

J617: NONPROFIT PUBLIC RELATIONS THEORY

Mondays and Wednesdays | 10-11:20 a.m. | Lawrence 230 | Four credits

Office hours

Mondays: Noon to 1:30 p.m.

Wednesdays: Noon to 1:30 p.m.

Office: Allen 233

Also available immediately
following class and by
appointment

Contact information

derville@uoregon.edu

541-543-0955 (cell)

tiffanygallicano (Skype)

@Gallicano

#J617, #UOSOJC

My background

- Former media relations manager at a nonprofit organization dedicated to reproductive health
- Former board member of a grassroots nonprofit organization that gives legacy grants to young adults with life-threatening illnesses
- Scholarship about nonprofit relationship management



Course overview

This class takes an academic approach to the study of public relations in nonprofit organizations by focusing on the major theories in public relations and applying them to nonprofit organizations, as well as examining influential studies in nonprofit public relations.

In addition to the required course reading, you will choose an area of specialization in nonprofit public relations and conduct a deep dive into the literature of your specified area. This reading will prepare you to write an insightful literature review and identify research questions or hypotheses that would advance scholarship in your area.

This course adopts an inclusive definition of public relations that includes not only strategic advocacy but also relationship management with publics who can influence a nonprofit organization's success, such as volunteers, donors, companies and the media.

Course objectives

- Apply public relations theories to the context of nonprofit organizations (Assessed through class participation and the literature review)
- Understand key scholarship in nonprofit public relations (Assessed through class participation, abstracts and the literature review)
- Develop an area of expertise within nonprofit public relations (Assessed through the abstracts and literature review)
- Identify important research questions in an area of nonprofit scholarship (Assessed through the introduction and literature review)
- Refine writing skills (Assessed through 12 abstracts and revisions of the introduction and literature review)



Reading materials

The assigned readings can be found on Blackboard.

Grading

Scores for each category are weighted on Blackboard based on the percentages listed below. Assignments are due in hard copy, except for the final draft of the paper, which is due during final exams week.

25% Class participation: Preparation helps you maximize your learning in this class while contributing to a worthwhile experience for your classmates. This grade is based on the following criteria and will be assigned at the end of the quarter:

- Quality and quantity of participation, class preparation
- Quality of discussion questions for each class (three discussion questions are due by 9 p.m. via email to me during the evening before the class period)
- Professionalism
- Punctuality (for both attendance and the email deadline for discussion questions)

5% Memo: This document will present the area of nonprofit public relations research you want to specialize in and include a list of 30 relevant academic sources in APA style. The memo grade is based on the following items:

- Relevance of area to nonprofit public relations
- Identification of the best 12 sources for your topic (top sources will be bolded)



- Format of sources in APA style, including doi numbers for recent articles
- Writing quality

If your sources fall into different categories, organize the readings by category. For example, you could have a category about the theory you would like to use and a category about the topic itself. Number the list, so I can easily see that you have 30 sources. Keep in mind that the most relevant articles will include many important sources for your list. You will bold the 12 most important articles on your list, which you will explore for the annotated bibliography assignment. The rest you will likely incorporate in your literature review. Please note that a “research in brief” article in *Public Relations Review* counts as half an article toward your top 12. You may revise the memo and submit it within a week of receiving it from me if you would like me to average your original grade with a revision grade.

10% Abstracts: This grade is based on summaries of 12 studies in the nonprofit public relations area you chose as your specialization. Do not choose readings that we are already covering in class for your 12 summaries. Each summary will include the following information:

- Citation in APA style
- Overview and purpose of the study
- Theoretical frameworks and key terms
- Research questions/hypotheses
- Method
- Key results
- Theoretical contribution (if any)
- Limitations
- Suggestions for future research
- Your reflection, criticism or insights

All of the writing must be in your own words with the exception of material you quote, which should be minimal. The abstracts grade is based on the following criteria:

- Source quality
- Relevance of the summary to your defined area
- Level of detail
- Critical thinking or reflections about the study
- Writing quality and format



The course schedule dictates when each abstract is due, which is based on the amount of assigned reading for the day. There are no revision opportunities, and I will use the average score from the summaries for this portion of your grade. An article labeled as a “research in brief” in *Public Relations Review* counts as half an article toward the required number of abstracts for the day.

