.066
14.* Presenting all sides of an issue and providing an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions is not only the job of the news media, but also public relations.	.006	-.040	.837	.083
7.* It is not all right for an individual to have one ethical standard in his or her private life and a different standard in business affairs.	.096	-.179	.050	.796
10. Public relations practitioners must avoid putting corporate obedience ahead of personal conscience.	.081	.409	-.054	.687
Eigenvalue	4.2	1.5	1.2	1.2
Variance	30.3%	10.7%	8.8%	8.7%

* Items seven and 14 were restated for the proper valence with other items in this table.

The original study, Ryan's (1986), defined three dimensions: Q1 to Q3, Q4 to Q7, and Q8 to Q14. However, this study found four different dimensions. In comparison with Ryan's (1986), Q1 to Q6 were found as one factor, Q7 and Q10 were united as one factor, and Q8 to Q14 were separated as two factors, Q8 to Q12 and Q13 to Q14. Therefore, this study found a new and slightly different dimension from the original study. Although item Q6 cross loaded among factors, it did not damage the integrity of the total CSR scale and was, therefore, included in subsequent analysis.

Construction of Measures

The reliabilities of the variables were tested as scales. Langdridge (2004) noted, "Cronbach's alpha coefficient is used to assess the internal reliability of items with scaled responses (e.g., strongly agree to strongly disagree)" (p. 77), and suggested .70 as an expected alpha score. Howitt and Cramer (2005) suggest .80 as satisfactory. However, John and Benet-Martinez (2000) note that "an alpha of .70 is not a benchmark every scale must pass" (p. 346) but rather a guide. They also mention that "alpha needs to be interpreted in terms of its two main parameters-interitem correlation as well as scale length- and in the context of how these two parameters fit the nature and definition of the construct to be measured" (p. 346). Alphas of .70 and above will be considered strong and alphas of .60 to .69 will be considered good in this study.

First, Cronbach's alpha for the 20 items of professionalism was .66 on the whole. The 20 items are divided into three groups: practitioner, consultancy, and industry level. The first grouping consisted of Q1 to Q5. The second grouping consisted of Q6 to Q9, and the third grouping consisted of Q10 to Q20. Cronbach's alpha was .70 for the first grouping, .44 for the second grouping, and .70 for the third grouping. Therefore, the reliabilities of the practitioner and

the industry levels were highly acceptable, whereas the reliability of the consultancy level was not. However, the scales of professionalism's reliability were generally acceptable in considering that the scales were multidimensional as practitioner, consultancy, and industry levels.

Second, Cronbach's alpha for the 14 items for measuring the attitudes towards corporate social responsibility was .76. The 14 items are divided into three groups: importance of contemporary goals, importance of deep-seated conviction, and realization of an important role. The first grouping consisted of Q1 to Q3. The second grouping consisted of Q4 to Q7, and the third grouping consisted of Q8 to Q14. Cronbach's alpha was .72 for the first grouping, .56 for the second, and .61 for the third. Therefore, the importance of contemporary goals' reliability was highly acceptable, whereas the realization of an important role's reliability was moderately acceptable. The importance of deep-seated conviction's reliability was not acceptable. Generally, the scales of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility were highly acceptable.

The Relationship between Professionalism and Attitudes towards CSR

In order to examine the association between professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility (CSR), three statistical analyses, a simple regression analysis, a univariate analysis of variance, and a crosstab analysis were conducted using SPSS.

First of all, a simple regression analysis was conducted between mean value of professionalism and mean value of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. Before conducting an analysis, the mean values of both professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility were calculated for every response.

Table 12. The Regression Analysis for Professionalism Predicting Attitudes towards CSR

	B	SE B	B
Professionalism	.304	.065	.265*

*. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in Table 12, a positive correlation between mean values of professionalism and mean values of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility was found significantly at the .01 level ($r=.265, p=.00$). However, the R squared was .07 which means that the level of professionalism explains only a small proportion of the variance (7%) in attitudes of the level of corporate social responsibility. Therefore, the result did not show a strong correlation between the two variables.

For theoretical purposes, it was necessary to figure out the level of professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. This study tries to examine how the orientation of professionalism is related to the orientation of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. Using categorical variables, a univariate analysis of variance and a cross tabulation analysis were conducted.

Therefore, each respondent was placed into one of three groups based on his or her mean value of professionalism. The mean values of professionalism ranged from 3.20 to 6.15. According to the criteria of these values, the total respondents were divided into the following three groups of professionalism: the first group from 3.20 through 4.70 ($n=97$ or 33.6%), the second group from 4.71 through 5.15 ($n=91$ or 31.5%) and the third group from 5.16 through 6.15 ($n=101$ or 34.9%). Similarly, each respondent was also placed into one of three groups based on his or her mean value of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. The mean values of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility were from 3.00 through 7.00. The first group was from 3.00 through 5.57 ($n=97$ or 33.6%). The second group was from 5.64 through 6.00 ($n=90$ or 31.1%), and the third from 6.07 through 7.00 ($n=102$ or 35.3%). It was impossible to divide each of the three groups by 33.3% because several numbers of same mean values were in the boundary.

Secondly, a univariate analysis of variance was used to look for relationships how different levels of professionalism affect practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. This analysis found significant differences in evaluating practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility by different level of professionalism groups at the .01 level ($F(2, 286) = 9.980, p = .00$). R squared was .065. The low level of professionalism has an attitude of low level of corporate social responsibility ($M=5.55$), the medium level of professionalism has an attitude of medium level of corporate social responsibility ($M=5.82$), and the high level of professionalism has an attitude of high level of corporate social responsibility ($M=5.92$).

Table 13. Professionalism Levels and CSR Difference

Professionalism level	<i>M</i>	SE B	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower bound	Upper bound
Low level	5.55 ($n=97$)	.060	5.434	5.672
Medium level	5.82 ($n=91$)	.062	5.694	5.940
High level	5.92 ($n=101$)	.059	5.804	6.037

A post-hoc analysis was also carried out to find out which pairs of groups are significantly different (Barnes & Lewin, 2005) and Scheffe test was used in this study. The result showed that the mean value of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility were significantly different within low and medium level of professionalism at the .05 level ($p=.010$) and low and high level of professionalism at the .01 level ($p=.00$). However, the difference between medium and high level of professionalism was not significant ($p=.485$).

Thirdly, the proportion of respondents at three levels of professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility, low, medium, and high level, were shown using cross tabulation in Table 14. The result was significant at the .01 level ($\chi^2=14.24, df=4, p=.007$).

Table 14 shows that high professionalism is statistically significant in its explanation of

the attitudes of high level of corporate social responsibility by showing that 45.5% among the high professionalism group are included in the high corporate social responsibility group. It also demonstrates that low professionalism explains the attitudes of low level of corporate social responsibility by showing that 44.3% among the low professionalism group are included in the low corporate social responsibility group.

