AUTHOR: David W. Guth
TITLE: Organizational Crisis Experience and Public Relations Roles
SOURCE: *Public Relations Review* v21 p123-36 Summer '95

ABSTRACT In theory a function of management, the practice of public relations assumes various roles in different organizations, ranging from technician to manager. Crises present organizations with significant financial, social and ethical challenges. This article suggests a relationship between organizational crisis experience and the placement of the public relations function. A relationship between organizational size and crisis experience is noted. It also uncovers an alarming absence of crisis planning and training in organizations. David W. Guth is an assistant professor at the William Allen White School of Journalism and Mass Communications at the University of Kansas.

Your organization is on the hot seat. Someone has screwed up and the whole world knows it.

The public wants to see heads roll. The district attorney is on the telephone and an angry delegation of investors is in your waiting room. To make matters worse, reporters are digging around in the hope of unearthing the one piece of dirt that will transform a page 14 story into a seven-part award-winning series.

You are in trouble. You need help. What is your next move?

Many organizations are prepared to respond to this all-too-familiar scenario. They have committed the time, energy and resources to develop a crisis communications plan to guide them through hazardous waters. Unfortunately, many other organizations founder on the brink of disaster because they didn't have the foresight to anticipate their worst nightmares.

"If economics is the dismal science," disaster recovery consultant Kenneth Myers writes, "then contingency planning is the abysmal science. No one likes to look into the abyss."(FN1) But like it or not, this planning has become an imperative in the 1990s for big and small organizations, alike. "Any small business owner who doesn't have a crisis management plan is derelict in his duties," says Martin Cooper of Cooper Communications in Encino, Calif.(FN2) As academicians Donald Chisholm and Martin Landau have pointedly noted, "When people believe that because nothing has gone wrong, nothing will go wrong, they court disaster. There is noise in every system and in every design. If this fact is ignored, nature soon reminds us of our folly."(FN3)

At the vortex of this "abysmal science" are public relations practitioners. For the purpose of this discussion, the author defines public relations as a planned management

function that fosters two-way communications between an organization and the publics important to its success. It is also a discipline based in the social sciences and grounded in a strict code of ethics.

As will be discussed in some detail, there is noteworthy research in defining public relations roles. Some researchers define these roles based upon an analysis of practitioner relationships within the organizational management structure (Cutlip, Center & Broom), while others define these roles based upon an analysis of practitioner roles as communicators (Grunig & Hunt). Others, such as Acharya and Schneider, have focused upon the environment in which these practitioners must operate. Still others, such as Benn and Noguera, have written about the misplacement of the public relations function within organizations. These analyses beg the question, what, if any, if any relationship is there between these roles and the environment? It was upon this theoretical basis, as well as the author's professional background in crisis communications, that led to the hypotheses for this research. It is hypothesized that the greater level of experience an organization has with crises, the more likely it is that the public relations function will adopt the attributes of management. Conversely, it is hypothesized that in those organizations less experienced in crises, the more likely it is that the public relations function takes on a technical role.

The research design offers an opportunity to explore the role organization size plays in crises. Although all organizations face potential danger, are larger organizations more vulnerable? Intuition tells us that this is the case. However, can that be quantified? Thus it is hypothesized that larger organizations tend to be more crisis-prone than smaller organizations. In that regard, this study serves as a baseline study that is descriptive of the environment in which practitioners operate within organizations of different sizes and/or missions. The research design also presents the opportunity to gauge the current level of crisis communications preparedness and determine which crises are most prevalent.

These are issues that are significant to the continuing development of the public relations profession. There are also significant financial, emotional and ethical considerations.

CRISES DEFINED

In everyday parlance, the use of the term "crisis" has, in many respects, been subject to the same level of ambiguity as the term "art." While one person's trash may be viewed as another person's treasure, one person's incident is often viewed as another's crisis.