20% Research paper introduction and references: This grade is based on the following items:

- Importance of the topic, as demonstrated through argumentation and sources, and justification for study
- Clear statement of purpose (e.g., the purpose of this paper is to...), mention of method (including which method and what sample), and appropriateness of the method to the study’s purpose
- Enough sources and source quality (some trade literature – especially timely literature – is acceptable in the introduction, as long as it is a primary source)
- Appropriate length (one to two pages)
- Writing quality and APA format
- References from introduction in APA style

You will revise the introduction, and the final grade for the introduction and accompanying references will be based on averaging the two grades.

40% Research paper literature review, research questions or hypotheses, and references:

This grade is based on the following criteria:

- Positioning of the literature review with regard to the study at hand; there should be a smooth narrative that leads into the research questions or hypotheses rather than a pile of literature
- Relevance of literature reviewed to the research questions or hypotheses
- Relevance of the study’s purpose to the research questions or hypotheses
- Research questions or hypotheses that are theoretically significant; the results will advance the public relations literature
- Enough sources to be published in a top journal and source quality (no trade literature is acceptable in this section without prior approval)
- Appropriate length (four to six pages)
- Writing quality and APA format



You will revise this section of your paper, and the final grade will be based on averaging the two grades.

Absences

Unexcused absences affect your ability to contribute to class discussion and learn from class discussion. A half grade will be deducted from your participation score for each unexcused absence. There are three types of excused absences: a religious holiday (a week of prior notice is required), an official university-excused activity or academic conference (a week of prior notice is required), and illness (notice is required at your earliest opportunity). I am lenient toward major professional development opportunities that cannot be rescheduled, depending on the opportunity, timing and your ability to reschedule it, provided that no more than a week of class is missed for this reason.

If you are sick, please help us not get sick by staying home until you are fully recovered. You can email me your discussion questions and any assignments from home.

Class etiquette

Your adherence to these guidelines counts toward the professionalism criterion of class participation:

- You are welcome to bring a beverage in a spill-proof container and food, provided that you clean it up before leaving and provided that it is not disruptive (skip smelly food and get rid of noisy wrappers prior to the start of class).
- Arrive on time and let me know if you expect difficulty with getting to class on time.
- Silence your cell phone before class begins and do not use your phone during class unless receiving permission from me prior to class.
- Do not use the Internet for private use once class begins; if you use a laptop for notes, make sure that your attention is clearly with the class and not on your laptop.
- Participate regularly without dominating discussion and do not talk while someone is talking.
- When answering discussion questions, talk with the class rather than just making eye contact with me.
- Wait to talk about grade appeals until we can meet privately.
- Talk with me if you disagree with notes I make to your work.
- Meet with me to discuss challenges, solutions and class suggestions; only speak for yourself.
- Express professionalism, respect and a good attitude.
- Be open-minded to feedback and instructional techniques.
- Avoid packing your belongings while someone is talking.



- Tuck your chair in before you leave class.

Additional policies

Class announcements, including the possibility of a **class cancellation**, will be communicated via email through the Blackboard system.

You are eligible for an **incomplete** if you are passing class, if you have completed most of the work in class and if you need to miss several classes for a university-approved reason. An “I” for “incomplete” would be your temporary grade. You would be responsible for completing the remaining assignments within one year, or the “I” would be changed to an “F” or “N” on your transcript. You are responsible for contacting me within the year to schedule the remaining assignments.



If you have a **disability**, let me know privately during office hours, regardless of whether you need accommodations, so I can see if there are ways that I can help you that are compatible with your learning style.