Table 14. Proportion of Respondents at Three Levels of Professionalism and Attitudes towards CSR

		Professionalism			Total
		Low level	Medium level	High level	
Attitudes towards Corporate Social Responsibility	Low level	43 (14.9%)	28 (9.7%)	26 (9.0%)	97 (33.6%)
	Within professionalism	44.3%	30.8%	25.7%	
	Medium level	33 (11.4%)	28 (9.7%)	29 (10.0%)	90 (31.1%)
	Within professionalism	34.0%	30.8%	28.7%	
	High level	21 (7.3%)	35 (12.1%)	46 (15.9%)	102 (35.3%)
	Within professionalism	21.6%	38.5%	45.5%	
Total		97 (33.6%)	91(31.5%)	101 (34.9%)	289 (100.0%)

$$\chi^2 (4, N=289) = 14.24, p=.007$$

Duration of Practice Affects Professionalism

This study found the significant relationship between three duration variables, the length of practitioners' public relations practice, the length of practice in their current organization, and the length of current role in an organization, and practitioners' professionalism using a univariate analysis of variance.

First of all, the length of practice in public relations showed the significant difference in professionalism at the .05 level ($F(3, 284) = 2.664, p=.048$). For this analysis, the variables of

the length of practice in a current organization were recoded as four categorical variables according to the possible equal percentages of each variable. As shown in Table 15, generally the longer the duration, the larger the mean values of professionalism. R squared was .027. However, in a post hoc analysis, no significant differences within different levels were found.

Table 15. Duration of Practice in Public Relations and Professionalism Difference

The length of practice in public relations	<i>M</i>	SE B	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower bound	Upper bound
1-5 years	4.87 (<i>n</i> =68)	.064	4.742	4.996
6-15 years	4.85 (<i>n</i> =95)	.055	4.747	4.962
16-25 years	4.97 (<i>n</i> =66)	.065	4.838	5.095
More than 25 years	5.08 (<i>n</i> =59)	.069	4.946	5.219

Secondly, the length of practice in their current organization showed the difference in professionalism at the .01 level ($F(3, 283) = 4.563, p=.004$). For this analysis, the variables of the length of practice in a current organization were recoded as four categorical variables according to the possible equal percentages of each variable. As shown in Table 16, the longer the duration, the larger the mean values of professionalism. R squared was .046. However, a post-hoc analysis showed that the first level, the shortest duration, and the fourth level, the longest duration, only showed a significant difference at the .01 level ($p=.008$).

Table 16. Duration at Present Organization and Professionalism Difference

The length of practices in a present organization	<i>M</i>	SE B	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower bound	Upper bound
1-2 years	4.79 (<i>n</i> =92)	.055	4.685	4.901
3-5 years	4.92 (<i>n</i> =77)	.060	4.798	5.033
6-10 years	5.02 (<i>n</i> =57)	.069	4.878	5.152
More than 10 years	5.09 (<i>n</i> =61)	.067	4.961	5.225

Thirdly, the duration of a current role showed the difference in practitioners' professionalism at the .01 level ($F(2, 283) = 5.744, p=.004$). R squared was .039. Duration level was recoded as three categorical variables for possible equal percentages of each variable. As

shown in Table 17, the longer the duration, the larger the mean values of professionalism. A post hoc analysis revealed that the difference between the shortest duration level and the longest duration level showed the significant difference at the .01 level ($p=.004$).

Table 17. Duration of Current Role and Professionalism Difference

The length of a current role	<i>M</i>	SE B	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower bound	Upper bound
1-2 years	4.82 ($n=115$)	.049	4.720	4.913
3-5 years	4.96 ($n=87$)	.056	4.846	5.068
More than 5 years	5.07 ($n=84$)	.057	4.957	5.183

All three duration variables showed the significant differences in professionalism. However, all three R squared values were not very strong, however, the length of practice in their current organization showed the largest variance among three variables.

PR Departments' Size Affects Professionalism

The PR departments' size affects practitioners' professionalism level at the .05 level ($F(3, 258) = 3.682, p=.013$). PR departments' size was recoded as four categorical variables for possible equal percentages of each variable. R squared was .041. A Scheffe test showed that the mean difference of professionalism between one practitioner and more than 11 practitioners size's department was significant at the .05 level ($p=.032$) while other mean differences were not significant. As shown in Table 18, the larger PR departments, the higher PR department's practitioners' professionalism.

Table 18. PR Departments' Size and Professionalism Difference

PR departments' size	<i>M</i>	SE B	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower bound	Upper bound
1 practitioner	4.84 ($n=57$)	.070	4.700	4.974
2-3 practitioners	4.88 ($n=65$)	.065	4.745	5.002
4-10 practitioners	4.93 ($n=76$)	.060	4.807	5.044
More than 10 practitioners	5.12 ($n=64$)	.066	4.994	5.252

Gender Affects Practitioners' Attitudes towards CSR

A univariate analysis of variance was conducted to see the relationship between gender and practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility (CSR). Gender was added to the univariate analysis of variance of professionalism levels and mean values of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. R squared was .101, and gender and professionalism explain 10.1% of practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility significantly. In this analysis, different levels of professionalism affect practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility significantly at the .01 level ($F(2, 281) = 9.650, p=.00$). Gender affects practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility significantly at the .01 level ($F(1, 281) = 7.471, p=.007$). However, interaction effects between gender and three levels of professionalism was not significant ($F(2, 281) = .913, p=.402$). As shown in Table 19, female practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility ($M=5.83$) was higher than male practitioners ($M=5.62$).

Table 19. Gender and CSR Difference

Gender	<i>M</i>	SE B	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower bound	Upper bound
Male	5.62 ($n=85$)	.064	5.489	5.742
Female	5.83 ($n=202$)	.041	5.743	5.907

Age Affects Practitioners' Attitudes towards CSR

A univariate analysis of variance was conducted to see the relationship between age and corporate social responsibility. Age values were divided into four categorical variables according to each category's possible equal percentage. R squared was .114, and age and professionalism explains 11.4% of practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility significantly. Three levels of professionalism affect the practitioner's attitudes towards corporate social

responsibility significantly at the .01 level ($F(2, 276) = 9.918, p=.00$). Age affects practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility significantly at the .05 level ($F(3, 276) = 2.676, p=.048$). As shown in Table 20, the first level age group's attitudes towards corporate social responsibility ($M=5.81$) were higher than the second ($M=5.63$) and the third level age group ($M=5.74$). The fourth level age group showed the highest values ($M=5.88$) among four groups. However, there were no significant interaction effects between professionalism and age ($F(6, 276) = 1.092, p=.367$). A post-hoc analysis, Scheffé test, showed that there is a significant difference between the second and the fourth level of age at the .05 level ($p=.023$), and other levels' differences were not significant.

