



GRADUATE SCHOOL
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
**Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University**

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

12-2011

Talking Heads: How Broadcast Media Frame the Public Relations Industry.

Samara Rose Litvack
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Public Relations and Advertising Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Litvack, Samara Rose, "Talking Heads: How Broadcast Media Frame the Public Relations Industry." (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1396. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1396>

This Thesis - unrestricted is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Talking Heads: How Broadcast Media Frame the Public Relations Industry

A thesis

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Communication

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in Professional Communication

by

Samara Litvack

December 2011

John King, Chair

Steven Marshall

Kelly Price

Keywords: public relations, PR, framing theory, content analysis, broadcast, media

ABSTRACT

Talking Heads: How Broadcast Media Frame the Public Relations Industry

by

Samara Litvack

Researchers conducted a content analysis to measure framing of the public relations industry in 354 English language broadcast transcripts from the United States, Canada, and Australia from Sept. 1, 2009 to Aug. 31, 2010.

The overall tone toward public relations was strongly negative. Mentions reflected one-way forms of communication and mentions of the pejorative term “PR” appeared more frequently than mentions of “public relations.” The profession was almost always mentioned within the body of the broadcast, as opposed to the headline or the lead paragraph.

Exploratory research showed 15 shows that included negative mentions 100% of the time. Additionally, 27 shows included zero positive mentions of either term. Of 251 speakers recorded during data analysis, 126 spoke of the industry negatively 100% of the time. American shows were most often negative. Stories about the public relations industry were most likely to reflect public relations as a two-way form of communication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. John King for his guidance over the last 2 years. Thank you for encouraging me to become involved with PRSSA. The trip I took to conference in Washington, DC, showed me the magnitude of this area of study and opened my eyes to all the possibilities that lie ahead in my career. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to begin research in my second semester of graduate school and to cowrite a paper with you. To say I am proud to be published already isn't enough. All I can say for that opportunity is thank you.

I would also like to thank Dr. Kelly Dorgan for making my first semester of grad school the toughest one of all. Your qualitative analysis course nearly tore me down but I survived, just as you assured me I would. You taught me to be excited about research and all things academic. You continued to support me despite my switch to "the dark side." Thank you for never accepting anything less than my best.

Thank you Dr. Dan Brown for assisting me in almost every aspect of the graduate school process. Without your last minute appointment setting and your forms assistance, I know I could not have successfully finished this program.

Lastly, thank you to Micah Briscall, my second data coder. You had no idea what you were getting yourself into but you jumped in without hesitation. You suffered through four rounds of trials and training until we reached agreement and you never once complained. In fact, every time I considered complaining you reminded me of the light at the end of the tunnel. You dedicated your time and energy to helping me with the most important academic project of my life and for that, I will forever be grateful.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	7
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Definition of Public Relations.....	9
Public Relations in the Media.....	11
Framing Theory.....	13
Public Relations Campaign for the Public Relations Industry.....	15
Similar Studies.....	18
3. HYPOTHESES AND METHODS.....	19
Hypotheses.....	19
Exploratory Research.....	19
Methodology.....	20
Results and Frequencies.....	23
Independent Variables.....	23
Dependent Variables.....	30
4. RESULTS AND CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS.....	32
5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	36
Limitations.....	41
Future Studies.....	41

REFERENCES.....	43
APPENDIX.....	51
Appendix A – Frequency of Show.....	47
Appendix B – Frequency of Name.....	50
Appendix C – Show by Tone.....	56
Appendix D – Name by Tone.....	60
VITA.....	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Holsti Formula.....	23
2. Frequency of Mentions by Network.....	25
3. Truncated Frequency of Mentions by Show.....	26
4. Frequency of Mentions by Type of Speaker.....	27
5. Frequency of Mentions by Gender of Speaker.....	27
6. Truncated Table of Mentions by Speaker Name.....	28
7. Frequency of Mentions by Story Topic.....	29
8. Frequency of Mentions by Topic.....	30
9. Frequency of Mentions by Communication Type.....	31
10. Nation by Tone.....	34
11. Topic by Communication.....	35
12. Gender Effects on Tone.....	36

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This content analysis shows the potentially harmful effects that broadcast media framing can have on the public relations industry. By systematically examining each mention of “public relations” and “PR” in published broadcast transcripts over a 1-year period, researchers observed severe patterns of negativity and misperception in use of the terms. More often than not, the industry was framed negatively and was represented as using one-way forms of communication, as opposed to the industry goal of two-way communication.

Framing theory suggests that media portrayal of a given subject directly affects the public’s perception of that subject. By examining how the media present the public relations industry, it becomes clearer why current negative opinions of the industry exist. Likewise, such research is instrumental in planning and completing a campaign for the industry to educate the public about itself and change public perception.

The existing body of literature shows that negative perceptions of the public relations industry often stem from a complete misunderstanding of the industry itself. Definitions of public relations are often vague and frequently attempt to explain the goals of its work as opposed to defining the actual work. Journalists and other “talking heads” who often use the term flippantly to describe reputation management, press agency, and a number of other subjects that are often used synonymously – and incorrectly – with public relations, compound these factors of misconception.

This study identifies the opportunity for public relations professionals to conduct a public information campaign about the industry using their inherent skill sets to show people how this industry works to help them not hurt them.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Public Relations

Since the inception of the industry, when public relations pioneer Ivy Lee's work was thought by many to be a "mediated communication activity used to reach multiple publics" (Taylor & Kent, 1999, p. 131-132), public relations has struggled to define itself. As Swann (2008) explains, many definitions of public relations speak to the building of relationships with specific groups of people. While these definitions rarely mention the term communication, the concept of solid relationship building implies the need for trust between public relations practitioners and those they serve (p.2). That trust is a common thread among industry definitions but often gets lost in translation by the general public. Swann references a number of definitions that many notable public relations practitioners have assigned to the industry but admits that the lack of a standard, go-to definition is one of the key problems of the field (p. 2).

Grunig and Hunt (1984) define public relations as "the management of communications between an organization and its publics" (p. 6). As stated on the Public Relations Society of America website, the definition of public relations has changed many times throughout the industry's history. The profession itself has continuously evolved and, with its changing roles and technological advances, its definition has evolved. Since 1982, Public Relations Society of America has held a common definition of the profession, which states: "Public relations helps an

organization and its publics adapt mutually to each other” (Public Relations Defined, n.d.)

One obvious problem with this industry-supported definition is that it speaks to the effects of the public relations industry rather than the process by which it works. Hutton (1999) argued that this approach has spurred confusion regarding the purpose and intent of the industry since its inception. From the very beginning, he claims public relations has “suffered from an identity crisis – largely of its own making” (p. 199).

Perhaps complex public relations strategies cannot be understood by the general public because the industry does not promote the quantifiable time, effort, and energy its practitioners invest (Hendrix & Haynes, 2010). Additionally, despite the very nature of the public relations profession, the industry “seldom works on its own behalf to campaign for the image of public relations itself” (Callison, 2001, p. 219).

Hendrix and Haynes (2010) claim the media perpetuate inaccuracies about public relations and its professional practices by rarely portraying the industry in a positive light. While there is little information about the industry released by the industry, there is an abundance of articles, stories, and broadcasts that tie negative connotations to the terms “public relations” and “PR.” Beder (1998) details this through his explanation of artificial grassroots campaigns, called “astroturf,” in which public relations professionals create front groups to mask their clients’ controversial affiliations.

Without a broadly-known, universally-accepted definition, the industry has given the public few parameters by which to deduce its purpose, practices, and goals. As such, “(t)he void has been filled by those outside the field, primarily its critics” (Hutton, 1999, p.199). A laundry list of inaccurate metaphors has been composed in referring and relating to the industry, including “spin,” “propaganda,” and “image control,” among others.

The confusion regarding the industry is so great that even future public relations professionals are unsure of its nature, as illustrated by Bowen’s (2009) study of public relations and other students at a research university. While Sallot’s (2002) research shows that public perceptions are somewhat positive of the industry, it underlines the common misconceptions of the definition of public relations and exactly what practitioners do for their clients and their communities.

Public Relations in the Media

Coverage in print and broadcast media previously meant legitimization for the public relations industry (Hallahan, 1994), but as Henderson’s (1998) study shows, news media often worsen the levels of misinformation and suspicion about the industry. Similarly, news coverage of American involvement in international wars and conflicts blurs the line between propaganda and public relations (Heibert, 2003). Metaphors of violence such as “public relations battle” and “public relations war” only magnify this problem (Scrimger & Richards, 2003).

While Ames’s (2010) research shows that Hollywood’s big screen portrayal of public relations is becoming more positive as time moves on, it also reflects a misrepresentation of industry definitions. As Lee (2001) reports, public relations

practitioners in film are most often men whose primary concerns are media relations. Contrary to popular public belief, media relations is merely one of many areas on which public relations practitioners focus their expertise (Hendrix & Haynes, 2010; Swann, 2008). According to the industry publication *PR Daily*, the majority of the public relations workforce consists of women (Sebastian, 2011, para. 2). Television and film portrayals of female public relations practitioners are often inaccurate and severely exaggerated. For example, *Sex and the City's* character Samantha Jones was a high profile practitioner whose daily life consisted of parties, alcohol, and vicarious sexual relations. Throughout six seasons and two big screen appearances, any time she was portrayed working, she was either organizing media appearances or working to gain publicity. This is an inaccurate portrayal of the public relations industry, representing instead the life of a publicist or press agent. This, of course, perpetuates the idea that public relations is synonymous with publicity and press agency.