Fortunately, a consensus is emerging among those that study and practice crisis communications as to a specific definition. Ole R. Holsti has defined crises as situations "characterized by surprise, high threat to important values, and a short decision time."(FN4) A similar view is held by Thierry C. Pauchant and Ian I. Mitroff, who write that a crisis is "a disruption that physically affects a system as a whole and threatens its

basic assumptions, its subjective sense of self, its existential core."(FN5) They describe three existential effects of a crisis as threatening the legitimacy of an industry, reversing the strategic mission of an organization and disturbing the way people see the world and themselves.(FN6) Steven Fink characterizes crises as being prodromal (forewarning) situations that run the risk of escalating in intensity, falling under close media or government scrutiny, interfering with normal operations, jeopardizing organizational image and damaging a company's bottom line.(FN7) Laurence Barton refines the terminology even farther, writing, "A crisis is a major, unpredictable event that has potentially negative results. The event and its aftermath may significantly damage an organization and its employees, products, services, financial condition, and reputation."(FN8)

Also emerging is consensus on a model of crisis dynamics. Although there is variety in the terminology employed to describe the various phases of a crisis, there is general agreement upon its structure. Fink writes that a crisis can consist of as many as four distinct phases: the prodromal crisis (warning) stage, the acute crisis stage (the point of no return is reached, some damage is done), the chronic crisis stage (the clean-up phase), and the crisis resolution stage (where things return to normal).(FN9) Myers describes what he calls "a Disaster Life Cycle" as normal operations (the period before a disaster occurs), emergency response (the period immediately following a disaster), interim processing (a period in which temporary measures are taken to support essential functions), and restoration (when operations return to normal).(FN10) Gerald C. Meyers, who upon his retirement as chief executive officer of American Motors Corp. went on to teach a course called "Crisis Management and Leadership in Business" at Carnegie-Mellon's Graduate School of Industrial Administration, evokes a similar, but somewhat broader model. He lists the stages of "an unmanaged crisis" as the pre-crisis period (characterized by nonperformance, denial/recrimination, anger and fear), the crisis period (failure, followed by panic and collapse), and the postcrisis period (shock, uncertainty and radical change).(FN11)

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND ITS ROLES DEFINED

This consensus does not appear to extend to the practice of public relations. Even the very name is open to wide interpretation. Pioneer educator Rex Harlow uncovered approximately 500 different definitions of public relations from nearly as many sources.(FN12) Dutch practitioner Frans Voorhoeve, in a survey of accounting, legal and public relations consultants, expresses concern at this ambiguity. He notes that although the practitioners in the three disciplines have similar relationships with their clients, the role of the public relations consultant was least understood. "They are our own colleagues," Voorhoeve wrote. "But with our own colleagues we do not have a clear cut image."(FN13)

A four-pronged model of public relations roles has been developed by Scott M. Cutlip, Allen H. Center, and Glen M. Broom: the expert-prescriber (the definer of problems and implementor of solutions), the communications technician (non-manager concerned with preparation of communications), the communications facilitator (a mediator concerned with maintaining two-way communication), and the problem-solving process facilitator (collaborator with other managers in defining and solving problems).(FN14)

James E. Grunig and Todd T. Hunt used a different approach in identifying four public relations role models. They are the press agentry/publicity model, where the practitioner is a propagandist; the public information model, where there is a one-way flow of information from an organization to its publics; the two-way asymmetric model, two-way communication with an emphasis on persuasion; and the two-way symmetric model, where the practitioner serves as a mediator between the organization and its publics. Grunig and Hunt cite survey research they say suggests "a contingency view of management" that makes the placement of public relations a function of the organization and its environment.(FN15)

It is this "contingency view of management" that often places practitioners at odds with top management. A survey conducted by researchers at Bowling Green University used the Grunig-Hunt public relations models to study this phenomenon. While more than two-thirds of the responding practitioners said they prefer a two-way symmetric definition of their role within their organization, less than one-third said their top managers would support that point of view. Conversely, while only 11.3 percent defined their function along the lines of the press agentry/publicity model, almost three times as many, 29.3 percent, said they felt that was top management's view of their role within the organization.(FN16)

This perceptual gap between management and practitioners concerning the role of public relations has ethical ramifications. In one study, 96 percent of the responding practitioners said they either "strongly disagree" or "disagree" with the notion that the public interest is what management says it is. Researchers Michael Ryan and David L. Martinson write, "Practitioners typically are not satisfied with acting as management representatives (or as mere technicians), implementing policies decided by others. They want to be involved in the making of those decisions, and evidence from this study indicates that practitioners think the public interest must be considered when those decisions are made."(FN17) While most respondents to an August 1989 Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) leadership survey said they were optimistic about the prospects of practitioners advancing to the highest levels of management during the 1990's, some indicated that "the field will not be a good point of entry for top management."(FN18)