Table 20. Age and CSR Difference

Age	<i>M</i>	SE B	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower bound	Upper bound
20-29	5.81 (<i>n</i> =55)	.079	5.649	5.962
30-39	5.63 (<i>n</i> =81)	.066	5.495	5.755
40-49	5.74 (<i>n</i> =69)	.071	5.600	5.880
More than 49	5.88 (<i>n</i> =83)	.066	5.752	6.012

In summary, this study shows that the current practitioners' professionalism falls in mid-range and their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility are slightly positive. One of the most important findings is the positive correlation between practitioners' professionalism and their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility; the higher the professionalism, the higher the CSR rating. Additionally, permanence of job and PR departments' size affect practitioners' professionalism positively; the longer the practitioner is in his/her job and the larger the practitioners' department, the higher practitioners' professionalism. Gender and age affect practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility; women and practitioners on both ends of the age spectrum have higher CSR scores.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

This study's purpose was to better understand the perceptions of public relations practitioners in regard to their professionalism and corporate social responsibility. While public relations academia has emphasized the implications of both concepts as an abstract idea, empirical studies have failed to show a significant correlation between professionalism and corporate social responsibility. In this vein, this study attempted to be the cornerstone of public relations ethics.

Results of Hypotheses Testing

Results of hypotheses testing were follows:

RQ1 asked if there is a relationship between practitioners' professionalism and their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility in public relations. The result showed that there is a significant relationship between practitioners' professionalism and their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. This confirms the fundamental assumptions of this research. However, the correlation is not very strong between professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. Langdrige (2004) noted, "A small or moderate correlation coefficient may well be significant (especially with large sample sizes) but only explain a tiny amount of the variance" (p. 202).

H1 stated that practitioners with a high level of professionalism will have attitudes of a high level of corporate social responsibility. The result significantly showed that the largest number of practitioners in the high professionalism category ranked in the highest level of corporate social responsibility. Almost half the practitioners (45.5%) within the high professionalism group have attitudes of high level of corporate social responsibility. Hypothesis 1 was supported.

H 2 stated that practitioners with a low level of professionalism will have attitudes of a low level of corporate social responsibility. The result demonstrated that the largest number of practitioners in the low professionalism category ranked in the lowest level of corporate social responsibility. Almost half the practitioners (44.3%) within the low professionalism group have attitudes of low level of corporate social responsibility. Hypothesis 2 was supported.

H 3 stated that practitioners with high professionalism will have attitudes of higher levels of corporate social responsibility than those with low professionalism. Based on the supported hypotheses H1 and H2, H3 was supported accordingly. The fact that almost half the practitioners (45.5%) within the high professionalism group have attitudes of high level of corporate social responsibility and almost half the practitioners (44.3%) within the low professionalism group have attitudes of low level of corporate social responsibility group supports H3. A univariate analysis of variance also revealed that the mean value of attitudes towards corporate social responsibility were significantly different within low and medium level of professionalism and low and high level of professionalism. Therefore, it means that high professionalism can explain a serious consideration of corporate social responsibility in public relations. Hypothesis 3 was supported.

This study found a positive correlation between practitioners' professionalism and their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility empirically. The supported hypotheses H1, H2, and H3 show the previous research's contention, that high professionalism is linked to emphasis on the public relations' role for society (Bivins, 1993; Boynton, 2002; Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Wilcox, Cameron, Ault, & Agee, 2003). Even though the correlation between professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility failed to explain a large portion of the variance, this study has shown significant implications in that it explains the variables as categorical variables. High professionalism was linked to attitudes of high level of corporate social responsibility significantly. The reason for the small portion of the variance may be that there are a number of factors to explain practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility other than professionalism. For example, this study found a larger R-squared when an age factor was added to the model of professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility than the model without an age factor.

Wright's (1979) study failed to show any correlation between professionalism and corporate social responsibility in public relations by using quantitative methodology with public relations practitioners. However, this study showed the meaningful and significant results, that professionalism and corporate social responsibility are in the same context in some degree. Therefore, the result shows that there is a possibility to improve public relations' low standards of professionalism by emphasizing the role of PR for social responsibility. When more public relations practitioners value their role in corporate social responsibility, their professionalism will be improved and public relations will also be more valued by society.

RQ2 asked what demographic characteristics are relevant to practitioners' high level of professionalism. Among a number of demographic profiles, three duration variables, the length

of practitioners' public relations practice, the length of practice in their current organization, and the length of current role in an organization, and the PR departments' size correlated with their professionalism.

First of all, there were differences depending on the length of practice in terms of professionalism. The longer practitioners practice in public relations fields, practice at their current organization, and practice their current role, the higher their professionalism. However, all three variables' correlation was weak. Among three variables, the length of practice in their current organization showed the largest variance, and seems the most explanatory cause. There were not many past studies that pointed out the importance of duration of a PR job. Lages and Simkin (2003) included 'permanence of job' in one of public relations practitioners' professionalism factors. Berger and Heyman (2005) mentioned 'hanging on to practitioner's job' as one of a number of descriptive characteristics by executives to define success in public relations. On the other hand, they also suggested that diverse experiences are more important than years of experience as one of ten patterns in PR practitioners' success. Therefore, Berger and Heyman's (2005) study emphasized on keeping the current job in some degree while having varied experience. In conclusion, this study's finding also stresses the permanence of job for public relations practitioners' professionalism in some degree.

Secondly, the PR departments' size affects practitioners' professionalism. Though the correlation was not very strong, the finding shows that the larger the PR departments' size, the higher practitioners' professionalism. It is interesting to compare the result that organizations' size does not affect practitioners' professionalism while PR departments' size does affect it. Public relations' past studies rarely focused on PR departments' size. However, Grunig (2000) noted collaboration as professional values, "Public relations professionals can be the voice of

collectivism and collaboration in organizations that typically are obsessed with individualism and competition” (p.39). Choi (2005) stressed the importance of perceiving practitioners’ role within the context of broader social practices rather than practical techniques. Those studies emphasized importance of practitioners’ collaborative perception for their professionalism. The finding from this study also linked to those past studies because practitioners’ larger PR departments’ environment definitely needs more collaboration or consideration for others in everyday life than a sole practitioner, therefore it is more likely for a practitioner to develop their professionalism. However, this study also found that more than a half of current practitioners who responded work in a PR department of one to five practitioners, and about one-fifth of practitioners work as a sole practitioner in current real world. Therefore, current situation is not a good condition to develop practitioners’ professionalism in terms of the PR departments’ size.

RQ3 asked what demographic characteristics are relevant to practitioners’ positive attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. Among a number of demographic profiles, gender and age affected significantly practitioners’ attitudes towards corporate social responsibility.