Keenan (1996) argued that the media also tend to portray public relations as an occupation with "elements of criminality" (p. 226). His study showed that media commonly depict practitioners as trying to distract the public from reality and offset poor decisions made by their clients (p. 227). He also argued that television news coverage specifically presents the public relations industry as using "aggressive or confrontational tactics" (Keenan, 1996, p. 227).

The existing body of research regarding the news media's coverage of the public relations industry offers similar results. Kinsky and Callison (2009) found that while the most common terms used were "public relations" and "PR," there

were a substantial number of “PR euphemisms” (p. 10), such as the aforementioned “PR headache” and “PR nightmare” often used to describe a variety of scenarios that create crisis communications opportunities. They also found that few stories positively framed the public relations industry.

As illustrated often during wartime, the American public is quick to detect and discount press coverage as simply a series of PR stunts conducted specifically for United States government image control. It is a common assumption of consumers of American media that “the government will frame the issues, story line, slogans and catch phrases to serve its purposes” (Hiebert, 2003, p. 254). Such is often the case with anything the public perceives as image control, drawing parallels between public relations, propaganda and spin.

Framing Theory

The framing theory of mass communication states that the thought processes of media consumers are greatly influenced by the way in which media present certain information. The words and images media use to communicate with their audiences directly influence how those audiences interpret the messages they receive (Tewksbury & Scheufele, 2009). Similarly, the ways in which media present or frame the public relations industry and its practitioners directly influences the general public’s perception of them.

As stated by Baylor (1996), “media agents can be selective about the stories they cover, and to what degree they cover them” (p. 242). Often,

The power of the media to shape social events is a fact beyond dispute. Since the invention of the printing press competing groups have vied for control and support of those agents and technologies responsible for the distribution of information. The power of these agents has increased as daily living has

become more complex, and as the amount of information available to the average citizen has exploded. Those agencies able to offer a concise summary of important information wield considerable power (Baylor, 1996, para. 2)

As Gamson (1989) states, it is possible – even probable – for the same event to result in many versions of the same story (p. 158). Facts are subject to human interpretation both by the giver of information and by the receiver. Although news stories by nature include factual elements, news media is delivered by newscasters, who are human. Broadcast news stories are a human interpretation of the facts not a direct delivery of the facts themselves (Gamson, 1989, p. 158).

Professionals in the public relations industry “understand a frame as a construction of reality in communication” (Lim & Jones, 2010, p. 296), but the general public does not. Therefore, the media hold the power to greatly influence public opinion about a given topic. Because journalists “hold public relations practitioners in fairly low esteem, believing that they seek primarily to make their organization look favorable, operate from hidden agendas, regularly withhold information, and attempt to mislead the public with their information subsidies” (Arpan & Pompper, 2003), it should come as no surprise that journalists’ depictions of the public relations industry and its practitioners are often less than favorable. This, as supported by media framing theory, affects the general public perception of public relations practitioners and the industry as a whole.

In a global newspaper content analysis conducted by King and Litvack (2011), it was shown that mentions of the terms “public relations” and “PR” were rarely featured on front pages or section fronts. Similarly, mentions were rarely featured in headlines, in lead paragraphs, or with graphics. The research posits that

“low levels of page prominence and story placement” (p. 9) signal the unimportance of a topic to readers. This discovery of story placement and page prominence signifies the need for the industry to “work to educate newspaper editors and journalists about the nature of professional public relations work as a management function seeking to establish mutually beneficial relationships among publics” (King & Litvack, 2011, p.9).

Public Relations Campaign for the Public Relations Industry

Although the term “public relations” is thought by industry professionals to “imply a relationship, a mutuality, a duality between message sender and receiver” (Hiebert, 2003, p. 244), that definition is not often understood by the public. Perhaps the practitioners should spend more time conveying messages of public relations ethics, such as the transparency quality of public relations, which allows “third party objective scrutiny, thereby gaining credibility” (Hiebert, 2003, p. 244). As technology progresses and social media continues to grow as a staple in communication, the opportunity for the public relations industry to define itself becomes greater. In an age where Facebook and Twitter are used to schedule and coordinate protests and YouTube is used as a vehicle to tell the world (Makovsky, 2011, para. 6), social media can also be used to establish definitions, clarify goals and establish procedures of the public relations profession. Because social media have now permeated nearly every aspect of public relations, it seems common sense for industry professionals to begin using it to combat the negative stereotypes about the industry with more informative, positive ideals.

As stated by Holmes (2003), public relations has been “a business with an identity crisis” (para. 1) for many years. Because of the failure of the industry to define itself, the public is severely unaware of its nature, its standards, and its governance. Outside of practitioners, few people are aware of the Public Relations Society of America, the primary purpose of which is to maintain industry standards and distribute information regarding the prevention of potential issues such as illegal recording, plagiarism, and expropriation of intellectual property, among others (Professional Standards Advisories, para. 3-4, 8-10, 14-15). Similarly, the public does not have ready access to industry publications, which continually disseminate indepth information regarding various divisions of the public relations profession – consumer relations, community relations, media relations, international relations, crisis management, etc. (Beaubien, G., 2011; Morrissey, P., 2011; Scudder, V., 2011). The public also has no access to or knowledge of ethical practices in place within and regulated by the industry and the practitioners themselves.

Despite negative perceptions, “public relations education is being called on more and more to provide strategic, international, ethical, and research methods and leadership” (DiStaso, Stacks, & Botan, 2009, p. 254). With emerging technologies, the demand for public relations practitioners is actually increasing, and the management function of the profession is becoming more prevalent. As education in the field continues to increase, it is predicted that there will 18% more public relations specialists and 24% more public managers by 2016 (DiStaso et al., 2009, p. 255). As the demand for education grows, the pressure to offer more

training in research, ethics, and information technology will mount, offering even more ammunition for public relations practitioners in the fight for industry value (DiStaso et al., 2009, p. 255).

If the public is to ever develop an understanding and respect for the public relations industry, the responsibility of education falls to those who practice it. Public relations practitioners must “distinguish between publicity and public relations, and take every opportunity to explain what the latter term really means, and what distinguishes good PR from bad” (Holmes, 2003, para. 2). It is the responsibility of public relations professionals to differentiate unethical conduct from the common practices of the industry. The industry “has the power to help deliver messages that restore consumer confidence and rebuild reputations” (Diamond, 2009, p. 14) and the means and opportunity to capitalize on its strengths for its own benefit.

One such campaign is currently underway with the PRSA. The Business Case for Public Relations is multifaceted with an ultimate goal of driving “industry recognition and growth by helping professionals in the field educate key audiences about public relations’ roles and outcomes, demonstrate its strategic value and enhance its reputation” (The Business Case for Public Relations, para. 3). In time, the campaign will also incorporate traditional public relations practices, such as research, media outreach, third party advocacy, and “targeted career development opportunities” (The Business Case for Public Relations, para. 4), as well as publicly celebrate the industry’s positive influence on society.

Similar Studies

Content analyses similar to this study have been conducted using print media (King & Litvack, 2011) and broadcast (Kinsky & Callison, 2009), leading to several relevant research questions and hypotheses regarding the framing of public relations by news media. It was the goal of this research paper to mimic the methodologies used by King and Litvack, whose research measured “how the public relations industry was framed in 125 English language newspapers published in 29 nations” (para. 1) over a 1-year time period and apply the same methods and, essentially, hypotheses to broadcast transcripts from the same time period. From that framework, researchers of this study were able to detect new variables and generate new research questions to fill the hole in the existing body of research.

Past research has revealed highly negative framing of the public relations industry by news media. With a severe minimum of mentions of the terms “public relations” and “PR” being presented positively (King & Litvack, 2011) and the term “public relations” frequently being used inaccurately (Kinsky & Callison, 2009), the existing body of literature shows undoubtedly that the industry is rarely presented favorably by print media. This research is an attempt to add to existing information by looking further at the way in which broadcast media frame the public relations industry, by examining how media framing varies between network and cable networks, and by seeking out potential trends in tone as delivered by specific news shows and television personalities.

CHAPTER 3

HYPOTHESES AND METHODS

Hypotheses

H1: The overall tone toward public relations in broadcast news will be negative.

H2: The term “public relations” will most often be presented as a one-way form of communication, including Grunig’s press agency and one-way asymmetrical models, as opposed to the industry preferred two-way model of communication.

H3: Television news will more often use the pejorative term “PR” than the industry preferred “public relations.”

H4: The terms will appear more often within the body of a story than within the headline or the lead.

H5: United States stories will be more negative than stories broadcast from outside the United States.

Exploratory Research

Data in this study were coded for several topics in order to detect possible relationships between independent and dependent variables. Researchers were interested to see if relationships existed between the topic of the mention and the tone, term and communication of the mention. Similarly, researchers were interested in examining relationships between broadcast networks and specific shows and the tone, term, communication, and placement of each mention. As stated previously, the purpose of this study was to observe broadcast transcripts from around the world; however, Lexis Nexis provided information from only the United

States, Canada, and Australia. Researchers shifted focus from a global comparison to a United States versus a non-United States comparison.

EQ1: Will any popular news shows stand out as being more negative than others?

EQ2: Will any newscasters stand out as being more negative than others?

EQ3: Will topic have any effect on communication style in the story?

EQ4: Will the gender of the speaker have any effect on tone?

Methodology

Two coders, including the author of this thesis and another party, coded articles retrieved from the Lexis-Nexis database. Using the “All News” search option, broadcast transcripts were collected by searching “public relations” or “PR” in the TV & Radio Transcripts section. Transcripts from all three countries published between Sept. 1, 2009, and Aug. 31, 2010 were analyzed. The unit of analysis was any mention of “public relations” or “PR” contained in a transcript.