James E. Arnold writes practitioners must "think like a chief executive and speak the language of management" if they are to get a foot into the board room. Among the steps Arnold says practitioners should take to gain credibility with top management are the development of a strategic communications plan and to assure that communications are paramount in any crisis context.(FN19)

Several writers argue that the misplacement of the public relations function within an organization undermines its ability to achieve its strategic goals. According to Alec Benn, the organization of corporate communications functions by techniques rather than by audience and purpose is a common mistake. Benn asserts that a task-oriented technician cannot address organizational goals as well as the policy-oriented manager.(FN20) Communications Professor A. Noguera states the incorrect utilization of public relations as a non-management function requires an evaluation "of what degree the social function of public relations is being disturbed by an incorrect utilization."(FN21)

ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES

Public relations plays a critical role during times of crisis. Mayer Nudell and Norman Antokol, veterans of the U.S. Foreign Service, advocate a managerial role for practitioners. They write, "Communications are an essential part of crisis management ... a specialist in the technical side of communications should be part of a Crisis Action Team in all three phases of an emergency: planning, response and recovery."(FN22) Robert F. Littlejohn, who has experience in both the academic and emergency management communities, advocates the inclusion of a good communicator on a crisis management team, saying that strong communication skills are an essential quality of the team leader.(FN23)

Lalit Acharya has focused upon the decision making environment in which practitioners must operate. In doing so, he used the Cutlip-Center-Broom public relations models. He identified four environmental types: simple-static (factors important to the decision-making process are relatively few and stable), complex-static (factors numerous but stable), simple-dynamic (few factors, but in a state of change), and complex-dynamic (many factors in a state of change). Acharya hypothesized that communication-technician behavior is most likely to occur in a simple-static environment, expert-prescriber behavior in a complex-static environment, communication facilitator behavior in an simple-dynamic environment, and problem-solving process facilitator behavior in a complex-dynamic environment.(FN24)

Organizational size also appears to influence the role the public relations function plays within an organization. Using organizational typologies based upon size and complexity of organizations, Larissa A. Schneider concluded that the size and influence of the public relations function increases as organizations evolve from smaller and simpler structures to those that are larger and more complex.(FN25) If one logically

assumes that increasing size and complexity bring an organization an increasing number of crises or threats, then Schneider's research lends support to Archarya's hypothesis.

METHODOLOGY

One purpose of the research was to measure the role organizational crisis experienced had upon the managerial level of the public relations practitioner. Another was to measure the relationship between organizational size and crisis experience. The third major goal of the research was to gauge the level of crisis communications preparedness within organizations with differing missions, such as for-profit, not for profit and public agencies.

A questionnaire was administered to a systematic sampling of the domestic U.S. memberships of PRSA and the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC). The membership list was drawn from the most recent directories of the two organizations. Because of the time, cost and complexity of international correspondence, the survey sample was restricted to those who use domestic U.S. mail service.

The first section of the survey contained a series of screening questions. The purpose was to separate the respondents into one of six categories:

1. Those employed by a public relations, advertising or marketing agency.	32	(14.2%)
2. Those self-employed.	21	(9.3%)
3. Those employed by a government agency.	16	(7.1%)
4. Those employed by a non-government, for-profit organization.	80	(35.6%)
5. Those employed by a non-government, not-for-profit organization.	54	(24.0%)
6. Those that felt they did not fit into any of the above categories.	22	(9.8%)

Respondents in the first, second and sixth categories were asked to skip the second section of the questionnaire, a series of managerial role indicators, and third section, a series of organizational crisis experience indicators. The rationale was that those respondents were not affiliated with organizations that are appropriate for the study of organizational crisis experience. Rather than being agents of a single organization, they were seen as consultants to a number of organizations, thereby making measurement of the critical indicators difficult. These respondents were asked to complete the final section of the survey, a serious of questions about crisis plan preparation and demographic attributes.

In the second section of the survey, a series of 30 rating scale questions served as indicators of how closely respondents were affiliated with the management of their organizations. They were asked the degree to which they performed managerial functions, such as budgeting, planning, and policy development. They were also asked the degree to which they performed technical functions, such as typing, photography, and publication design (Table 1). The technical and management indicators were interspersed in an effort to avoid a patterned response. From that data, each respondent was assigned a management index (MI) number. Through data reduction, those with MI's among the lowest one-third in the sample were said to have a "low" MI. Those with MI numbers in the middle one-third of the sample were said to have a "medium" MI. The remaining respondents were said to have a "high" MI.