First, there were significant differences between male and female public relations practitioners in terms of the attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. Female practitioners showed more positive attitudes towards corporate social responsibility than male practitioners. Gender factors with professionalism explain 10.1 % of practitioners’ attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. This finding logically links to past studies that have revealed female practitioners are more concerned about ethical and social responsibility issues than male practitioners in public relations. Pratt (1991) found that female PRSA members’ beliefs were significantly more ethical than those of male counterparts. Weaver-Lariscy,

Cameron, and Sweep (1994) found that female public relations practitioners are more likely to be the conscience of the organization than male practitioners. Grunig, Toth, and Hon (2000) understood altruism and morality as feminist values. This study also mentioned, “At least one study of public relations students suggests ethical differences based on respondents’ gender. Wakefield (1993) found that 12 times as many female as male students recognized an overriding responsibility to society as a whole” (p. 59).

Secondly, age affects practitioners’ attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. Generally, older practitioners showed attitudes of high level of corporate social responsibility than younger practitioners. However, the finding of this study specifically suggests that practitioners older than 50s have more positive attitudes towards than those in 30s. Regarding ethics there have been many studies which have revealed the effects of demographic profiles of public relations practitioners on ethical judgment. Martinson (1995) directly linked ethical public relations to emphasis on public interest, which may be understood as corporate social responsibility in this study. Many studies contended that age has a progressive effect on ethical values among public relations practitioners (Berger & Reber, 2006; Kim & Choi, 2003; Pratt, 1991; Wright, 1985). In the main, the findings of this study also support those studies’ results, though specifically suggests that current practitioners older than 50s have more positive attitudes towards corporate social responsibility than those in 30s.

Practitioners’ Professional Status

The practitioners did not strongly agree on most professionalism items and the overall professionalism in this study was ranked as average. Therefore, it revealed that practitioners’ professionalism is not very high. The finding from this study supports a number of past studies,

which revealed the public relations' low standards of professionalism (Cameron, Sallot, & Weaver-Lariscy, 1996; Van Ruler, 2005; Sallot, Cameron, & Weaver-Lariscy, 1997; Wylie, 1994).

The practitioners agreed most strongly with the statement that "My clients or companies ask for communications programs that go beyond media relations." This item had the highest mean value on the professionalism scale in this study. Because public relations is often seen as publicity and public relations practitioners as spin doctors or deceivers (Baker & Martinson, 2002; Jo, 2003), the result from this study is good news for public relations' improving professionalism because actual public relations practice is not limited to media relations even though PR has been commonly regarded as image makers using media by the public.

However, practitioners disagreed most strongly with the statement that "I evaluate PR graduates' management skills as excellent." In the open-ended questions, a few practitioners showed strong dissatisfaction with PR graduates, noting "Most recent PR graduates I come in contact with seem to lack critical thinking skills and an understanding of how business must operate. Thus it is hard for them to play a meaningful role in social responsibility of any other aspect of a corporation," and "Colleges are doing a poor job of preparing graduates. It seems that students find themselves majoring in PR when they don't know what to do. Counselors need to give better direction." Neither PR graduates' management skills nor PR graduates' strategic thinking and overall preparation were evaluated as excellent. These reactions are consistent with the results from Van Ruler (2005). She contended that there is no agreement between scholars and practitioners on what is needed to become a professional in public relations. On the other hand, the practitioners agreed moderately on the emphasis of academic training for PR practitioners. Those results suggest that PR practitioners regard academic training in public

relations as important; however, they believe the current PR graduates are not well prepared for real world. In this study, the kind of skills or knowledge expected of PR graduates was not explicitly examined, but PR practitioners' dissatisfaction with current PR graduates was examined. The responses from practitioners suggest they might be expecting too much for new graduates. Currently, most PR practitioners expect for new employees to begin in jobs that require tactical skills more than strategic knowledge, but they express a desire for strategic thinking. Such knowledge is advanced by professional experience more than class room or book learning. It seems that an agreement or a moderator is needed between academia and the real world in the public relations field.

Practitioners' Attitudes towards CSR

Based on the scales from Ryan (1986), the overall practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility (CSR) in this study were estimated as slightly positive. It means that the practitioners showed weak, though positive, agreements with most items. Comparatively, their attitudes towards corporate social responsibility are more positive than their professionalism. This finding is in the same context with Kruckeberg and Starck's (1988) criticism of public relations practitioners' ignorance of their roles for the society and Ryan's (1986) finding that a substantial minority of practitioners are ignorant of social responsibility.

The practitioners agreed most strongly with the statement that "Developing programs that are good for society is both good business and good citizenship," so this item had the highest mean value on the corporate social responsibility scale in this study. In Ryan's (1986) study, this item was the best among 14 items, and the finding from this study also shows a duplicative result. This finding mirrors those of past studies, which understood corporate social responsibility as a

good citizenship for a society (Kelly, 2001; Wartick & Cochran, 1985) and as a good marketing tool for a good business (Heath, 1997; Maignan & Ferrell, 2001). This result showed empirically that public relations practitioners value their role for society highly and also understand that programs that are beneficial to society will also make a profit for the business ultimately.

However, practitioners disagreed most strongly with the statement that “Presenting all sides of an issue and providing an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions is not only the job of news media, but also public relations.” This result implies that public relations practitioners understand their role significantly as advocating for their clients. It is also related to public relations practitioners’ confusion regarding their roles for clients and for the public or society. However, ideally PRSA (2000b) demonstrated that “We serve the public interest by acting as responsible advocates for those we represent” and “We provide objective counsel to those we represent” (p. 7) in the PRSA member statement of professional values. From the focus group findings at the 1999 PRSA national conference, Fitzpatrick (2002b) demonstrated that “Advocating for a particular issue or product rather than dispensing information” (p. 116) is a corruption of communication channels. Those PRSA statements emphasize providing objective advice to the clients while at the same time serving the public. Nevertheless, in reality PRSA (1989) reported misleading press release, dissemination of misleading information, misrepresentation of facts, and issuance of false news release as some of the sample cases of historical complaints in public relations. Edelman (1992) noted that public relations practitioners struggled with the public and the media. The finding from this study also supports that public relations practitioners face a dilemma in devoting themselves to their clients while also serving the public.

Importance of Top Managers' Role

In two open-ended questions, public relations practitioners with emphasis on corporate social responsibility expressed the importance of top managers' role in executing corporate social responsibility programs in reality. A practitioner mentioned the plain fact, "If the executives/bosses say no regarding the corporate social responsibility, the answer is no. PR people are not the ones who can drive corporate social responsibility, the executives are." Another practitioner said, "If an organization's top management insists in not acting in a socially responsible manner, the PR practitioner must decide whether to abandon their ethics and bend to unscrupulous management, or to leave the organization." Bivins (1993) noted that individual practitioners do not have the formal doctrine of public service in public relations. White and Dozier (1992) argued that the senior public relations practitioners must be in the dominant coalition as a high level of decision making to make public relations excellent. Therefore, in order to show public relations' role for social responsibility in the real world, top managements' sense of social responsibility is more important than individual practitioners' perception of social responsibility.