If you require additional accommodations, please visit Disability Services at the university (<http://ds.uoregon.edu>). Request an instructor note from Disability Services that lists possible accommodations that would assist you and see me during office hours.

The university stands for the well-being of all members and

- rejects discrimination of any kind
- respects the dignity and essential worth of all people
- promotes a culture of respect and diversity of opinions
- respects everyone’s privacy, property and freedom
- expects personal and academic integrity

Diversity is supported and valued at the University of Oregon. We respect the dignity and essential worth of all individuals; reject bigotry, discrimination, violence, and intimidation; practice personal and academic integrity and expect it of others; and promote a diversity of ideas, opinions, and backgrounds.

The University of Oregon affirms and actively promotes the right of all individuals to **equal opportunity** in education at this institution without regard to race, color, sex, national origin, age, religion, marital status, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation or any other extraneous consideration not directly and substantively related to effective performance. This policy implements all applicable federal, state, and local laws; regulations; and executive orders. Direct related inquiries to the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, 474 Oregon Hall, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, (541) 346-3123, TDD (541) 346-0852.

For **conflict resolution**, please report problems to me. If the problem is not resolved, you may contact the associate dean of the School of Journalism and Communication. If the problem is still not resolved,

you may contact Dean Julie Newton. Outside of the School of Journalism and Communication, you may contact the University of Oregon bias response team at (541) 346-1139, Conflict Resolution Services at (541) 346-0617, or Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity at (541) 346-3123.

You may appeal decisions pertaining to certain aspects of programs, performance evaluation, and program retention and completion. See <http://aaeo.uoregon.edu/booklet.htm#student>.

Cheating is an act of deception by which a student misrepresents or misleadingly demonstrates that he or she has mastered information on an academic exercise that he or she has not mastered, including the giving or receiving of unauthorized help in an academic exercise. Examples include but are not limited to

- copying from another student's test paper, computer program, project, product or performance
- collaborating without authority
- resubmitting substantially the same work that was produced for another assignment without my knowledge and permission

Fabrication is the intentional use of information that you have invented when you state or imply otherwise; it also includes the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive.

Listed below are fabrication examples:

- citing information not taken from the source indicated
- listing sources in a reference not used in the academic exercise
- inventing data or source information for research or other academic exercises

Plagiarism includes the inclusion of someone else's product, words, ideas or data as your own work.

When you submit work for credit that includes the product, words, ideas or data of others, the source must be acknowledged by the use of complete, accurate references. By placing your name on work submitted for credit, you certify the originality of all work not otherwise identified by appropriate acknowledgements. On written assignments, if verbatim statements are included, the statements must be enclosed by quotation marks. Note that paraphrasing is preferable to using direct quotes in this class.

You can avoid being charged with plagiarism if there is an acknowledgement



of indebtedness. Indebtedness must be acknowledged whenever you engage in the following activities:

- quote another person's words or replicate all or part of another person's product
- use another person's ideas, opinions, work, data or theories
- borrow facts, statistics, or other illustrative materials – unless the information is clearly common knowledge

Unauthorized collaboration with others on homework can inadvertently lead to a charge of plagiarism. If in doubt, check with me or seek assistance from the staff of Academic Learning Services (68 PLC, 346-3226). In addition, submitting as your own any academic exercise (e.g., written work, design work) prepared totally or in part by another is considered plagiarism.

Plagiarism also includes submitting work in which portions were substantially produced by someone acting as a tutor or editor.

The University Student Conduct Code (available at conduct.uoregon.edu) defines **academic misconduct**. You are prohibited from committing or attempting to commit any act that constitutes academic misconduct. If there is any question about whether an act constitutes academic misconduct, it is your obligation to clarify the question with me before committing or attempting to commit the act.