The third section of the survey was a series of 25 rating scale questions that served as indicators of each organization's level of crisis experience. Respondents were asked the degree to which their organization had been exposed to various crises during the previous five years. Those crises included the forced resignation of executive-level officer(s), public allegations of impropriety, labor unrest, and a major restructuring of the organization. (Table 2) From that data, each respondent was assigned a crisis index (CI) number. A data reduction process similar to that carried out for MI's was conducted. Upon completing the third section of the survey, the respondents were asked to complete the aforementioned fourth section.

The relationship between organizational crisis experience and size was also examined. Respondents were asked to give the number of full-time employees within their organizations. Through a process of data reduction, the respondents were divided into three classifications of approximately equal size. There were 76 respondents who said they were affiliated with organizations with 70 or fewer employees and were designated as having a "low" number of employees. The 75 respondents who indicated they were affiliated with an organization with 71-1200 employees were placed in the "medium" classification. Those with more than 1200 employees were classified in the "high" category.

Out of 444 surveys mailed, 223 were returned and had been properly completed for a response rate of just over 50 percent. An additional nine questionnaires had been returned, but had either been improperly completed or had been left blank.

SURVEY RESULTS

As indicated in Table 3, the largest number of those affiliated with organizations with low CI's, 42.3 percent, also had low MI's. Conversely, the largest number of those affiliated with organizations high CI's, 41.2 percent, also had high MI's.

As indicated in Table 4, a majority of the organizations with a low number of employees, 56.9 percent, had a medium CI. In comparison, nearly half of the

organizations in the medium number of employees category, 47.5 percent had a high CI. Nearly two-thirds of the largest organizations, 64.7 percent, had a high CI.

While 62.5 percent of responding practitioners in low CI organizations say they have 10 or less years of public relations career experience, 64 percent of respondents in high CI organizations claim more than 10 years experience in the field. In terms of personal earning power, 58.9 percent of those in low CI organizations report annual salaries at or below $40,000 while 78 percent of those in high CI organizations say they make more than $40,000 a year.

All of the survey respondents were asked a series of questions about the existence of crisis communications plans and training within their organizations. Only 56.9 percent said the organization with which they are employed have written communications plans for dealing with crises or emergencies. The level of preparation appears highest among for-profit organizations, where 83.8 percent of the responding practitioners said their organizations have a written crisis communications plan. That compares to 68.5 percent among not-for-profit organizations, 62.5 percent for government practitioners, and only 25.8 percent for those employed by public relations/advertising agencies.

The respondents who acknowledged the existence of a written crisis communications plan within their organizations were asked a contingency question: "Has your organization either practiced or conducted training regarding its emergency or crisis communications plan within the past two years?" Just under two-thirds, 62.8 percent, answered in the affirmative (standard error ± 4.3 percent).

The survey confirms what logic suggests; that organizations with a high level of crisis experience are more likely to have a written crisis communications plan than those with less experience. Among organizations in the high CI category, 84.3 percent reported having a written plan. That compares to 74.5 percent in the medium CI category and 68.6 percent in the low CI category (significance level .001). Although not a startling statistic, in and of itself, it does tend to validate the CI index used in this study.

Of the 25 crisis categories listed, "a major restructuring of the organization" ranked first, with a mean of 3.41 on a five-point scale. "Intense scrutiny from the news media" was second with a mean of 3.10. "Severe budget cutbacks/shortfall" was next with a mean of 2.87. As indicated in Table 5, public sector practitioners identified "intense scrutiny from the news media" as their top-rated crisis. While both for-profit and not-for-profit practitioners ranked "a major restructuring of the organization" first, that category was seventh on the public sector list.

SURVEY ANALYSIS

Survey results suggest a possible relationship between the role of the public relations function within an organization and the organization's level of experience with crises. The significance level for the relationship between CI's and MI's is only 0.1. However,

another study by the author using a similar methodological approach with selected state government public information officers as the sampling frame exhibited a similar relationship between CI's and MI's while having a significance level of .05.(FN26) This suggests that there may be a link between an organization's crisis experiential level and the managerial role of its public relations function. However, it also suggests that it may not be the dominant influence. Clearly, further investigation into this area is warranted.