The population size was 482 transcripts, all of which were included in the sample. Conference calls and wire stories were removed, leaving 376 television and radio transcripts. Articles with extraneous references to “public relations” or “PR” were removed. Coders agreed that extraneous references included any instance of speaker description (e.g. “Howard Bragman, 15 Minutes Public Relations”), which was used in the transcript for the benefit of the transcript reader. This explains the variation in sample size across the various chi-square analyses listed later in this paper.

Independent variables included:

- the medium (television or radio)
- the nation in which the show was broadcast
- the network from which the show was broadcast
- the show title
- the speaker
- the gender of the speaker (male or female)
- the name of the speaker, as an indicator of exploratory research
- and the topic being discussed during which the mention occurred

Medium variables were coded as “television” or “radio.” During trials, researchers coded for “wire service” and “conference call,” which also showed up in the Lexis Nexis search. After seeking advice from the advising professor, researchers agreed to omit wire service stories and conference calls from the actual sample used for this study.

Dependent variables included:

- tone
- type of communication
- term
- and placement of the mention

Tone variables were coded as positive, negative, or neutral.

- Positive example: “Toyota has the smartest, the best public relations people I have ever seen” (Brown, 2010, para. 30).

- Negative example: “The same public relations firm that brought you the sleaziest, lying-est, most memorable, most parody-ready attack ads of the whole 2004 election is coordinating a new multi-million-dollar ‘Don’t Fix the Health Care System’ campaign” (Maddow, 2009, para. 125).
- Neutral example: “What’s your sense of this from a PR perspective?” (Roberts, 2009, para. 156).

Communication was coded as to reflect one-way communication or reciprocal two-way communication.

- One-way example: “And I felt that we could elevate the stickiness of the campaign and get a lot of PR if we used people that were known, but maybe not that expensive, if you know what I mean” (Resnick, 2010, para. 12).
- Two-way example: “The assignment was part of a PR campaign to raise awareness about the switch from analogue to digital television.” (Baier, 2009, para. 98).

Term was coded as either “public relations” or “PR.” Placement was coded according to where each mention fell, including headline, lead paragraph, or body of the story.

Coders analyzed each unit of analysis individually for each variable. Training was conducted before coding began. Researchers conducted four separate rounds of “pilot coding” (Neuendorft, 2002, p.133) individually and compared and discussed their findings after each round to negotiate better reliability. Trial articles were drawn from timeframes either before or after the population used for the actual research of this study. Trial samples included between 30 and 40 articles, as

recommended by Neuendorft (p. 133). Each unit of analysis was analyzed based on the context of the sentence in which it occurred. If researchers needed more context to make decisions on a variable, they looked to the sentence before and the sentence after.

The Holsti formula (Neuendorft, 2002, p. 149) was used to measure intercoder reliability. The formula used was $2M/N1+N$, where M = the number of coding decisions agreed upon and N1 and N2 refer to the number of coding decisions made by each coder. Results of final trial rounds for each variable can be seen in Table 1.

TABLE 1: Holsti Formula

Variable	Holsti formula	Agreement
Medium	$2(36) / 36 + 36$	100%
Nation	$2(36) / 36 + 36$	100%
Network	$2(36) / 36 + 36$	100%
Show	$2(35) / 36 + 36$	97.22%
Speaker	$2(33) / 34 + 34$	97.06%
Gender	$2(32) / 34 + 34$	94.12%
Name	$2(32) / 34 + 34$	94.12%
Topic	$2(33) / 36 + 36$	91.67%
Tone	$2(33) / 36 + 36$	91.67%
Communication	$2(32) / 34 + 34$	94.12%
Term	$2(36) / 36 + 36$	100%
Placement	$2(36) / 36 + 36$	100%

Results and Frequencies

Independent Variables

Frequency tables for each variable were calculated and are presented in this paper. Of 795 mentions, most (743 or 93.5%) occurred in television transcripts.

During trials, the nation variable was coded using international country codes, found at www.countrycodes.org. When it became apparent that the only countries represented in the trial samples and population were Canada, the United States and Australia, nation was coded “zero” for Canada, “one” for the United States and “two” for Australia. The researcher collapsed this frequency table twice to eliminate cells with expected count less than 5 in later chi-square tests. The majority of mentions (746 of 795 or 93.8%) were from American broadcast organizations.

Network was noted in each transcript either at the beginning of the copy or at the end. If no network information was available, a Google search was conducted with all other available information to research the network. If no network was located, the mention was coded “undeterminable.”

American networks were recorded by their acronyms, if available. Exceptions were made for those without acronyms, such as Bloomberg TV. Non-American networks, such as Australian Broadcast Corporation, were spelled out to avoid confusion with American companies, such as ABC. As shown in Table 5, the majority of mentions came from CNN and Fox, with ABC and CBS falling closely behind.

Table 2. Frequency of Mentions by Network

Network	Frequency	Percentage
CNN	269	33.8
Fox	125	15.7
ABC	84	10.6
CBS	73	9.2
MSNBC	58	7.3
NPR	49	6.2
NBC	39	4.9
CNN International	28	3.5
Australian Broadcast Corporation	23	2.9
CTV	9	1.1
PBS	9	1.0
Bloomberg TV	8	1.0
Australian Broadcasting Corporation	7	2.9
(undeterminable)	5	.6
NewsAsia	4	0.5
CW	2	0.3
HDNet	2	0.3
CNBC	1	0.1

Note: n = 795

These data produced several cells with an expected count less than 5. The researcher collapsed this data into categories of broadcast and cable to eliminate empty cells in the chi-square test. With the new variables, 52.6% of mentions appeared in stories from broadcast news organizations while 47.4% appeared in stories from cable news organizations.

Show was coded using all available words in the show title, including all articles, such as “the” and “an.” The name of the show was often noted at the beginning of each transcript. Few shows were unnamed in the transcript and were coded by researchers as “undeterminable.” As reflected in Table 7, CNN Newsroom

had the most mentions, with Good Morning America, American Morning and Anderson Cooper 360 falling closely behind.

Table 3. Truncated Frequency of Mentions by Show

Show	Frequency	Percentage
CNN Newsroom	73	8.6
Good Morning America	38	4.5
American Morning	37	4.3
Anderson Cooper 360 Degrees	34	4.0
Channel 4 News	27	3.2
Quest Means Business	27	3.2
Cavuto	24	2.8
Hardball	24	2.8
All Things Considered	23	2.7
Showbiz Tonight	23	2.7

Note: n = 865

(See Appendix Table A for complete table.)

Speaker categories were determined during trials to reflect each type of speaker that had been identified. To eliminate low expected frequency in the chi-square test, the original “politician” category was collapsed into the “guest” category when only one “politician” mention was coded during trials. As shown in Table 8, the host mentioned the terms most often. Overlooking mentions by undeterminable speakers and terms used for the benefit of the broadcast reader to describe the person speaking (as shown in Table 4), the guests and reporters were second and third most likely to mention the terms.

Table 4. Frequency of Mentions by Type of Speaker

Speaker	Frequency	Percentage
Host	357	41.9
Undeterminable	184	21.6
Guest	177	20.8
Descriptor	65	7.6
Reporter	47	5.5
Narrator	11	1.3
Part of headline	9	1.1
Producer	2	.2

Note: n = 852

This data was collapsed further to avoid low frequency in the chi-square test. The resulting data showed that 44.8% of mentions were spoken by hosts of shows, 22.3% of mentions were spoken by guests of shows, and the remaining 1.4% were spoken by other network staff.

If the gender of the speaker was not obvious, researchers searched Google images to locate photographs. This method was necessary for data significance, due to the great number of mentions that were not immediately obvious. As shown in Table 5, the majority of mentions were by male speakers.

Table 5. Frequency of Mentions by Gender of Speaker

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	398	46.7
Female	191	22.4
No speaker	80	9.4
Undeterminable	184	21.6

Note: n = 853

This data was collapsed to address low expected frequency in the chi-square test. Of 588 mentions, 50.1% were spoken by males and 23.9% were spoken by females.

The name of the speaker was recorded for each mention to explore possible significant findings. Researchers were interested to see which popular newscasters spoke of public relations in a positive, negative or neutral light. As shown in Table 6, the speakers who most frequently mentioned the terms “public relations” and “PR” were Rachel Maddow, Chris Matthews and John Roberts, followed by Anderson Cooper and Josh Levs.

Table 6. Truncated Table of Mentions by Speaker Name

Speaker	Frequency	Percentage
Maddow, Rachel	15	2.5
Matthews, Chris	15	2.5
Roberts, John	15	2.5
Cooper, Anderson	11	1.8
Levs, Josh	11	1.8
Santow, Simon	10	1.6
Cavuto, Neil	9	1.5
Willis, Gerri	9	1.5
Foster, Max	8	1.3
Velshi, Ali	8	1.3

Note: n = 624

(See Appendix Table B for complete table.)

The categories for the topic of the story were noted during trial rounds and added as needed during coding of actual data. Because the population was small, researchers used the entire population as the sample, therefore preventing trial rounds from being taken from the population. As such, certain topics that appeared

relevant to researchers emerged during data collection. Researchers wrote out the names of topics as they emerged and coded from string to numeric when data was entered into SPSS.