Validity/Limitations of This Study

There are a number of possible limitations to this study. In terms of the sample, there are limitations on the sample selection from the particular listings because the population was chosen from the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA). Members of PRSA do not represent all public relations practitioners, so it is hard to generalize the results from this study to all practitioners. For example, the items Q10 and Q11 in professionalism scales are measures for trade body contribution, and this study used PRSA as an example of the trade body of public

relations. Considering the fact that the sample of this study is drawn from PRSA, the result may be biased. However, generally samples from PRSA give reliable information about public relations practitioners. Many past studies have used samples drawn from the PRSA (e.g., Aldoory & Toth, 2004; Austin, Pinkleton, & Dixon, 2000; Choi & Hon, 2002; Kelleher, 2001; Serini, Toth, Wright, & Emig, 1998; Werder, 2005).

There is also an inherent difficulty in examining professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility only by quantitative methods because these are very subjective topics difficult to measure only by survey. Therefore, qualitative research such as long interviews, case studies, and focus group interviews would strengthen the results. However, there were two open-ended questions in the survey. The answers to the open-ended questions helped to understand the practitioners' more in-depth thoughts about professionalism and corporate social responsibility. A respondent who answered "Little to none" for the question about public relations' role in their organization's social responsibility was in the low level of corporate social responsibility group. The female practitioner who said, "As an agency, every communications plan we develop for a client has a social responsibility component. Social responsibility is also a key factor into the agency's overall success" was in both high professionalism and high corporate social responsibility group. Also valuable responses such as comments on the importance of the role top managements' plays in corporate social responsibility and poor evaluation of PR graduates provided information about the plain reality and enriched this study.

More Research Is Needed

This study provides many future research possibilities and suggestions on professionalism and corporate social responsibility in public relations. First, more in-depth

studies about the relationship between professionalism and corporate social responsibility in public relations are needed. Even though this study found a correlation between the two variables, the correlation coefficients were not strong. Therefore, future research may focus on the relationship between particular characteristics of professionalism and particular characteristics of corporate social responsibility. Secondly, this study examined the practitioners' professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility in the U.S. Therefore, practitioners in other countries should be examined to find out their professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. A cross-cultural study will reveal the effects of the society and the culture on the practitioners' professionalism and attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. Thirdly, generalized survey items might elicit a different response than specific situations. Scenario surveys may provide more realistic situations for practitioners to respond to and, on-the-job observation or an evaluation of documented occurrences of questionable behavior may reveal practitioners' reality more accurately. Fourthly, one of the main topics of this study was practitioners' attitudes towards corporate social responsibility. It is substantive to look into practitioners' perception about corporate social responsibility. However, it would be more practical to look into public relations practitioners' involvement with corporate social responsibility programs in the real world. Therefore, further research is needed to find out what kinds of corporate social responsibility programs practitioners execute.

This study sheds light on public relations ethics by revealing empirically one of the most often emphasized concepts in public relations, public relations' significant responsibility to society as an important value of professionalism.

REFERENCES

- Aldoory, L., & Toth, E. (2004). Leadership and gender in public relations: Perceived effectiveness of transformational and transactional leadership styles. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 16*(2), 157-183.
- Austin, E. W., Pinkleton, B. E., & Dixon, A. (2000). Barriers to public relations program research. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 12*(3), 235-253.
- Baker, S., & Martinson, D. L. (2002). Out of the red-light district: Five principles for ethically proactive public relations. *Public Relations Quarterly, 47*(3), 15-19.
- Barnes, S., & Lewin, C. (2005). An introduction to inferential statistics: Testing for differences and relationships. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin (Eds.), *Research methods in the social sciences* (pp. 226-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Berger, B., & Heyman, W. (2005). *You can't homogenize success in PR: Top PR executives reveal 10 patterns in success*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, New York, NY.
- Berger, B., & Reber, B. (2006). *Gaining influence in public relations: The role of resistance in practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bivins, T. H. (1992). A systems model for ethical decision-making in public relations. *Public Relations Review, 18*(4), 365-383.
- Bivins, T. H. (1993). Public relations, professionalism, and the public interest. *Journal of Business Ethics, 12*, 117-126.
- Bowen, S. A. (2005). A practical model for ethical decision making in issues management and public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*(3), 191-216.
- Boynton, L. A. (2002). Professionalism and social responsibility: Foundations of public relations ethics. *Communication Yearbook, 26*, 230-265.
- Brown, T. J., & Dacin, P. A. (1997). The company and the product: Corporate associations and consumer product responses. *Journal of Marketing, 61*, 68-84.
- Buchholz, R. A. (1982). *Business environment and public policy: Implications for management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Burson, H. (1974). The public relations function in the socially responsible corporation. In M. Ashen (Ed.). *Managing the socially responsible corporation* (pp. 224, 227). NY: Macmillan.

- Cameron, G. T., Sallot, L. M., & Weaver-Lariscy, R. A. (1996). Developing standards of professional performance in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 22(1), 43-61.
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497-505.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991, July-August). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39-48.
- Choi, H. (2005). *An alternative view of public relations ethics: Taking a critical perspective*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, New York, NY.
- Choi, Y., & Hon, L. C. (2002). The influence of gender composition in powerful positions on public relations practitioners' gender-related perceptions. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 14(3), 229-263.
- Chrisman, J. J., & Carroll, A. B. (1984). SMR forum: Corporate responsibility-reconciling economic and social goals. *Sloan Management Review*, 25(4), 59-65.
- Clark, C. E. (2000). Differences between public relations and corporate social responsibility: An analysis. *Public Relations Review*, 26(3), 363-380.
- Cutlip, S. M., Center, A. H., & Broom, G. M. (1985). *Effective public relations* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cutlip, S. M., Center, A. H., & Broom, G. M. (1994). *Effective public relations* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- David, P. (2004). Extending symmetry: Toward a convergence of professionalism, practice, and pragmatics in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 16(2), 185-211.
- David, P., Kline, S., & Dai, Y. (2005). Corporate social responsibility practices, corporate identity, and purchase intention: A dual-process model. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17(3), 291-313.
- Daugherty, E. L. (2001). Public relations and social responsibility. In Robert L. Heath(Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp.389-401). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dennis, L. B. (1981 & 1982). The promises, promises era is turning. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 26(4), 13-17.
- 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.
- Drumwright, M. D. (1994). Socially responsible organizational buying: Environmental concern as a noneconomic buying criterion. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 1-19.