The survey results suggest a strong relationship between organizational crisis experience and size. As the survey results have shown, organizational crises experience tends to increase with the size of the organization. These results are significant at the .001 level.

Survey results indicate that the more experienced and better-paid practitioners gravitate toward the organizations with the highest crisis experiential levels. The relationship between organizational crisis experience and size was found to be significant at the .01 level. The relationship between organizational crisis experience and salaries were found to be significant at the .05 level. Although there may be a variety of reasons for these results, including the fact that larger organizations general pay better than smaller ones, they are consistent with and tend to validate the aforementioned analysis of the relationships between organizational crisis experience, the managerial role of practitioners, and the size of organizations.

Although the sampling frames were different, it is interesting to note that research conducted five years earlier on behalf of Western Union came up with similar results. In that instance, only 57 percent of the responding companies said they had an operational crisis plan (standard error ± 3.3 percent).

Compare that figure with a similar 1984 study, when only 53 percent of the respondents indicated their organization had an operational crisis communications plan. "At the same time, the number of companies citing anticipation of a crisis as a reason for establishing an operational plan more than doubled from 1984 to 1987, from 32 percent to 70 percent."(FN27) Although comparing the Western Union studies to this research constitutes an ecological fallacy, they may provide meaningful anecdotal evidence of a woeful continuing lack of crisis communications planning.

On the surface, the fact that approximately two-thirds of organizations with written crisis communications plans indicated that they also train for the implementation of those plans appears to be a positive. However, there is a darker side to those numbers. It also means that only 36.3 percent of all of the respondents, just one person in three, worked in an organization that had a crisis communications plan that was both written and practiced.

Other environmental influences upon practitioners are in evidence. Two of the top three rated crises appear to relate the nation's economic health and the downsizing of organizations. Both private for-profit and not-for profit respondents ranked "a major

restructuring of the organization" as their top-rated crisis. Public sector practitioners, more insulated from economic swings than their private sector counterparts, ranked restructuring seventh. Meanwhile, public sector practitioners, who often operate in a highly-charged political environment, appear less insulated from public opinion swings than their private sector counterparts. They rank "intense scrutiny from the news media" at the top of their list of crises. For private non-profit and for-profit practitioners, media scrutiny ranked second and third, respectively.

Although not directly related to the thrust of this research effort, there is one survey result that merits comment. Only four percent of the respondents identified themselves as being non-white. Out of 2,536 respondents to a 1993 Public Relations Journal annual salary survey, only five percent were non-white.(FN28) The under-representation of non-whites is disturbing, especially since the sample for each of the surveys was taken from the rolls of one or both of the profession's leading practitioner associations. From a societal point of view, these results suggest that PRSA and IABC must take a more aggressive role in attracting non-whites into the practice of public relations. From a crisis communications point of view, the absence of non-white practitioners can create serious credibility problems for organizations among important publics during times of stress.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

The implications of this survey for public and private organizations are clear. At a time when "big government" and "big business" are under increasing attack for being out of touch with the people, a program of proactive public relations is critical. Through this approach, many of the crises that confront agencies can be avoided or, at least, minimized. However, this can not happen if the person responsible for organizational public relations is not a key player in the decision-making process. It is only with management support that an appropriate program of research and gathering public feedback can be achieved.

Public relations should be seen as a natural extension of the democratic process. It is a channel through which a real discussion of social issues can be facilitated. During this time of public disenchantment, public relations can help provide the catalyst for change that so many in and out of government are seeking. However, this can only happen when the practitioner has input into an organization's most important policy decisions. For this reason, this dynamic is considered worthy of continued exploration.

The lack of planning for crises is also a cause for great concern. Crises, as well as inappropriate responses to them, pose societal threats on a variety of levels. There are tangible losses associated with them, such as damage to property and financial setbacks. There are also intangible losses, as evidenced by the psychological damage to their victims and a loss of public confidence in organizations. Even more, who can put a value and assess the cost when the outcome of a crisis is the loss of human lives?