J617: Nonprofit Public Relations Theory Course Schedule

Week one

Monday, March 30: Class Overview

Introduction to class

Discussion of research project and instructions for writing the memo

Research and writing mechanics refresher

Today or Wednesday: Discuss your area of interest regarding nonprofit public relations scholarship

Wednesday, April 1: Foundational nonprofit PR scholarship

Reading due

- Dozier, D. M., & Lauzen, M. M. (2000). Liberating the intellectual domain from the practice: Public relations, activism, and the role of the scholar. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 12, 3-22. doi:10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1201_2
- Smith, M. F., & Ferguson, D. P. (2010). Activism 2.0. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Public Relations* 2nd ed. (pp. 395-407). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2012). Fringe public relations: How activism moves critical PR toward the mainstream. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 880-887. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.02.008
- Sisco, H. F., Pressgrove, G., & Collins, E. (2013). Paralleling the practice: An analysis of the scholarly literature in nonprofit public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 25, 282-306. doi: 10.1080/1062726X.2013.806869

Assignment due

- Three discussion questions

Week two

Monday, April 6: Symmetric and asymmetric communication

Reading due

- Grunig, J. E. (2001). Two-way symmetrical public relations: Past, present, and future. In R. L. Heath (with G. M. Vasquez) (Eds.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 11-30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Karlberg, M. (1996). Remembering the public in public relations research: From theoretical to operational symmetry. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 8*, 263-278.
- Curtin, P. A., & Gaither, T. K. (2005). Privileging identity, difference, and power: The circuit of culture as a basis for public relations theory. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*, 91-115.
 - Just read pages 91-97 (we will read the rest of the study during week four)
- Stokes, A. Q., & Rubin, D. (2010). Activism and the limits of symmetry: The public relations battle between Colorado GASP and Philip Morris. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 22*, 26-48. doi:10.1080/10627260903150268

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions

Wednesday, April 8: Situational theory of publics and its evolution

Reading due

- Optional: Grunig, J. E. (1997). A situational theory of publics: Conceptual history, recent challenges and new research. In D. Moss, T. MacManus, & D. Vercic (Eds.), *Public relations research: An international perspective* (pp. 3-48). Boston: International Thomas Business Press.
- McKeever, B. W. (2013). From awareness to advocacy: Understanding nonprofit communication, participation, and support. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 25*, 307-328. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2013.806868
- Kim, J.-N., Grunig, J. E., & Ni, L. (2010). Reconceptualizing the communicative action of publics: Acquisition, selection, and transmission of information in problematic situations. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 4*, 126-154. doi:10.1080/15531181003701913
- Kim, J.-N., & Grunig, J. E. (2011). Problem solving and communicative action: A situational theory of problem solving. *Journal of Communication, 61*, 120-149.
- Hyegyu, L., Oshita, T., Oh, H. J., & Hove, T. (2014). When do people speak out? Integrating the spiral of silence and the situational theory of problem solving. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 26*, 185-199. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2013.864243
- Kruckeberg, D., & Vujnovic, M. (2010). The death of the concept of *publics* (plural) in 21st century public relations. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 4*, 117-125. doi:10.1080/15531181003701921

Assignment due

- Three discussion questions
- No abstract due because of the amount of reading required
- Memo about area of research and list of 30 key references (numbered list, organized by topic, formatted in APA style, bolded 12 that you have chosen for annotated bibliography assignment)

Week three

Monday, April 13: Stakeholder analysis and CSR, followed by dialogue and websites

Reading due

- Rawlins, B. L. (2006, March). Prioritizing stakeholders for public relations. Retrieved from http://www.instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/2006_Stakeholders_1.pdf
- Rumsey, G. G., & White, C. (2009). Strategic corporate philanthropic relationships: Nonprofits' perceptions of benefits and corporate motives. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 301-303. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.05.005
- The three news articles in today's Blackboard folder about Susan G. Komen for the Cure's partnership with KFC. We will apply this case to Rawlins' discussion of prioritizing stakeholders.
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web. *Public Relations Review*, 24, 321-334. – Focus on pp. 326-331.
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 28, 21-37.
- Sommerfeldt, E. J., Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2012). Activist practitioner perspectives of website public relations: Why aren't activist websites fulfilling the dialogic promise? *Public Relations Review*, 38, 303-312. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.01.001

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- One abstract (abstract 1)

Wednesday, April 15: Dialogue and websites (continued)

In groups of two to three people, informally share your thoughts about a nonprofit website based on the reading and other considerations. Reflect on other potential approaches to scholarship pertaining to nonprofit websites. We will use my computer to show the websites during class.