Table 7. Frequency of Mentions by Story Topic

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
BP	187	21.9
PR industry	117	13.7
Tiger Woods scandal	83	9.7
American politics	79	9.3
Big business	58	6.6
Local news	56	6.6
Toyota	47	5.5
Economy/recession	41	4.8
Speaker description	41	4.8
Sports/entertainment	38	4.5
International news	35	4.1
Religion	25	2.9
n/a (descriptor)	11	1.3
War US involved in	11	1.3
David Letterman	10	1.2
Other	8	.9
Legal	4	.5
Nonprofit	1	.1
Sandra Bullock/Jesse James	1	.1

Note: n = 766

Data were collapsed due to numerous cells having expected counts less than 5 in the chi-square test. As shown in Table 8, the topics that most frequently involved mentions of “public relations” and “PR” were the BP oil spill, the public relations industry and celebrity sex scandals.

Table 8. Frequency of Mentions by Topic

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
BP	187	23.5
PR industry	109	13.7
Celebrity sex scandal	83	10.4
American politics	78	9.8
Local news	61	7.7
Big business	57	7.2
Toyota	42	5.3
Economy/recession	40	5.0
Sports/entertainment	38	4.8
International news	35	4.4
Religion	25	3.1
US war	11	1.4

Note: n = 766

Dependent Variables

Tone was coded as being negative, positive or neutral. Researchers looked at the phrase surrounding the mention to detect tone. If tone could not be coded within a phrase, researchers looked at the entire sentence in which the mention fell. If the sentence could not be coded either positive or negative, the mention was coded neutral. Mentions were predominately negative at 58% and very rarely positive at 6.1%. The remaining 39% of mentions were neutral.

Communication was coded as being one-way or two-way, based on Grunig's Excellence Model of Public Relations. The excellence model states that public relations communication represents one of four types of communication. As illustrated in Table 9, mentions predominately reflected one-way communication.

Table 9. Frequency of Mentions by Communication Type

Communication	Frequency	Percentage
One-way	564	66.4
Neither one-way nor two-way	189	22.2
Speaker description	66	7.8
Two-way	31	3.6

Note: n = 850

Researchers removed “speaker description” and “neither one-way nor two-way” mentions to eliminate low expected frequency for the chi-square test. This resulted in 70.1% of mentions reflected one-way communication and only 3.9% reflected two-way communication. The remaining mentions were coded as being neither one-way nor two-way.

Term was coded either for “public relations” or for “PR.” There was no “undeterminable” option within this variable because researchers ran the Lexis Nexis search for this population and sample by searching for only broadcast transcripts that included the terms “public relations” or “PR.” Therefore, these two options were deemed mutually exclusive. The more pejorative “PR” was used 60.1% of the time, much more frequently than the industry-preferred “public relations” which was used 39.9% of the time.

Placement of the story was coded based on whether it fell in the headline, lead or body of a story. If a mention was in the first paragraph of a story, it was coded as being in the lead. If it fell after the lead, it was coded as being in the body of the story. If a mention was in the obvious headline, the subhead or anywhere else above the body of the story, it was coded as a part of the headline. The terms were

mentioned in the body of the story much more than anywhere else (98.2%).

Headline and lead paragraph were collapsed for chi square purposes.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS

Because all data were nominal, chi-square analyses were used to test the hypotheses. The first portion of this results section reflects the seven hypotheses stated by the researcher.

H1: The overall tone toward public relations in broadcast news will be negative.

This hypothesis was supported. Mentions were negative 56.3% of the time.

H2: The terms “public relations” and “PR” will most often be presented as a one-way form of communication, as opposed to the industry-defined, two-way model of excellence.

This hypothesis was supported. One-way communication was represented 70.1% of the time.

H3: Television news will more often use the pejorative term “PR” than the industry-preferred “public relations.”

This hypothesis was supported. “PR” was used 60.1% of the time.

H4: The terms will appear more often within the body of a story than within the headline or the lead.

As discussed earlier in this paper, mentions occurred in the body of the broadcast 98.2% of the time. This supports the hypothesis.

H5: United States stories will be more negative than stories broadcast from outside the United States.

This hypothesis was supported.

Table 10. Nation by Tone

Nation	Negative	Neutral	Positive
US	447 59.9%	256 34.3%	43 5.8%
Non-US	11 28.9%	21 55.3%	5 15.8%

Note: n = 784; chi-square = 16.24; p < .001

EQ1: Will any news shows stand out as being more negative than others?

While the entire sample was predominantly negative, exploratory research showed 15 shows that had negative mentions 100% of the time. They included: CBS Evening News, Face to Face, Follow the Money, Fox Hannity, Morning News, On the Record with Greta van Susteren, Saturday Today, Sunday Today, The Ed Show, The Joy Behar Show, The O'Reilly Factor, Wall Street Journal Reports, World News Saturday, World News Sunday, and World News with Charles Gibson. Additionally, there were 27 shows that had zero positive mentions of either term. These included ABC Evening News, Dan Rather Reports, NBC Nightly News, Nightline, State of the Union, and Talk of the Nation, among others. *(See Appendix Table C for table.)*

EQ2: Will any newscasters stand out as being more negative than others?

Of 251 recorded names, which as already stated include hosts, guests, and other network staff, 126 of them were negative 100% of the time. Despite low frequencies, it is significant to point out that these speakers included newscasters, political candidates and television personalities. *(See Appendix Table D for table.)* Even public relations practitioners serving as guest speakers on behalf of the

industry were predominately negative, such as Howard Bragman who used the terms negatively 7 out of 8 times (or 92.85% of the time).

EQ3: Will topic have any effect on communication style in the story?

Exploratory research revealed that stories most likely to mention public relations in regards to a two-way communication model were stories about the public relations industry itself. However, this data was not significant.

Table 11. Topic by Communication

Topic	One-way	Two-way
PR industry	37 88.1%	5 11.9%
Big business	40 90.9%	4 9.1%
American politics	59 92.2%	5 7.8%
Economy and recession	24 92.3%	2 7.7%
Local news	37 92.5%	3 7.5%
Toyota	34 94.4%	2 5.6%
Celebrity sex scandal	63 95.5%	3 4.5%
International news	26 96.3%	1 3.7%
Sports and entertainment	27 96.4%	1 3.6%
BP	157 96.9%	5 3.1%
Religion	25 100%	0 0%
US war	9 100%	0 0%

Note: n = 569; chi-square = 9.98; n.s.

EQ4: Will the gender of the speaker have any effect on tone?

Variations were extremely slight in each category and the chi-square deemed the data not significant.

Table 12. Gender Effects on Tone

Gender	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Male	228 57.3%	139 34.9%	31 7.8%
Female	114 60.0%	65 34.2%	11 5.8%

Note: n = 342; chi-square = 8.343; n.s.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This content analysis illustrates how negative broadcast news coverage of the public relations profession can potentially perpetuate negative public perceptions of the industry. As expected, the overall tone toward public relations in broadcast news media was negative, with only 5.8% of television mentions and 11.5% of radio mentions being positive. United States broadcasts were also more frequently negative than non-U.S. broadcasts, supporting hypothesis five of this study.

This negative portrayal is harmful to the public perception of the industry. It appears that general ignorance of the industry, its practices, and its framework leads journalists, newscasters, guests of television news shows, and the general public to stereotype the industry as manipulative and dishonest.

This study also supports the hypothesis that public relations would be most frequently depicted as involving one-way communication versus the ultimate goal of two-way communication. Interestingly and perhaps encouragingly, mentions relating to the public relations industry itself were more likely to represent two-way communication. Again, general ignorance of the industry and its components perpetuates the idea that the main goals of the public relations industry include publicity and press agency.

Broadcast news stories typically used the term “PR” instead of the industry-preferred “public relations.” Exploratory research revealed that broadcast news networks were more likely to use “PR” than their cable news counterparts. Both

types of network most frequently mentioned the terms within the body of a story, versus the headline or the lead paragraph. This signifies the viewpoint that public relations is unimportant to and often looked upon as not being newsworthy by broadcast media.

If the public relations industry accepts Swann's (2008) definition of public relations as "the art and social science of analyzing trends, predicting their consequences, counseling organizational leaders, and implementing planned programs of action which serve both the organization's and the public's interest" (p. 2), it must work to ensure the public understands the definition and, therefore, the function of the industry. Particularly in relation to framing theory, media must understand what public relations is before they can accurately portray the industry and its goings on to the viewing public. Public relations practitioners incorporate media relationship management practices into standard campaigns (Hendrix & Haynes, 2010) and press releases, tours, and ample information should be available to members of the media regarding the industry itself.

It is the responsibility of public relations practitioners to publicly define the industry in a way that reflects its nature, practices, and function. Historically, corrupt governmental propaganda practices have made a lasting impact on the perception of public relations, so redefining the industry will be no small feat. However, this industry is well equipped to develop a strategy that is effective enough to do so. Using the well-known and often used ROPE (Research, Objectives, Programming, Evaluation) model approach (Hendrix & Hayes, 2010), public

relations professionals should take this research as motivation to band together to assess the current views of the industry and create a plan of action to correct them.

As previously stated, The Business Case for Public Relations is PRSA's current effort to thwart this negative perception of the industry within the business world. This effort aims to educate its practitioners so they are "more fully equipped to explain public relations' roles, outcomes, and value (The Business Case for Public Relations, para. 5). PRSA has organized a solid framework for conducting this effort, including initiating parameters by which to document the business outcomes of public relations. This information will yield tangible, easy to understand components that will aid in defining public relations for other industries. The effort will determine benchmarks for public relations . This is increasingly more important to public trust, as cited by Edelman Public Relations' 2011 Trust Barometer. "Trust in all credentialed people is higher this year, signaling a desire for authority and accountability" (Edelman, 2011, p.5) so this effort occurs just in time to boost trust in the public relations industry.