Pauchant and Mitroff see it as an ethical issue. They write on the topic from what they say are "two very distinct moods." Although they have a certain degree of "empathy" for those caught in the vortex of a crisis, they also express "moral outrage" when those crises and their subsequent fallouts are preventable.(FN29)

It is not enough to develop technical contingencies to meet the logistical needs of an organization in crisis. Developing plans for communicating during times of stress is critical to the success, if not the very survival, of organizations. As one post-mortem on the Alaskan oil spill noted:

The Exxon Valdez spill clearly shows the penalty for perceived unreadiness in the face of an environmental disaster. But it also shows the importance of having insurance for when things go wrong. It would be unthinkable to go without liability insurance against claims for loss or negligence. Why then, do some companies fail to take out strong public relations 'insurance' for claims against image?(FN30)

Although one would hope that ethical arguments might move the unconcerned and unprepared to action, tangible evidence of the consequences of such failures may prove more convincing. In either event, both are potentially fruitful areas for continuing research.

Added material

TABLE 1 Role Indicators

The Managerial Role Index (MI) was developed from the degree toward which respondents indicated they perform these:

Technical Duties	**Managerial Duties**
Write News Releases	Handle News Media Inquiries
Write/Design	Prepare Public Relations Budget
Serve as a Photographer	Report Directly to CEO
Seek Copy Approval from Superiors	Engage in Research
Take Dictation	Contract Outside Services
Do Own Typing	Engage in Planning
Do Someone Else's Typing	Make Public Speeches
Earn Hourly Wages	Supervise Other Employees
Paid Overtime Wages	Serve as Organization Spokesperson
Counsel Others on PublicConcerns	Conduct Marketing/Opinion Surveys
	Represent CEO at Meetings
	Brief CEO on Important Matters
	Develop Organizational Policy
	Draft Policy Statements/Speeches
	Serve at the Pleasure of the CEO
	Have a Private Office
	Have a Four-Year College Degree
	Work Weekends, Nights and/or Holidays
	Have Prior Public Relations Experience

TABLE 2 Crisis Indicators

The Crisis Index (CI) was developed from the degree to which respondents indicated that they had been faced with these crises in the past five years:

The Forced Resignation of Executive-Level Officer(s)
Potentially Damaging Civil Litigation
Public Allegations of Impropriety
Criminal Charges Filed Against an Employee
The Effects of a Natural Disaster
Public Questions about Hiring Practices
The Job-Related Death of an Employee
The Reelection/Reappointment of the CEO
Public Protests of Organization Actions
Intense Scrutiny from State/Federal Regulators
Intense Scrutiny for State/Federal Regulators
Intense Scrutiny from the News Media
A Civil Disturbance or a Hostage Situation
A Major Restructuring of the Organization
A Major Relocation of Operations
Failure to Meet Organizational Responsibilities
Organizational Actions that Resulted in Death of Non-Employee(s).
Substantial Loss of Property through Theft
Severe Budget Cuts/Shortfall
Allegations of Financial Irregularities
Being the Subject of an Unsolicited/Hostile Takeover
Public Health-Related Difficulties
Labor Unrest
Being at the Center of a Political Controversy

TABLE 3 Managerial Role vs. Crisis Experience (Percentage)

	Crisis Index		
	Low	Medium	High
Management Index	(CI: 25-44)	(CI: 45-54)	(CI: 55-102)
Low (MI: 70-99)	42.3	34.0	25.5
Medium (MI: 100-111)	38.5	25.5	33.3
High (MI: 112-141)	19.2	40.4	41.2

df = 4 X[sup2 = 7.842 p = 0.1

TABLE 4 Organizational Size vs. Crisis Experience (Percentage)

	Crisis Index		
	Low	Medium	High
Number of Employees	(CI: 25-44)	(CI: 45-54)	(CI: 55-102)
Low ([less than or equal] 70)	17.6	21.3	9.8
Medium (71-1200)	56.9	36.2	25.5
High ([greater or equal] 1201)	25.5	42.6	64.7

df = 4 X[sup2 = 16.317 p = .001

TABLE 5 Rankings of Organizational Crisis Experience Within The Past Five Years

Category	Overall	Public (Profit)	Private (Nonprofit)	Private (Profit)
Major Restructuring of Organization	1	7	1	1
Intense Scrutiny from News Media	2	1	2	3
Severe Budget Cutbacks/Shortfall	3	3	4	2
Intense Scrutiny from Regulators	4	4	3	6
Potentially Damaging Civil Litigation	5	9	5	8
Re-election/Reappointment of CEO	6	5	11	4
Forced Resignation of Executive	7	13	6	5
Public Protests	8	6	10	7
Intense Scrutiny by Regulators	9	8	8	12
Effects of a Natural Disaster	10	10	9	10
Major Relocation of Operations	11	21	7	11
Political Controversy	12	2	13	9

FOOTNOTES

1. Kenneth N. Myers, Total Contingency Planning for Disasters (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1993), p.2.