- Edelman, D. J. (1992, November). Ethical behavior is key to field's future. *Public Relations Journal*, 48, 31-32.
- Ehling, W. P. (1992). Public relations education and professionalism. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 439-464). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Esrock, S. L., & Leichty, G. B. (1998). Social responsibility and corporate Web pages: Self-presentation or agenda-setting? *Public Relations Review*, 24(3), 305-319.
- Fitzpatrick, K., & Gauthier, C. (2001). Toward a professional responsibility theory of public relations ethics. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 16(2&3), 193-212.
- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2002a). Evolving standards in public relations: A historical examination of PRSA's Codes of Ethics. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 17(2), 89-110.
- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2002b). From enforcement to education: The development of PRSA's member code of ethics 2000. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 17(2), 111-135.
- Galitzine, Y. (1960). The philosophy of public relations. *Public Relations*, 12(4), 49-55.
- Griswold, G. (1967). How AT&T public relations policies developed. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 12, 7-16.
- Grunig, J. E. (2000). Collectivism, collaboration, and societal corporatism as core professional values in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 12, 23-48.
- Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. New York: Hilt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (2002). *Excellent public relations and effectiveness organizations: A study of communication management in three countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Grunig, L. A., Toth, E. L., & Hon, L. C. (2000). Feminist values in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 12(1), 49-68.
- Hainsworth, B. E. (1993). Commentary: Professionalism in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 19(4), 311-313.
- Heath, R. L. (1997). *Strategic issues management: Organizations and public policy challenges*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heath, R. L., & Ryan, M. (1989). Public relations' role in defining corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 4(1), 21-38.

- Hill, L. N., & White, C. (2000). Public relations practitioners' perception of the World Wide Web as a communications tool. *Public Relations Review*, 26, 31-51.
- Howitt, D., & Cramer, D. (2005). *Introduction to research methods in psychology*. Harlow, England: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Jo, S. (2003). The portrayal of public relations in the news media. *Mass Communication & Society*, 6(4), 397-411.
- John, O. P., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Measurement: Reliability, construct, validation, and scale construction. In H. T. Reis, & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology* (pp. 339-369). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Judd, L. R. (1989). Credibility, public relations and social responsibility. *Public Relations Review*, 15(2), 34-40.
- Kelleher, T. (2001). Public relations roles and media choice. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13(4), 303-320.
- Kelly, K. S. (2001). Stewardship: The fifth step in the public relations process. In Robert L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp.279-289). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kim, Y., & Choi, Y. (2003). Ethical standards appear to change with age and ideology: A survey of practitioners. *Public Relations Review*, 29(1), 79-89.
- Korn/Ferry salary survey. (2006, February 20). *PR Week*, p. 16-22.
- Kruckeberg, D. (1998). The future of PR education: Some recommendations. *Public Relations Review*, 24(2), 235-248.
- Kruckeberg, D., & Starck, K. (1988). *Public relations and community: A reconstructed theory*. NY: Praeger.
- Lages, C., & Simkin, L. (2003). The dynamics of public relations: Key constructs and the drive for professionalism at the practitioner, consultancy and industry levels. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(1/2), 298-328.
- Langdridge, D. (2004). *Introduction to research methods and data analysis in psychology*. Harlow, England: Pearson Prentice Hall
- Maignan, I., & Ferrell, O. C. (2001). Corporate citizenship as a marketing instrument: Concepts, evidence and research directions. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(3/4), 457-484.
- Martinson, D. L. (1995). Ethical public relations practitioners must not ignore "public interest." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 10(4), 210-222.

- Menon, A., & Menon, A. (1997). Enviropreneurial marketing strategy: The emergence of corporate environmentalism as marketing strategy. *Journal of Marketing*, 61, 51-67.
- Mogel, L. (2002). *Making it in public relations. An insider's guide to career opportunities*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Olasky, M. N. (1985 & 1986). Ministers or panderers: Issues raised by the public relations society code of standards. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 1(1), 43-49.
- Pieczka, M., & L'Etang, J. (2001). Public relations and question of professionalism. In Robert L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp.223-236). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pratt, C. B. (1991). PRSA members' perceptions of public relations ethics. *Public Relations Review*, 17(2), 145-159.
- PRSA offers new section: Strategic social responsibility. (2003, March). *Public Relations Tactics*. 8-8.
- Public Relations Society of America. (1989). *Grievance Board research report*. NY: Author.
- Public Relations Society of America. (2000a). *A student's guide to public relations education*. FL: Author.
- Public Relations Society of America. (2000b). *PRSA member code of ethics 2000*. NY: Author.
- Reder, A. (1995). The wide world of corporate philanthropy. *Business and Society Review*, 92, 36-42.
- Ryan, M. (1986). Public relations practitioners' views of corporate social responsibility. *Journalism Quarterly*, 63(4), 740-762.
- Sallot, L. M., Cameron, G. T., & Weaver-Lariscy, R. A. (1997). Professional standards in public relations: A survey of educators. *Public Relations Review*, 23, 197-216.
- Sallot, L. M., Cameron, G. T., & Weaver-Lariscy, R. A. (1998). Pluralistic ignorance and professional standards: Underestimating professionalism of our peers in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 24, 1-19.
- Serini, S. A., Toth, E. L., Wright, D. K., & Emig, A. (1998). Power, gender, and public relations: Sexual harassment as a threat to the Practice. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 10(3), 193-218.
- Sharpe, M. (1986). Recognition comes from consistently high standards. *Public Relations Review*, 7(4), 17-25.

- Stone, J. D. (2005). Public relations and public responsibility. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 50(1), 31-34.
- Thomas, A. S., & Simerly, R. L. (1994). The chief executive officer and corporate social performance: An interdisciplinary examination. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13, 959-968.
- Tilson, D. J., & Vance, D. (1985). Corporate philanthropy comes of age. *Public Relations Review*, 11(2), 26-33.
- Van Ruler, B. (2005). Commentary: Professionals are from Venus, scholars are from Mars. *Public Relations Review*, 31(2), 159-173.
- Wakefield, G. (1993, April). Trouble, trouble, trouble... . *PR Update*, 4-4.
- Wartick, S. L., & Cochran, P. L. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 758-769.
- Weaver-Lariscy, R. A, Cameron, G. T., & Sweep, D. D. (1994). Women in higher education public relations: An inkling of change? *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 6(2), 125-140.
- Werder, K. P. (2005). An empirical analysis of the influence of perceived attributes of publics on public relations strategy use and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17(3), 217-266.
- Werther Jr., W. B., & Chandler, D. (2005). Strategic corporate social responsibility as global brand insurance. *Business Horizons*, 48, 317-324.
- White, J., & Dozier, D. M. (1992). Public relations and management decision making. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 91-108). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wilcox, D. L., Cameron, G. T., Ault, P. H., & Agee, W. K. (2003). *Public relations strategies and tactics*. Boston, MA: Allyn And Bacon.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2003). *Mass media research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Wood, D. J. (1991). Toward improving corporate social performance. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 66-73.
- Wright, D. K. (1976). Social responsibility in public relations: A multi-step theory. *Public Relations Review*, 2, 33-35.
- Wright, D. K. (1979). Professionalism and social responsibility in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 5(3), 20-33.

Wright, D. K. (1981). Accreditation's effects on professionalism. *Public Relations Review*, 7(1), 48-61.

Wright, D. K. (1985, Spring). Age and the moral values of practitioners. *Public Relations Review*, 11, 51-60.

Wright, D. K. (1989). Ethics research in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 15(2), 3-5.