PRSA offers limited information on its website regarding the decision-making progress for The Business Case for Public Relations but it is clear that this effort aims to quantify return on investment to earn credibility in the business world. The discussion section of this paper offers suggestions for implementing standard public relations tactics to create a campaign for the public relations industry, which will increase favorability not only in the business world but with the general public, as well.

The first step of the ROPE model is research. Articles such as this thesis examine existing problems of perception within the industry and can be used as tools for determining why public perception of the industry is negative. More research, both quantitative and qualitative, should be conducted to examine how these messages are interpreted, what could be done to change the effects these messages have, when the best time would be to implement a strategy to change public perception, and who would be the best spokespeople for the effort. If a goal of this potential campaign is to raise favorable opinion of the industry, specific research should also be conducted to gauge the current views of the public through survey or other means.

The second step of the ROPE model is to establish objectives. If a low percentage of the public views public relations positively or understands what the industry even is, by what percentage does the campaign intend to increase favorability? Similar objectives could be set for future content analyses. By what percentage would future researchers expect to see positive mentions increase or negative mentions decrease? By establishing quantifiable, measurable goals, practitioners can gauge the success of the campaign and either deem it successful or adjust it in the future to gain more favorable results.

The third step of the ROPE model is programming. What exactly will this campaign do to reach its goal? Favorable media coverage seems a logical first step but what would it take to achieve it? Perhaps an education strategy aimed first at mass media, specifically newscasters and producers, would be an effective first step in gaining favorable media mentions. According to the existing body of literature,

much of which is cited in this paper, more favorable media mentions will yield a more favorable public opinion. As such, public relations professionals must determine creative ways to educate the public. Social media campaigns that encourage two-way communication should be implemented to illustrate the desired interaction of the industry. This strategy would also allow for a continuous means of gauging public opinion. To reiterate, no industry is better equipped to handle a public information campaign than this one. With a well-planned, creative, informative campaign, the public relations industry could completely revolutionize the way people view it.

The final step of the ROPE model is evaluation. No campaign is complete until those who implement it determine whether or not they achieved their goals. This is crucial in every campaign and especially so in the one proposed here. Until public relations practitioners are able to effectively change the way their industry is perceived by the public, the industry will never reach its full potential. In the final stage of this proposed campaign, surveys and content analyses conducted during research should be repeated to measure attitudinal and behavioral change.

If the media had a better understanding of the public relations industry, the messages they relayed to the general public would become decreasingly framed and increasingly reflective of industry-set definitions. “Journalists and editors make many critical decisions in their work ranging from whom to interview to what questions to ask and what specific words to use when writing a story” (Swann, 2009, p. 18). These decisions are pieces of the framing theory puzzle and given the

right informational campaign, journalists and editors can be educated to make better decisions that reflect the true definition of public relations.

Limitations

A Lexis Nexis search excludes many published broadcast transcripts from around the world. Because researchers used the Lexis Nexis database, several such broadcast transcripts from several countries were excluded from the study. Also, researchers were only able to examine broadcast transcripts printed in English within a 1-year time frame; this also limited the study's findings. Several variables yielded undeterminable results, potentially affecting the findings. Also, because coders included the author of this paper and an inexperienced coder, training could have potentially been skewed by either the author or the second coder, which in turn may have skewed the findings of this research.

Future Studies

This study could be easily replicated across different time frames and different forms of media. It would be interesting to see the results of application to blogs, magazines, and other forms of media that were published within the same time period. It would also be beneficial to continue the study over consecutive years to measure how representation in the media changes, particularly if the proposed campaign for public relations is implemented. New variables that could be included in this study include whether the terms "public relations" and "PR" are used as part of phrases such as "public relations headache" or "PR nightmare," as done by Kinsky and Callison (2010) and how often the terms are found in conjunction with terms such as "spin" and "propaganda." Additionally, content analyses should be

conducted using Lexis Nexis to search the terms “spin” and “propaganda” to see how often they are used as a substitution for “public relations.”

This study opens many doors for future research. Understanding contributing factors, such as media representation, is crucial in assessing why so many people view public relations negatively. To truly understand this view, researchers should also survey the public and conduct more qualitative forms of research, such as interviews and focus groups. Information such as this would be a great first step toward educating the public on an industry that essentially exists to help businesses, organizations and individuals communicate more effectively.

REFERENCES

- Ames, C. (2010). PR goes to the movies: The image of public relations improves from 1996 to 2008. *Public Relations Review*, 36, 164-170.
- Arpan, L. M., & Pompper, D. (2003). Stormy weather: Testing 'stealing thunder' as a crisis communication strategy to improve communication flow between organizations and journalists. *Public Relations Review*, 29, 291-308.
- Baylor, T. (1996). Media framing of movement protest: The case of American Indian protest. *The Social Science Journal*, 33, 241-255.
- Beaubien, G. (2001). Weiner scandal is latest reminder of power, perils of social media. *The Public Relations Strategist*, retrieved from http://www.prsa.org/Intelligence/TheStrategist/Articles/view/6K-031102/1033/Weiner_Scandal_Is_Latest_Reminder_of_Power_Perils.
- Beder, S. (Summer 1998). Public relations' role in manufacturing artificial grass roots coalitions. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 43(2), 21-23.
- Bigne-Alcaniz, E., Ruiz-Mafe, C., Aldas-Manzano, J., & Sanz-Blas, S. (2008). Influence of online shopping information dependency and innovativeness on internet shopping adoption. *Online Information Review*, 32, 648-667.
- Bowen, S. (2009). All glamour, no substance? How public relations majors and potential majors in an exemplar program view the industry and function. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 402-410.
- Brown, W. (2010, February 4). *Automotive Recall 101 [broadcast transcript]*. NPR. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis on July 30, 2011.
- Callison, C. (2001). Do PR practitioners have a PR problem? The effect of associating a source with public relations and client-negative news on audience perception of credibility. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13, 219-234.
- Carroll, C. E. & McCombs, M. (2003). Agenda-setting effects of business news on the public's images and opinions about major corporations. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6 (1), 36.
- Diamond, H. (2009) Measurable impact: Agency leaders on why PR matters. *The Strategist*. Retrieved from www.prsa.org.
- DiStaso, M. W., Stacks, D. W., & Botan, C. H. (2009). State of public relations education in the United States: 2006 report on national survey of executives and academics. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 254-269. k

- Duck, J. M. & Morton, T. A. (2000). Social identity and media dependency in the gay community: The prediction of safe sex attitudes. *Communication Research*, 27, 439-440.
- Edelman Public Relations (2011). *Trust Barometer 2011*. Retrieved from www.edelman.com/trust on November 6, 2011.
- Forbes, S. (2009, December 30). *Cavuto [broadcast transcript]*. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis on July 30, 2011.
- Gamson, W. A. (1989). News as framing comments on Graber. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 33 (2), 157.
- Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hallahan, K. (Summer 1994). Public relations and the circumvention of the press. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 39(2), 17-19.
- Heibert, R. E. (2003, March 17). To overcome identity crisis, the industry has to define and defend public relations. *PR Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.prweekus.com>
- Hutton, J. G. (1999). The definition, dimensions, and domain of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 25 (2), 199-214.
- Henderson, J. K. (1998). Negative connotations in the use of the term “public relations” in the print media. *Public Relations Review*, 24(1), 45-54.
- Hendrix, J. A., & Haynes, D. C. (2010). *Public relations cases*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Holmes, P. (2003). To overcome its identity crisis, the industry has to define and defend ‘public relations.’ *PR Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.prweekus.com>.
- Keenan, K. L. (1996). Network television news coverage of public relations: An exploratory census of content. *Public Relations Review*, 22, 215-231.
- Kim, Y. C., Jung, J. Y, Cohen, E. L., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2004). Internet connectedness before and after September 11, 2001. *New Media and Society*, 6, 611-631.
- King, J. M., & Litvack, S. (2011). *A global study of newspaper framing of public relations*. Madrid, Spain: Pozuelo de Alarcon.

- Kinsky, E., & Callison, C. (2009). PR in the news: How a sample of network newscasts framed public relations. *Public Relations Journal*, 3 (1), 6-12.
- Lee, M. (2001). The image of the government flack: Movie depictions of public relations in public administration. *Public Relations Review*, 27, 297-315.
- Lim, J., & Jones, L. (2010). A baseline summary of framing research in public relations from 1990 to 2009. *Public Relations Review*, 36, 292-297.
- Maddow, R. (2009, December 30). *The Rachel Maddow Show [broadcast transcript]*. CNN. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis July 30, 2011.
- Makovsky, K. (2011, July 2). 7 reasons why the golden age of public relations is in reach. *The Public Relations Strategist*, retrieved from http://www.prsa.org/Intelligence/TheStrategist/Articles/view/9275/1033/7_Reasons_Why_the_Golden_Age_of_Public_Relations_I.
- Morrissey, P. (2011). Crisis management: The evolving role of the CEO as crisis manager. *The Public Relations Strategist*, retrieved from http://www.prsa.org/Intelligence/TheStrategist/Articles/view/6K-031100/1033/Crisis_Management_The_Evolving_Role_of_the_CEO_as.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Professional Standards Advisories. Retrieved September 25, 2011, from <http://www.prsa.org/AboutPRSA/Ethics/ProfessionalStandardsAdvisories>.
- Public Relations Defined. Retrieved September 20, 2011, from <http://www.prsa.org/aboutprsa/publicrelationsdefined/>.
- Resnick, L. (2010, February 5). *Levi Johnston helps makes pistachios 'hawt' [broadcast transcript]*. NPR. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis on July 30, 2011.
- Roberts, J. (2009, December 14). *Obama vs. Wall Street; Health care blowup; Dropping Tiger; Berlusconi attacked [broadcast transcript]*. Retrieved from Lexis Nexis on July 30, 2011.
- Sallot, L. M. (Spring 2002). What the public thinks about public relations: An impression management experiment. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79, 150-171.
- Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49, 103-122.