Reading due

- Bortree, D. S., & Seltzer, T. (2009). Dialogic strategies and outcomes: An analysis of environmental advocacy groups' Facebook profiles. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 317-318. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.05.002
- Sommerfeldt, E. (2011). Activist online resource mobilization: Relationship building features that fulfill resource dependencies. *Public Relations Review*, 37, 429-431. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.03.003
- Sommerfeldt, E. (2013). Online power resource management: Activist resource mobilization, communication strategy, and organizational structure. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 25, 347-367. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2013.806871
- Reber, B. H., & Kim, J. K. (2006). How activist groups use websites in media relations: Evaluating online press rooms. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 18, 313-333.
- Theunissen, P., & Noordin, W. N. W. (2012). Revisiting the concept "dialogue" in public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 5-13. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.09.006

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions and the URL of the nonprofit website you examined
- One abstract (abstract 2)

Week four

Monday, April 20: Circuit of culture, cultural considerations, advocacy

Reading due

- Curtin, P. A., & Gaither, T. K. (2005). Privileging identity, difference, and power: The circuit of culture as a basis for public relations theory. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 17*, 91-115.
 - Finish reading this study by reading pages 98-115
- Curtin, P. A., & Gaither, T. K. (2006). Contested notions of issue identity in international public relations: A case study. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 18*, 67-89.
- Curtin, P. A. (2014, August). Renegade Girl Scouts or a merit badge for spin: (Re)articulating activism and public relations through the cultural-economic model. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Montreal, Canada.

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- Two abstracts (abstracts 3-4)

Wednesday, April 22: Mainstream advocacy and radical activism

Reading due

- Mundy, D. E. (2013). The spiral of advocacy: How state-based LGBT advocacy organizations use ground-up public communication strategies in their campaigns for the “Equality Agenda.” *Public Relations Review*, 39, 387-390.
doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.07.021
- Henderson, A. (2005). Activism in “paradise”: Identity management in a public relations campaign against genetic engineering. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17, 117-137.
- Ho, B., Pang, A., AuYong, G. X.-P., & Lau, L.-T. (2014). Enduring image: Capturing defining moments in crises. *Public Relations Review*, 40, 519-525.
doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.03.008
- Kim, S., Kim, J.-N., Tam, L., & Kim, G. T. (2014). Inquiring into activist publics in chronic environmental issues: use of the mutual gains approach for breaking a deadlock. *Journal of Public Affairs*, doi:10.1002/pa.1554
- Derville, T. (2005). Radical activist tactics: Overturning public relations conceptualizations. *Public Relations Review*, 31, 527-533.
- Bronstein, C. (2006). Responsible advocacy for nonprofit organizations. In K. Fitzpatrick & C. Bronstein (Eds.), *Ethics in public relations: Responsible advocacy* (pp. 71-87). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- No abstract due because of the amount of reading required

Week five

Monday, April 27: Radical activism (continued)

Reading due

- Klumpp, J. F. (1973). Challenge of radical rhetoric: Radicalization at Columbia. *Western Speech*, 37, 146-156.
- Jahng, M. R., Hong, S., & Park, E. H. (2014). How radical is radical? Understanding the role of activists' communication strategies on the formation of public attitude and evaluation. *Public Relations Review*, 40, 119-121. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.11.004
- Excerpt from DeLuca, K. M. (1999). *Image politics: The new rhetoric of environmental activism* (pp. 45-60). New York: Guilford Press.
- Weaver, C. K. (2010). Carnavalesque activism as a public relations genre: A case study of the New Zealand group Mothers Against Genetic Engineering. *Public Relations Review* 36, 35-41. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.09.001