Wylie, F. (1994). Commentary: Public relations is not yet a profession. *Public Relations Review*, 20, 1-3.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey instrument is on the following six pages. Because the actual survey was an online survey design, it is not possible to recreate the survey as it was presented to practitioners. The original survey was ten pages including the first consent form page and the last expressing thank you page. There were one page for twenty items of measuring the professionalism, one page for fourteen items of measuring social responsibility, five pages for 12 items of demographic questions, and one page for two open-ended questions.

1. Direction: In this section, we ask you about your practice of public relations. Twenty statements are listed below. Please identify your level of agreement or disagreement with the statement.

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Neutral, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly agree

1	I set strategic goals often.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2	I set quantifiable objectives often.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3	I decide on communications policy often.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4	I consider myself a long time employee in my organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5	I have been in my current role for a long time.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6	My clients/company ask the agency/PR department to get involved in their strategic planning.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7	My clients/company ask for communications programs that go beyond media relations.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8	My company is considered a profit leader in our industry.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9	My company has a large executive staff.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10	I think that PRSA contributes to professionalism.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11	I think that PRSA has membership benefits.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12	I think that the public relations industry has a clear code of ethics.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13	I think that the public relations industry has clear standards of performance.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14	I evaluate PR graduates' overall preparation as excellent.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15	I evaluate PR graduates' management skills as excellent.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16	I evaluate PR graduates' strategic thinking as excellent.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17	Formal qualifications should be compulsory to be a PR practitioner.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18	Academic training is important for PR practitioners.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19	I feel like I have to compete with the marketing agency/people.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20	I feel like I have to compete with the advertising agency/people.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
----	---	---------------

2. Direction: In this section, we ask you about your views towards social responsibility. Fourteen statements are listed below. Please identify your level of agreement or disagreement with the statement.

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Neutral, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly agree

1	Developing programs that are good for society is both good business and good citizenship.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2	The pursuit of social goals strengthens a corporation's ability to earn a fair profit.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3	A corporation that is socially responsible over a long time period is more credible with the public than one that is not.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4	Corporate social responsibility must stem from a firm, deep-seated conviction of management that it is important for corporations to act in the public interest.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5	Management in an organization that wants to be socially responsible must act consistently in the public's best interest, and not just when it is convenient to do so.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6	Management must act socially responsibly, regardless of how those actions influence profit.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7	It is all right for an individual to have one ethical standard in his or her private life and a different standard in business affairs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8	Public relations practitioners should act as the consciences of the corporations for which they work.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9	Public relations practitioners should be deeply involved in helping management define a corporation's social role.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10	Public relations practitioners must avoid putting corporate obedience ahead of personal conscience.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11	Public relations practitioners must work hard to insure that corporate secrecy is not used to hide corporate misconduct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12	Corporations must try to calculate the social impacts of major decisions before implementing policies or taking actions.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13	A socially responsible public relations staff presents several sides of an issue and provides an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions when it disseminates information.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14	Presenting all sides of an issue and providing an objective appraisal of conflicting opinions is the job of the news media, not of public relations.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
----	--	---------------

Demographic Information

1. How many years of full-time experience do you have in the practice of public relations?

- 1-2 years _____
- 3-5 years _____
- 6-10 years _____
- 11-15 years _____
- 16-20 years _____
- 21-25 years _____
- 26-30 years _____
- more than 30 years _____

2. How many years have you worked in your present organization?

- 1-2 years _____
- 3-5 years _____
- 6-10 years _____
- 11-15 years _____
- 16-20 years _____
- 21-25 years _____
- 26-30 years _____
- more than 30 years _____

3. Which title best describes your present full-time position?

- CEO/president/Owner _____
- Vice President _____
- Senior Account Executive _____
- Account Executive _____
- Assistant Account Executive _____
- Director _____
- Manager _____
- Public Relations Specialist _____
- Communication Specialist _____
- Other (Please, specify) _____

4. How many years have you been in your current position?

- 1-2 years _____
- 3-5 years _____
- 6-10 years _____
- 11-15 years _____
- 16-20 years _____
- 21-25 years _____
- 26-30 years _____
- more than 30 years _____

5. What are your organization's revenues? (dollars)

- under 1 million _____
- 1-5 million _____
- 5-10 million _____
- 10-50 million _____
- 50-100 million _____
- 100-500 million _____
- 500-1 billion _____
- more than 1 billion _____
- Other (Please, specify) _____

6. How many employees are there in your organization?

- under 50 _____
- 50-100 _____
- 100-500 _____
- 500-1,000 _____
- 1,000-5,000 _____
- 5,000-10,000 _____
- 10,000-25,000 _____
- 25,000-50,000 _____
- 50,000-75,000 _____
- 75,000-100,000 _____
- more than 100,000 _____
- Other (Please, specify) _____

7. How many employees are there in your PR department (Please, specify)? _____

8. Which is the highest degree you earned?

- Some High School _____
- High School Graduate _____
- Some College _____
- College Graduate _____
- Master's Degree _____
- Doctorate Degree _____
- Other (Please, specify) _____

9. What did you study as your highest degree?

- Journalism & Mass Communications _____
- Advertising _____
- Speech Communication _____
- Other (Please, specify) _____
- Public Relations _____
- English _____
- Business _____

10. Which best describes the organization with which you are employed on a full-time basis?

- Corporation _____
- Government _____
- Education-related organization _____
- Trade Association _____
- Other (Please, specify) _____
- Public Relations Agency _____
- Non-profit Organization _____
- Health-related organization _____
- Independent PR Consultant _____

11. What is your sex? Male _____ Female _____

12. How old are you?

- under 20 _____
- 20-29 _____
- 30-39 _____
- 40-49 _____
- 50-59 _____
- 60-69 _____
- over 70 _____

13. What role do you believe PR plays in your organization's social responsibility?

14. If you have additional comments or thoughts on the subject of public relations and social responsibility, please include them.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration!!

It is only with your generous help that this research can be successful.

APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM

Dear public relations professional:

You are invited to participate in a research study titled “Practitioners’ Professionalism and Attitudes towards Corporate Social Responsibility in public relations” which is being conducted by Sooyeon Kim, a master student of the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Georgia, moon1020@uga.edu. This study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Bryan Reber, University of Georgia, Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication, 706-542-3178, reber@uga.edu.

The goal of this research is to understand the relationship between professionalism of practitioners and the attitudes towards social responsibility in public relations. You will not directly benefit from this research; your participation, however, may contribute to the advancement of knowledge regarding public relations industry.

If you should choose to participate in this study, your participation will involve the following:

- Completing an online survey that includes your PR practice and basic demographic questions. Please note that you may consider some of these terms offensive and may, therefore, wish to choose not to participate in this research.