- Scrimger, J., & Richards, T. (2003). Public relations battles and wars: Journalistic clichés and the potential for conflict resolution. *Public Relations Review*, 29, 485-492.
- Sebastian, M. (2011, March 3). In the PR world, men still earn more than women. *PR Daily*. Retrieved from http://www.prdaily.com/Main/Articles/In_the_PR_world_men_still_earn_more_than_women_7411.aspx
- Stauber, J., & Rampton, S. (1995). *Toxic sludge is good for you: Lies, damn lies and the public relations industry*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Swann, P. (2008). *Cases in public relations management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tewksbury, D., & Scheufele, A. A. (2009). News framing theory and research. In J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 71-31). New York: Routledge.
- The Business Case for Public Relations. Retrieved October 16, 2011, from www.prsa.org/intelligence/BusinessCase
- White, C., & Park, J. (2010). Public perception of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 36, 319-324.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Frequency of Show

Show	Frequency	Percentage
CNN Newsroom	73	8.6
Good Morning America	38	4.5
American Morning	37	4.3
Anderson Cooper 360 Degrees	34	4.0
Channel 4 News	27	3.2
Quest Means Business	27	3.2
Cavuto	24	2.8
Hardball	24	2.8
All Things Considered	23	2.7
Showbiz Tonight	23	2.7
PM	19	2.2
The Rachel Maddow Show	19	2.2
The Willis Report	18	2.1
The Early Show	17	2.0
Channel 25 News	15	1.8
IMUS in the Morning	15	1.8
Channel 6 News	12	1.4
Morning News	12	1.4
6 (undeterminable)	11	1.3
Larry King Live	11	1.3
Bloomberg TV	10	1.2
Channel 7 News	10	1.2
CNN Tonight	10	1.2
Joy Behar Show	10	1.2
Your Money	10	1.2
Happy Hour	9	1.1
Rick's List	9	1.1
State of the Union	9	1.1
Tell Me More	9	1.1
Today	9	1.1
Canada AM	8	.9
Channel 10 News	8	.9
Countdown	8	.9
John King USA	8	.9
Morning Edition	8	.9
Talk of the Nation	8	.9
ABC Evening News	7	.8
Nightly Business Report	7	.8

Sunday Morning	7	.8
Channel 13 News	6	.7
Fox Special Report with Bret Baier	6	.7
Hannity	6	.7
Issues with Jane Velez-Mitchell	6	.7
On the Record with Greta van Susteren	6	.7
Saturday Morning News	6	.7
The Situation Room	6	.7
AM	5	.6
Channel 33	5	.6
Lou Dobbs Tonight	5	.6
Reliable Sources	5	.6
Weekend Edition Sunday	5	.6
4 News at 10	4	.5
American Nightly Scoreboard	4	.5
Channel 29 News	4	.5
Channel 35 News	4	.5
Dateline NBC	4	.5
NBC Nightly News	4	.5
News Channel 5 at 6	4	.5
Q13 Morning	4	.5
Sunrise on KGMB	4	.5
The Ed Show	4	.5
Weekend AM News	4	.5
World News with Diane Sawyer	4	.5
Connect the World	3	.4
Follow the Money	3	.4
KAIT 10pm	3	.4
Late News 2	3	.4
Nancy Grace	3	.4
News 2 at 4	3	.4
Nightline	3	.4
The Charlie Rose Show	3	.4
The Edge Show	3	.4
The O'Reilly Factor	3	.4
World News Sunday	3	.4
4 News at 6	2	.2
CBS Evening News	2	.2
Channel 12 News	2	.2
Channel 29 News	2	.2
Dan Rather Reports	2	.2
Eyewitness News at 4	2	.2
Eyewitness News at 6	2	.2
Face to Face	2	.2

Fox Hannity	2	.2
Fresh Air	2	.2
KAIT 5pm	2	.2
KARE 11 News First	2	.2
O'Reilly Factor	2	.2
Question Period	2	.2
Saturday Today	2	.2
South Florida Today	2	.2
Sunday Today	2	.2
The Joy Behar Show	2	.2
The World Today	2	.2
World News Saturday	2	.2
Campbell Brown	1	.1
Channel 28 News	1	.1
Channel 5 News	1	.1
Channel 9 News	1	.1
CTV News	1	.1
Eyewitness News at 6:30	1	.1
KARK 11am	1	.1
Late Fox 17	1	.1
Late News 2 Sunday	1	.1
Local News	1	.1
News 2 at 5	1	.1
News 2 This Morning	1	.1
News 3 at 6	1	.1
News 4 at 10	1	.1
News 4 at 10:30	1	.1
News at 10	1	.1
News at 4	1	.1
News at Noon	1	.1
News Channel 5 This Morning	1	.1
News Channel 9	1	.1
Wall Street Journal Reports	1	.1
World News with Charles Gibson	1	.1

Note: n=865

APPENDIX B – Frequency of Name

Name	Frequency	Percentage
Maddow, Rachel	15	2.5
Matthews, Chris	15	2.5
Roberts, John	15	2.5
Cooper, Anderson	11	1.8
Levs, Josh	11	1.8
Santow, Simon	10	1.6
Cavuto, Neil	9	1.5
Willis, Gerri	9	1.5
Foster, Max	8	1.3
Velshi, Ali	8	1.3
Whitfield, Fredricka	8	1.3
Wynter, Kareen	8	1.3
Dezenhall, Eric	7	1.1
Behar, Joy	6	1.0
Harris, Tony	6	1.0
Phillips, Kyra	6	1.0
Quest, Richard	6	1.0
Anderson, Brooke	5	.8
Bacon, Wendy	5	.8
Bolling, Eric	5	.8
Bragman, Howard	5	.8
Candiotti, Susan	5	.8
Crowley, Monica	5	.8
Frankel, Sheera	5	.8
Gasparino, Charlie	5	.8
King, John	5	.8
King, Larry	5	.8
Kurtz, Howard	5	.8
Martin, Michael	5	.8
Romans, Christine	5	.8
Schultz, Ed	5	.8
Sunshine, Ken	5	.8
Baier, Bret	4	.7
Dimond, Diane	4	.7
Hammer, A.J.	4	.7
Imus, Don	4	.7
Lake, Maggie	4	.7
Luce, Edward	4	.7
Mankiewicz, Josh	4	.7
McCord, Charles	4	.7
Olbermann, Keith	4	.7

Potter, Wendell	4	.7
Sanchez, Rick	4	.7
Sydell, Laura	4	.7
Tuibbi, Matt	4	.7
Allred, Gloria	3	.5
Bennett, Bill	3	.5
Borger, Gloria	3	.5
Braggman, Howard	3	.5
Brinkley, Douglas	3	.5
Brown, Warren	3	.5
Chetry, Karin	3	.5
Chetry, Kiran	3	.5
Enclade, Byron	3	.5
Hannity, Sean	3	.5
Hayes, Chris	3	.5
Henry, Ed	3	.5
Hill, Erica	3	.5
Holmes, T.J.	3	.5
Johns, Joe	3	.5
Kates, Kathryn	3	.5
Malveaux, Suzanne	3	.5
McGinn, Dan	3	.5
McNally, Bruce	3	.5
Nungesser, Billy	3	.5
Roberts, Robin	3	.5
Sciutto, Jim	3	.5
Seitel, Fraser	3	.5
Sorrell, Martin	3	.5
Thompson, Beverly	3	.5
Van Susteren, Greta	3	.5
Yastine, Jeff	3	.5
Young, John	3	.5
Beckel, Bob	2	.3
Berman, John	2	.3
Brennan, Margaret	2	.3
Chance, Matthew	2	.3
Charles, Midwin	2	.3
Claybrook, Joan	2	.3
Cohan, William	2	.3
Collins, Heidi	2	.3
Colvin, Mark	2	.3
Cuomo, Chris	2	.3
Dudley, Bob	2	.3
Eastabrook, Diane	2	.3

Emanuel, Rahm	2	.3
Forbes, Steve	2	.3
Geragos, Mark	2	.3
Gifford, Rob	2	.3
Griffin, Drew	2	.3
Gupta, Sanjay	2	.3
Guthrie, Savannah	2	.3
Gutman, Matt	2	.3
Harlow, Poppy	2	.3
Hoenig, Jonathan	2	.3
Kaye, Randi	2	.3
Kiernan, Pat	2	.3
Klassen, Abbey	2	.3
Lee, Jenna	2	.3
Lemon, Don	2	.3
Magwood, Wayne	2	.3
Mickens, Robert	2	.3
Moret, Jim	2	.3
Myers, Lisa	2	.3
O'Reilly, Bill	2	.3
Pierce, Thomas	2	.3
Rather, Dan	2	.3
Reid, Chip	2	.3
Roberts, Rebecca	2	.3
Rodriguez, Maggie	2	.3
Schiavone, Louise	2	.3
Seitel, Frasier	2	.3
Sparks, Hal	2	.3
Sylvester, Lisa	2	.3
Tapper, Jake	2	.3
Todd, Chuck	2	.3
Valez-Mitchell, Jane	2	.3
Wragge, Chris	2	.3
Yellin, Jessica	2	.3
Abbott, Tony	1	.1
Abrams, Don	1	.1
Abramson, Larry	1	.1
Asman, David	1	.1
Badenhausen, Kurt	1	.1
Bermudez, Carolina	1	.1
Bernhard, Sandra	1	.1
Beutel, Peter	1	.1
Blitzer, Wolf	1	.1
Boudreau, Abie	1	.1