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- Two abstracts (abstracts 5-6)

Wednesday, April 29: Ethics

Reading due

- Porter, L. (2010). Communicating for the good of the state: A post-symmetrical polemic on persuasion in ethical public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 36, 127-133. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.08.014
- Bowen, S. (2005). A practical model of ethical decision making in issues management and public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17(3), 191-216. doi:10.1207/s1532754xjpr1703_1
- Baker, S. (2008). The model of the principled advocate and the pathological partisan: A virtue ethics construct of opposing archetypes of public relations and advertising practitioners. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 23, 235-253. doi:10.1080/08900520802222050
- Place, K. R. (2010). A qualitative examination of public relations practitioner ethical decision making and deontological theory of ethical issues management. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 25, 226-245. doi:10.1080/08900523.2010.497405

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- One abstract (abstract 7)

Week six

Monday, May 4: Ethics (continued), writing workshop (introduction)

Preparation

- Bring a laptop to class if possible and any materials you need to write the introduction. We will have a workshop during the second half of class. The introduction is due next Monday.

Reading due

- Neill, M. S., & Drumwright, M. E. (2012). PR professionals as organizational conscience. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 27*, 220-234. doi:10.1080/08900523.2012.746108
- Freeman, C. P. (2009). A greater means to the greater good: Ethical guidelines to meet social movement organization advocacy challenges. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 24*, 269-288. doi:10.1080/08900520903320969
- Berg, K. T. (2012). The ethics of lobbying: Testing an ethical framework for advocacy in public relations. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 27*, 97-114. doi:10.1080/08900523.2012.694276
- Gallicano, T. D., Cho, Y. Y., & Bivins, T. H. (2012, August). What do blog readers think? A survey to assess ghost blogging and ghost commenting. *Research Journal of the Institute for Public Relations, 2*(1), 1-35.

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- One abstract (abstract 8)

Wednesday, May 6: Relationship management and personal influence, writing (peer editing)

Preparation

- Bring a laptop to class if possible and any materials you need to work on the introduction.
- Bring a printed copy of your introduction (what you have completed so far, which needs to be at least two paragraphs as part of your participation score). We will have a peer editing session during the last part of class.

Reading due

- Broom, G. M., Casey, S., and Ritchey, J. (2000). Concept and theory of organization-public relationships. In J. A. Ledingham, & S. D. Bruning (Eds.). *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 3-22). Erlbaum, Mahwah: NJ.
- Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (with Anderson, F. W., Broom, G. M, Felton, J., & Gilfeather, J. et al.). (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations*. Retrieved from http://www.instituteforpr.com/measeval/rel_p1.htm
 - Read pages 2-22 (stop at “Relationship Outcomes in Public Relations Practice”)
- Scott, J. (2007). Relationship measures applied to practice. In E. L. Toth (Ed.), *The future of excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 263-273). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gallicano, T. D. (2009). Personal relationship strategies and outcomes in a case study of a multi-tiered membership organization. *Journal of Communication Management, 13*, 310-328. doi:10.1108/13632540911004597

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- One abstract (abstract 9)

Week seven

Monday, May 11: Volunteer and member relations, writing workshop (literature review)

Preparation

- Bring a laptop to class if possible and any materials you need to start the literature review. After discussing the reading, we will have a workshop about writing the literature review, which is due at the beginning of week nine.