Completion of the survey is expected to take about 10 to 15 minutes. Please note that Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. However, once the completed survey is received by the researcher standard confidentiality procedures will be employed. The data resulting from this study will be kept indefinitely in secure office storage for purposes of data analysis. If you are not comfortable with the level of confidentiality provided by the Internet, please feel free to print out a copy of the survey, fill it out by hand, and mail it to me at the address given below, with no return address on the envelope.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate and can withdraw from participation at any time without penalty, or skip any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. Closing the survey window will erase your answers without submitting them. Additionally, you will be given a choice of submitting or discarding your responses at the end of the survey.

If you have any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, please contact

Sooyeon Kim
Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-3018
moon1020@uga.edu

Research at the University of Georgia that involves human participants is overseen by the Institutional Review Board. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to the IRB chairperson in the Human Subjects Office at the University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411. Telephone: (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address: IRB@uga.edu

By completing the survey you are agreeing to participate in the research. Please begin the survey now by clicking on the "Go to survey" button below.

APPENDIX C

E-MAIL COVER LETTER

Date: Mon, 20 Feb 2006 07:51:07 -0800
From: Sooyeon Kim <moon1020@uga.edu>
To: moon1020@uga.edu
Subject: A graduate student needs your help!

Dear public relations professional,

Would you please help a graduate student in need of information?
It is only with your generous help that this research can be successful.

You are invited to participate in a research study titled "Practitioners' Professionalism and Attitudes towards Corporate Social Responsibility in public relations" which is being conducted by Sooyeon Kim, a master student of the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Georgia, moon1020@uga.edu. This study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Bryan Reber, University of Georgia, Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication, 706-542-3178, reber@uga.edu.

The survey is part of my master's thesis research at the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Georgia. As part of my research, I am examining the relationship between professionalism of practitioners and the attitudes towards social responsibility in public relations.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you should choose to participate in this study, your participation will involve the following:
Completing an online survey that includes your PR practice and basic demographic questions. Please note that you may consider some of these terms offensive and may, therefore, wish to choose not to participate in this research.

Completion of the survey is expected to take about 10 to 15 minutes.

By completing the survey you are agreeing to participate in the research. Please begin the survey now by clicking on the [SurveyLink] button.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
[RemoveLink].

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

If you have any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, please contact

Sooyeon Kim
Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-3018
moon1020@uga.edu

Please Note: Research at the University of Georgia that involves human participants is overseen by the Institutional Review Board. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to the IRB chairperson in the Human Subjects Office at the University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411. Telephone: (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address: IRB@uga.edu

APPENDIX D

E-MAIL FIRST FOLLOW UP

Date: Mon, 27 Feb 2006 06:10:37 -0800
From: Sooyeon Kim <moon1020@uga.edu>
To: moon1020@uga.edu
Subject: A graduate student needs your help!

Dear public relations professional,

Would you please help a graduate student in need of information?

You should have received an online survey invitation email a week ago. I asked you to take a few minutes of your time to complete the survey, and I haven't heard from you. Your help is crucial in completion of my thesis. It is only with your help that this research will be successful. I would greatly appreciate your help with my research by completing the survey.

By completing the survey you are agreeing to participate in the research. Please begin the survey now by clicking on the [SurveyLink] button.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
[RemoveLink].

If you have any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, please contact

Sooyeon Kim
Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
moon1020@uga.edu

APPENDIX E

E-MAIL SECOND FOLLOW UP

Date: Mon, 6 Mar 2006 09:13:41 -0500
From: Sooyeon Kim <moon1020@uga.edu>
To: moon1020@uga.edu
Subject: A graduate student's last favor to ask you

Dear public relations professional,

Would you please help a graduate student in need of information?

You should have received an online survey invitation email twice. I asked you to take a few minutes of your time to complete the survey, and I haven't heard from you. Your help is crucial in completion of my thesis. It is only with your help that this research will be successful. I would greatly appreciate your help with my research by completing the survey.

This is my last invitation email for you. I would greatly appreciate your help with my research by completing the survey by March 10th (this Friday). The survey will be closed on March 11th.

By completing the survey you are agreeing to participate in the research. Please begin the survey now by clicking on the [SurveyLink] button.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
[RemoveLink].

If you have any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, please contact

Sooyeon Kim
Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
moon1020@uga.edu

APPENDIX F
PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS TABLE FOR PROFESSIONALISM VARIABLES

Item #	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	.634**	.424**	.139*	.149*	.315**	.232**	.192**	-.035	-.039	-.004	-.015	.056	-.041	-.135*	-.099	.109	.098	-.026	-.013
2		.299**	.157**	.132*	.229**	.220**	.131*	-.011	-.002	.064	.092	.156**	.011	-.056	-.057	.125*	.050	.015	-.005
3			.288**	.254**	.282**	.217**	.170**	-.077	.025	.060	.020	.055	-.069	-.095	-.011	-.049	.003	-.084	-.100
4				.815**	.169**	.182**	.058	-.036	.009	.059	.098	.037	-.074	-.045	-.136*	.017	.019	-.048	-.019
5					.097	.134*	.034	-.052	.014	.039	-.016	-.067	-.071	-.092	-.151*	.039	.053	.032	.019
6						.618**	.084	-.131*	-.036	-.009	.023	.049	.003	-.027	-.044	.082	.086	-.049	-.041
7							.092	-.052	-.056	-.027	.076	.097	.038	-.032	-.097	.069	.054	-.033	-.061*
8								.453**	-.110	-.062	.008	.079	.119*	.137*	.057	-.006	.017	.038	.101
9									.029	.041	.120*	.126*	.130*	.141*	.091	-.007	-.035	.097	.119*
10										.820**	.346**	.349**	.171**	.084	.051	.127*	.068	.064	-.001
11											.333**	.339**	.164**	.055	.044	.137*	.066	-.044	-.081
12												.611**	.234**	.127*	.073	.110	.119*	.123*	.064
13													.376**	.322**	.280**	.193**	.138*	.077	.011
14														.684**	.609**	.074	.082	.111	.090
15															.761**	.072	-.023	.075	.100
16																.081	-.041	.107	.133*
17																	.437**	.048	.018
18																		.191**	.154**
19																			.862**

N = 289

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX G

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS TABLE

FOR CSR VARIABLES

Item #	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	.491**	.410**	.336**	.360**	.147*	.151*	.053	.261**	.159**	.188**	.277**	.053	.057
2		.528**	.456**	.363**	.288**	.060	.130*	.302**	.171**	.317**	.346**	.204**	.080
3			.604**	.502**	.334**	.080	.134*	.371**	.162**	.262**	.312**	.128*	.050
4				.579**	.396**	.146*	.223**	.268**	.203**	.319**	.305**	.255**	.098
5					.516**	.164**	.160**	.297**	.310**	.232**	.326**	.145*	.053
6						.108	.109	.279**	.298**	.304**	.259**	.331**	.145*
7							-.042	.023	.248**	.144*	.055	-.041	.157**
8								.323**	.162**	.239**	.209**	.165**	.064
9									.236**	.350**	.423**	.143*	.088
10										.338**	.274**	.082	.002
11											.355**	.236**	.134*
12												.214**	.094
13													.495**

N = 289

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).