Britto, Marvet	1	.1
Brogan, Molly	1	.1
Brown, Campbell	1	.1
Burns, Doug	1	.1
Cafferty, Jack	1	.1
Carnevale, Erica	1	.1
Carville, James	1	.1
Castle, Ken	1	.1
Cavnar, Bob	1	.1
Cerrone, Rick	1	.1
Chernoff, Allan	1	.1
Cho, Alina	1	.1
Chorev, Lior	1	.1
Clark, Doreen	1	.1
Colarusso, Dan	1	.1
Coon, Brent	1	.1
Corn, David	1	.1
Cornyn, John	1	.1
Cupp, S.E.	1	.1
Defterios, John	1	.1
Dehlin, John	1	.1
Diamond, Rebecca	1	.1
Dobbs, Lou	1	.1
Elliot, Michael	1	.1
Farzad, Roben	1	.1
Ferguson, Ben	1	.1
Feyerick, Deborah	1	.1
Filan, Susan	1	.1
Finkelstein, Sydney	1	.1
Fu, Scarlet	1	.1
Garcia, Michael	1	.1
Gharib, Susie	1	.1
Gielan, Michelle	1	.1
Grace, Nancy	1	.1
Gray, Robert	1	.1
Griffiths, Meredith	1	.1
Gross, Terry	1	.1
Ham, Mary Katherine	1	.1
Harris, Dan	1	.1
Harwood, John	1	.1
Hayward, Tony	1	.1
Helling, Steve	1	.1
Hill, Jess	1	.1
Hoggan, Jim	1	.1

Holt, Lester	1	.1
Inskeep, Steve	1	.1
Jarvis, Rebecca	1	.1
Javers, Emon	1	.1
Karas, Beth	1	.1
Klein, Ezra	1	.1
Kosic, Alison	1	.1
Kraker, Daniel	1	.1
Krauthammer, Charles	1	.1
Lauer, Matt	1	.1
Lee, John	1	.1
Lee, Spike	1	.1
Levitt, Arthur	1	.1
Lewis, Dana	1	.1
Lizza, Ryan	1	.1
Lothian, Dan	1	.1
Lui, Richard	1	.1
Mattingly, David	1	.1
McLeod, Shane	1	.1
McShane, Connell	1	.1
Montagne, Renee	1	.1
Moore, Stephen	1	.1
Moran, Terry	1	.1
Morici, Peter	1	.1
Murray, Jawn	1	.1
Norris, Michelle	1	.1
O'Donnell, Lawrence	1	.1
O'Donnell, Norah	1	.1
O'Rourke, Robert	1	.1
Pattenden, Holly	1	.1
Pavey, Sasha	1	.1
Payne, Charles	1	.1
Pence, Mike	1	.1
Phillips, Mark	1	.1
Pirro, Jeannine	1	.1
Pulca, Joe	1	.1
Quiggin, John	1	.1
Raina, Queen	1	.1
Reagan, Michael	1	.1
Reid, Mike	1	.1
Resnick, Lynda	1	.1
Robinson, Belinda	1	.1
Robinson, Eugene	1	.1
Rockefeller, Jay	1	.1

Rose, Charlie	1	.1
Rose, Julie	1	.1
Ross, Brian	1	.1
Rossen, Jeff	1	.1
Sachedina, Omar	1	.1
Sagal, Peter	1	.1
Schatzker, Erik	1	.1
Schorr, Daniel	1	.1
Shaeffer, Carolyn	1	.1
Siegel, Robert	1	.1
Smith, Harry	1	.1
Smith, Robert	1	.1
Smith, Stuart	1	.1
Spencer, Christina	1	.1
Stein, Ben	1	.1
Stephanopoulos, George	1	.1
Stockman, Shawn	1	.1
Stoddard, A.B.	1	.1
Sweet, Lynn	1	.1
Terrell, Leo	1	.1
Thompson, Anne	1	.1
Toobin, Jeffrey	1	.1
Travers, Jane	1	.1
Traynham, Robert	1	.1
Tuchman, Gary	1	.1
Viqueira, Mike	1	.1
Webber, Imogene	1	.1
Wedeman, Ben	1	.1
Wilbon, Michael	1	.1
Willard, Cody	1	.1
Williams, Juan	1	.1
Wilson, Brian	1	.1
Wolf, Reynolds	1	.1
Zander, Simon	1	.1

Note: n= 612

APPENDIX C – Show by Tone

Show	Negative	Neutral	Positive
ABC Evening News	5; 71.4%	2; 28.6%	0; 0%
All Things Considered	5; 26.3%	12; 63.2%	2; 10.5%
American Morning	20; 57.1%	15; 42.9%	0; 0%
American Nightly Scoreboard	3; 75.0%	1; 25%	0; 0%
Anderson Cooper 360 Degrees	21; 63.6%	11; 33.3%	1; 3%
Bloomberg TV	5; 62.5%	3; 37.5%	0; 0%
Campbell Brown	0; 0.0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Cavuto	12; 52.2%	5; 21.7%	6; 26.1%
CBS Evening News	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
CNN Newsroom	37; 52.9%	25; 35.7%	8; 11.4%
CNN Tonight	5; 55.6%	3; 33.3%	1; 11.1%
Connect the World	0; 0.0%	3; 100%	0; 0%
Countdown	6; 75.0%	2; 25%	0; 0%
CTV News	0; 0.0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Dan Rather Reports	0; 0.0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Dateline NBC	3; 75.0%	1; 25%	0; 0%
Face to Face	2; 100.0%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Follow the Money	3; 100.0%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Fox Hannity	2; 100.0%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Fox Special Report with Brett Baier	4; 66.7%	2; 33.3%	0; 0%

Fresh Air	0; 0.0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Good Morning America	9; 34.6%	17; 65.4%	0; 0%
Hannity	4; 66.7%	2; 33.3%	0; 0%
Happy Hour	2; 25.0%	5; 62.5%	1; 12.5%
Hardball	21; 87.5%	3; 12.5%	0; 0%
IMUS in the Morning	11; 73.3%	4; 26.7%	0; 0%
Issues with Jane Valez-Mitchell	2; 33.3%	4; 66.7%	0; 0%
John King USA	2; 25.0%	6; 75%	0; 0%
Larry King Live	10; 90.9%	1; 9.1%	0; 0%
Local	107; 55.7%	75; 39.1%	10; 5.2%
Lou Dobbs Tonight	3; 60.0%	2; 40%	0; 0%
Morning Edition	3; 37.5%	5; 62.5%	0; 0%
Morning News	8; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Nancy Grace	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
NBC Nightly News	2; 50%	2; 50%	0; 0%
Nightline	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Nightly Business Report	1; 16.7%	4; 66.7%	1; 16.7%
On the Record with Greta va Susteren	5; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Quest Means Business	11; 44.0%	11; 44.0%	3; 12%
Question Period	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
Reliable Sources	1; 20%	3; 60%	1; 20%
Rick's List	6; 66.7%	3; 33.3%	0; 0%

Saturday Morning News	5; 83.3%	1; 16.7%	0; 0%
Saturday Today	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Showbiz Tonight	13; 61.9%	6; 28.6%	2; 9.5%
State of the Union	3; 33.3%	6; 66.7%	0; 0%
Sunday Morning	6; 85.7%	0; 0%	1; 14.3%
Sunday Today	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Talk of the Nation	4; 50%	4; 50%	0; 0%
Tell me More	0; 0.0%	4; 50%	4; 50
The Charlie Rose Show	1; 33.3%	1; 33.3%	1; 33.3%
The Early Show	7; 53.8%	5; 38.5%	1; 7.7%
The Ed Show	4; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
The Edge Show	2; 66.7%	0; 0%	1; 33.3%
The Joy Behar Show	7; 77.8%	4; 22.2%	0; 0%
The O'Reilly Factor	5; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
The Rachel Maddow Show	15; 78.9%	4; 21.1%	0; 0%
The Situation Room	3; 60%	1; 20%	1; 20%
The Willis Report	15; 88.2%	1; 5.9%	1; 5.9%
The World Today	1; 50%	0; 0%	1; 50%
Today	6; 85.7%	0; 0%	1; 14.3%
Wall Street Journal Report	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Weekend Edition Sunday	2; 50%	1; 25%	1; 25%
World News Saturday	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%

World News Sunday	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
World News with Charles Gibson	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
World News with Diane Sawyer	2; 50%	2; 50%	0; 0%
Your Money	8; 80%	2; 20%	0; 0%

Note: n = 795; chi-square = 218.332; p < .001

APPENDIX D – Name by Tone

Name	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Abbott, Tony	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Abrams, Dan	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Abramson, Larry	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Allred, Gloria	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Anderson, Brooke	3; 60%	2; 40%	0; 0%
Asman, David	0; 0%	4; 80%	0; 0%
Bacon, Wendy	1; 20%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Badenhausen, Ken	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Baier, Bret	2; 50%	2; 50%	0; 0%
Beckel, Bob	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Behar, Joy	4; 66.7%	2; 33.3%	0; 0%
Bennett, Bill	0; 0%	3; 100%	0; 0%
Berman, John	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Bermudez, Carol	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Bernhard, Sandra	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Beutel, Peter	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Blitzer, Wolf	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Bolling, Eric	3; 60%	2; 40%	0; 0%
Borger, Gloria	2; 66.7%	1; 33.3%	0; 0%
Boudreau, Abie	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Bragman, Howard	7; 92.85%	1; 7.15%	0; 0%
Brennan, Margaret	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Brinkley, Doug	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Britto, Marvet	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Brogan, Molly	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Brown, Campbell	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Brown, Warren	0; 0%	0; 0%	3; 100%
Burns, Doug	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Cafferty, Jack	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Candiotti, Susan	2; 40%	3; 60%	0; 0%
Carnevale, Eric	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Carville, James	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Castle, Ken	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Cavnar, Bob	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Cavuto, Neil	6; 66.7%	2; 22.2%	1; 11.1%
Cerrone, Rick	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Chance, Matthew	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Charles, Midwin	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
Chernoff, Allan	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Chetry, Kiran	2; 20%	4; 80%	0; 0%
Cho, Alina	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%