Reading due – read four of the five articles below

- Gallicano, T. D. (2013). Relationship stresses: New ground for relationship management research. *Journal of Communication Management, 17*, 75-91. doi:10.1108/13632541311300160
- Bortree, D. S., & Waters, R. D. (2014). Race and inclusion in volunteerism: Using communication theory to improve volunteer retention. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 26*, 215-234. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2013.864245
- Bortree, D. S. (2010). Exploring adolescent-organization relationships: A study of effective relationship strategies with adolescent volunteers. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 22*, 1-25. doi:10.1080/10627260902949421
- Bortree, D., & Waters, R. (2008). Admiring the organization: A study of the relational quality outcomes of the nonprofit organization-volunteer relationship. *Public Relations Journal, 2*, 1-17.
- Kim, J.-N., & Rhee, Y. (2011). Strategic thinking about employee communication behavior (ECB) in public relations: Testing the models of megaphoning and scouting effects in Korea. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 23*, 243-268. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2011.582204

Assignment due

- Three discussion questions
- Research paper introduction with references (draft one)

Wednesday, May 13: Conflict management, coalitions, writing (literature review)

Preparation

- Bring a laptop to class if possible and be prepared to continue work on the literature review.

Reading due

- Plowman, K. D. (2007). Public relations, conflict resolution, and mediation. In E. L. Toth (Ed.), *The future of excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 85-102). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Jiang, H., & Bowen, S. A. (2011). Ethical decision making in issues management within activist groups. *Public Relations Journal*, 5(1), 1-21.
- Gallicano, T. D. (2013). Internal conflict management and decision making: A qualitative study of a multi-tiered grassroots advocacy organization. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 25, 368-388. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2013.806867
- Chávez, K. R. (2011). Counter-public enclaves and understanding the function of rhetoric in social movement coalition-building. *Communication Quarterly*, 59, 1-18. doi:10.1080/01463373.2010.541333

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- One abstract (abstract 10)

Week eight

Monday, May 18: Social media, writing (peer editing)

Preparation

- Bring a laptop to class if possible and be prepared to continue to work on the literature review.
- Bring a printed copy of your literature review (what you have completed so far, which needs to be at least two completed subheads of information as part of your participation score). We will have a peer editing session during the last part of class.

Reading due

- Cho, M., Schweickart, T., & Haase, A. (2014). Public engagement with nonprofit organizations on Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, 40, 565-567. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.01.008
- Saffer, A. J., Sommerfeldt, E. J., & Taylor, M. (2013). The effects of organizational Twitter interactivity on organization-public relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 39, 213-215. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.02.005
- Lovejoy, K., Waters, R. D., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Engaging stakeholders through Twitter: How nonprofit organizations are getting more out of 140 characters or less. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 313-318. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.01.005
- Auger, G. A. (2013). Fostering democracy through social media: Evaluating diametrically opposed nonprofit advocacy organizations' use of Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube. *Public Relations Review*, 39, 369-376. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.07.013
- Saxton, G. D., & Waters, R. D. (2014). What do stakeholders like on Facebook? Examining public reactions to nonprofit organizations' informational, promotional, and community-building messages. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 26, 280-299. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2014.908721

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- One abstract (abstract 11)

Wednesday, May 20: Social media (continued), donor relations, writing (literature review)

Special guest: Laurie Phillips Honda

Preparation

- Bring a laptop to class if possible and be prepared to continue to work on the literature review.

Reading due

- Phillips, L. M. (2013). Offering hope and making attributions through YouTube: An exploratory ethnographic content analysis of the social change-oriented "It Gets Better Project." *The Journal of Social Media in Society*, 2, 30-65.
- Briones, R. L., Kuch, B., Liu, B. F., & Jin, Y. (2011). Keeping up with the digital age: How the American Red Cross uses social media to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 37, 37-43. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.12.006
- Waters, R. D. (2009). Examining the role of cognitive dissonance in fundraising. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 139-143. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2008.11.001
- Weberling, B., & Waters, R. D. (2012). Gauging the public's preparedness for mobile public relations: The "Text for Haiti" campaign. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 51-55. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.11.005
- Waters, R. D. (2009). Comparing the two sides of the nonprofit organization-donor relationship: Applying coorientation methodology to relationship management. *Public Relations Review*, 25, 144-146.