2. Jane Applegate, "Why Crisis Management Plans Are Essential," Los Angeles Times December 29, 1989, D-3.

3. Donald Chisholm and Martin Landau, "Set Aside That Optimism If We Want To Avoid Disaster," Los Angeles Times April 18, 1989, p. II-7.

4. Ole R. Holsti, "Limitations of Cognitive Abilities in the Face of Crisis," in C.F. Smart and W.T. Stanbury (eds.), Studies in Crisis Management (Toronto: Butterworth & Company, 1978), p. 41.

5. Thierry C. Pauchant and Ian I. Mitroff, Transforming the Crisis-Prone Organization (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1992), p. 12.

6. Pauchant, Transforming the Crisis-Prone Organization, pp. 15-16.

7. Steven Fink, Crisis Management: Planning For The Inevitable (New York: AMACOM, 1986), pp. 15-16.

8. Laurence Barton, Crisis in Organizations: Managing and Communicating in the Heat of Chaos (Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1993), p.2.

9. Fink, Crisis Management: Planning For The Inevitable, pp. 20-28.

10. Myers, Total Contingency Planning for Disasters, pp. 7-9.

11. Gerald C. Meyers with John Holusha, When It Hits The Fan: Managing The Nine Crises of Business (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1986), pp. 15-21.

12. Dennis L. Wilcox, Phillip H. Ault, and Warren K. Agee, Public Relations: Strategies and Tactics (New York: Harper and Row, 1986), p.5.

13. Eric Denig, A Geography of Public Relations Trends: Selected Proceedings of the 10th Public Relations World Congress (Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Nijhoff Publishers, 1985), pp. 244-249.

14. Scott M. Cutlip, Allen H. Center, and Glen M. Broom, Effective Public Relations, 6th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985), pp. 68-72.

15. James E. Grunig and Todd T. Hunt, Managing Public Relations (New York: CBS College Publishing, 1984), pp. 21-43.

16. "Survey Confirms Practitioner/Management Goal Conflicts," Public Relations Journal (February 1989), p. 9.

17. Michael Ryan and David J. Martinson, "Public Relations Practitioners, Public Interest and Management," Journalism Quarterly (Spring 1985), pp. 111-115.

18. "PRJ Poll: Top '90s Challenge is Preparing for Strategic Roles," Public Relations Journal (November 1989), pp. 6-7, 12.

19. James E. Arnold, "Communications and Strategy: The CEO Gets and (Gives) the Message," Public Relations Quarterly (Summer 1988), pp. 5-11.

20. Alec Benn, The 23 Most Common Mistakes In Public Relations (New York: AMACOM, 1982), pp. 15-16.

21. Holsti, Studies in Crisis Management, p. 41.

22. Mayer Nudel and Norman Antokol, The Handbook for Effective Emergency and Crisis Management (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1988), p. 36.

23. Robert F. Littlejohn, Crisis Management: A Team Approach (New York: American Management Association, 1983), pp. 18-32.

24. Lalit Acharya, "Public Relations Environments." Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1985), pp. 577-584.

25. Larrisa A. Schneider, "The Role of Public Relations In Four Organizational Types," Journalism Quarterly (Autumn 1985), pp. 567-576.

26. David W. Guth, "Crisis and the Practitioner: Organizational Crisis Experience As It Relates To the Placement Of The Public Relations Function." Masters thesis, University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill, 1990.

27. "Many Still Aren't Prepared," Public Relations Journal (September 1989), p. 16.

28. Nicholas J. Tortorello and Elizabeth Wilhelm, "Eighth Annual Salary Survey," Public Relations Journal (July 1993), p. 19.

29. Pauchant, Transforming The Crisis-Prone Organization, pp. 5-6.

30. E. Bruce Harrison with Tom Prugh, "Assessing the Damage. Practitioner Perspectives on the Valdez." Public Relations Journal (October 1989), p. 42.

WBN: 9519601040003