Chorev, Lior	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Clark, Doreen	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Claybrook, Joan	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Cohan, William	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
Colarusso, Dan	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Collins, Heidi	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Colvin, Mark	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
Coon, Brent	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Cooper, Anderson	4; 36.4%	6; 54.5%	1; 9.1%
Corn, David	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Cornyn, John	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Crowley, Monica	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Cuomo, Chris	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Cupp, S.E.	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Defterios, John	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Dehlin, John	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Dezenhall, Eric	4; 57.1%	3; 42.9%	0; 0%
Diamond, Rebecca	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Dimond, Diane	3; 75%	0; 0%	1; 25%
Dobbs, Lou	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Dudley, Bob	0;0%	2;100%	0;0%
Eastabrook, Diane	0;0%	1;50%	1;50%
Elliot, Michael	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Emanuel, Rahm	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Enclade, Byron	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Farzad, Roben	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Ferguson, Ben	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Feyerick, Deborah	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Filan, Susan	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Finkelstein, Stan	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Forbes, Steve	1; 50%	0; 0%	1; 50%
Foster, Max	2; 25%	6; 75%	0; 0%
Frankel, Sheer	1; 20%	4; 80%	0; 0%
Fu, Scarlet	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Garcia, Michael	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Gasparino, Charles	2; 40%	0; 0%	3; 60%
Geragos, Mark	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Gharib, Susie	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Gielan, Michelle	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Gifford, Rob	0; 0%	1; 50%	1; 50%
Grace, Nancy	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Gray, Robert	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Griffin, Drew	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Griffiths, Merv	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%

Gross, Terry	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Gupta, Sanjay	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Guthrie, Savan	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Gutman, Matt	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Ham, Mary Katherine	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Hammer, A.J.	4; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Hannity, Sean	2; 66.7%	1; 33.3%	0; 0%
Harlow, Poppy	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
Harris, Dan	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Harris, Tony	3; 50%	3; 50%	0; 0%
Harwood, John	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Hayes, Chris	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Hayward, Tony	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Helling, Steve	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Henry, Ed	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Hill, Erica	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Hill, Jess	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Hoening, Jonathan	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Hoggan, Jim	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Holmes, T.J.	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Holt, Lester	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Imus, Dan	4; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Inskeep, Steve	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Jarvis, Rebecca	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Javers, Emon	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Johns, Joe	1; 33.3%	2; 66.7%	0; 0%
Karas, Beth	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Kates, Kathryn	0; 0%	1; 33.3%	2; 66.7%
Kaye, Randi	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Kiernan, Pat	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
King, John	1; 20%	4; 80%	0; 0%
King, Larry	5; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Klassen, Abbey	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Klien, Ezra	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Kosic, Alison	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Kraker, Daniel	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Krauthammer, Charles	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Kurtz, Howard	2; 40%	3; 60%	0; 0%
Lake, Maggie	3; 75%	1; 25%	0; 0%
Lauer, Matt	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Lee, Jenna	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Lee, John	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Lee, Spike	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Lemon, Don	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%

Levitt, Arthur	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Levs, Josh	7; 63.6%	2; 18.2%	2; 18.2%
Lewis, Dana	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Lizza, Ryan	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Lothian, Dan	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Luce, Edward	4; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Lui, Richard	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Maddow, Rachel	11; 73.3%	4; 26.7%	0; 0%
Magwood, Wayne	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Malveaux, Suzanne	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Mankiewicz, Jo	3; 75%	1; 25%	0; 0%
Martin, Michael	0; 0%	4; 80%	1; 20%
Matthews, Chris	14; 93.3%	1; 6.7%	0; 0%
Mattingly, David	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
McCord, Charles	1; 25%	3; 75%	0; 0%
McGinn, Dan	2; 66.7%	1; 33.3%	0; 0%
McLeod, Shane	1100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
McNally, Bruce	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
McShane, Connell	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Mickens, Robert	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Montagne, Renee	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Moore, Stephen	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Moran, Terry	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Moret, Jim	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
Morici, Peter	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Murray, Jawn	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Myers, Lisa	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Norris, Michelle	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Nungesser, Bill	2; 66.7%	1; 33.3%	0; 0%
O'Donnell, Law	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
O'Donnell, Nora	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
O'Reilly, Bill	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
O'Rourke, Robert	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Olbermann, Keith	3; 75%	1; 25%	0; 0%
Pattenden, Holly	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Pavey, Sasha	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Payne, Charles	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Pence, Mike	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Phillips, Kyra	0; 0%	3; 50%	3; 50%
Phillips, Mark	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Pierce, Thomas	0; 0%	1; 50%	1; 50%
Pirro, Jeannin	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Potter, Wendel	4; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Pulca, Joe	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%

Quest, Richard	3; 50%	2; 33.3%	1; 16.7%
Quiggin, John	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Raina, Queen	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Rather, Dan	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Reagan, Michael	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Reid, Chip	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Reid, Mike	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Resnick, Lynda	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Roberts, John	7; 46.7%	8; 53.3%	0; 0%
Roberts, Rebecca	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
Roberts, Robin	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Robinson, Belinda	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Robinson, Eugene	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Rockefeller, John	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Rodriguez, Maggie	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Romans, Christi	4; 80%	1; 20%	0; 0%
Rose, Charlie	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Rose, Julie	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Ross, Brian	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Rossen, Jeff	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Sachedina, Omar	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Sagal, Peter	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Sanchez, Rick	3; 75%	1; 25%	0; 0%
Santow, Simon	0; 0%	8; 80%	2; 20%
Schatzker, Eric	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Schiavone, Lou	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Schorr, Daniel	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Schultz, Ed	4; 80%	0; 0%	1; 20%
Scuitto, Jim	2; 66.7%	1; 33.3%	0; 0%
Seitel, Fraser	1; 16.7%	3; 66.7%	1; 33.3%
Shaeffer, Carol	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Siegel, Robert	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Smith, Harry	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Smith, Robert	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Smith, Stuart	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Sorrell, Martin	0; 0%	1; 33.3%	2; 66.7%
Sparks, Hal	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Spencer, Chris	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Stein, Ben	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Stephanopoulos, George	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Stockman, Shawn	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Stoddard, A.B.	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Sunshine, Ken	1; 20%	3; 60%	1; 20%
Sweet, Lynn	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%

Sydell, Laura	1; 25%	2; 50%	1; 25%
Sylvester, Lisa	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Tapper, Jake	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Terrell, Leo	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Thompson, Anne	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Thompson, Beverly	2; 66.7%	1; 33.3%	0; 0%
Todd, Chuck	1; 50%	1; 50%	0; 0%
Toobin, Jeffrey	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Travers, Jane	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Traynham, Robert	0; 0%	1; 100%	0; 0%
Tuchman, Gary	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Tuibbi, Matt	4; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Valez-Mitchell, Jane	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Van Susteren, Greta	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Velshi, Ali	5; 62.5%	2; 25%	1; 12.5%
Viqueira, Mike	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Webber, Imogene	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Wedeman, Ben	1; 10%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Whitfield, Fred	4; 50%	4; 50%	0; 0%
Wilbon, Michael	0; 0%	0; 0%	1; 100%
Willard, Cody	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Williams, Juan	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Willis, Gerri	8; 88.9%	1; 11.1%	0; 0%
Wilson, Brian	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Wolf, Reynolds	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Wragge, Chris	0; 0%	2; 100%	0; 0%
Wynter, Kareen	0; 0%	7; 87.5%	1; 12.5%
Yastine, Jeff	0; 0%	3; 100%	0; 0%
Yellin, Jessica	2; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Young, John	3; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%
Zander, Simon	1; 100%	0; 0%	0; 0%

Note: n = 795; chi-square = 713.939; p < .001

VITA

SAMARA R. LITVACK

Personal Data: Date of Birth: April 20, 1980
 Place of Birth: Greeneville, Tennessee
 Marital Status: Single

Education: Public Schools, Greeneville, Tennessee
 B.A. Mass Communication, East Tennessee State
 University, Johnson City, Tennessee 2003
 M.A. in Professional Communication, East Tennessee
 State University, Johnson City, Tennessee 2011

Experience: Assistant Editor, Hamilton County Herald; Chattanooga,
 Tennessee, 2007-2009
 Graduate Assistant, East Tennessee State University;
 Alumni Association, 2009-2011
 Public Relations Manager, Positive Approach Group;
 Johnson City, Tennessee 2010-2011
 Marketing Communications Coordinator, Eastman
 Chemical Company; Kingsport, Tennessee, 2011

Publications: King, J., & Litvack, S. (2011). *A global study of newspaper
 framing of public relations*. Madrid, Spain:
 Pozuelo de Alarcon.

Honors and Awards: Outstanding Graduate Creative Achievement, East
 Tennessee State University