Assignments due

- Three discussion questions
- One abstract (abstract 12)

Week nine

Monday, May 25: Memorial Day (no class)

Donor relations (this is what we would have covered if we had class)

Optional reading

- Waters, R. D. (2009). Measuring stewardship in public relations: A test exploring impact on the fundraising relationship. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 113-119. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.012
- Kang, M., & Yang, S.-U. (2010). Mediation effects of organization-public relationship outcomes on public intentions for organizational supports. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22, 477-494. doi:10.1080/10627261003601614
- O'Neil, J. (2007). The link between strong public relationships and donor support. *Public Relations Review*, 33, 99-102.
- Waters, R. D. (2008). Applying relationship management theory to the fundraising process for individual donors. *Journal of Communication Management*, 12, 73-87. doi:10.1108/13632540810854244

Wednesday, May 27: Media relations

Determine reading and discussion assignments for next Wednesday

Reading due

- Waters, R. D. (2013). Tracing the impact of media relations and television coverage on U.S. charitable relief fundraising: An application of agenda-setting theory across three natural disasters. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 25, 329-346. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2013.806870
- Mundy, D. E. (2013). One agenda, multiple platforms: How 21st-century LGBT advocacy organizations navigate a shifting media landscape to communicate messages of equality. In N. T. J. Tindall & R. D. Waters (Eds.), *Coming out of the closet: Exploring LGBT issues in strategic communication with theory and research* (pp. 57-72). New York: Lang.
- Ciszek, E., & Gallicano, T. D. (2013). Changing cultural stigma: A pilot study of sexual orientation and mental illness organizations. *Public Relations Review*, 39, 82-84. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.09.011
- Cabosky, J. M. (2014). Framing an LGBT organization and a movement: A critical qualitative analysis of GLAAD's media releases. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 3, 69-89. doi:10.1177/2046147X13519638
- Yang, A., & Kent, M. (2014). Social media and organizational visibility: A sample of Fortune 500 corporations. *Public Relations Review*, 40, 562-564. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.04.006

A note from Dean Mundy, who would attend our class today if he weren't teaching during the same time:

My question for the students would be, now that the sexy issue of marriage seems to be close to resolution, how on earth do these small organizations with little money or formal media relations expertise get their messages into the media? It was somewhat easy when you have a sexy issue like marriage, but how do you get media interested in "non discrimination" or "hate crime prevention" campaigns?

I'm going to start a study this summer that looks at "what's next," and "how." A lot of these organizations are saying their funding is drying up now that marriage is going away. A lot of media attention is disappearing. So how can they keep the public dialog going?

Assignment due

- Three discussion questions
- Research paper introduction (draft two): Include the original graded draft to avoid a deduction of a letter grade from your final introduction grade
- Literature review, including at least 30 sources (draft one)

Week 10

Monday, June 1: Emails, newsletters, documentaries, and virtual worlds

Special guest: Nicole Dahmen at 10 a.m. and Donna Davis at 11 a.m.

Reading due

- Davis, D. (2014). Making a case for virtual healthcare communication: Mayo Clinic's integration of virtual world communities in their social media mix. *Journal of Case Studies in Strategic Communication*, 3, article 6. Retrieved from <http://cssc.uscannenberg.org/cases/v3/v3art6>
- Weberling, B. (2012). Framing breast cancer: Building an agenda through online advocacy and fundraising. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 108-115. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.08.009
- Sommerfeldt, E. (2011). Activist e-mail action alerts and identification: Rhetorical relationship building strategies in collective action. *Public Relations Review*, 37, 87-89. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.10.003
- Reber, B. H., Pētersone, B., & Berger, B. K. (2010). Managing from the middle: The role of mid-level gatekeepers in mobilizing grassroots activism and encouraging facilitative relationships. *Journal of Communication Management*, 14, 32-46. doi:10.1108/13632541011017799
- Shiau, H.-C. (2011). Engaging publics via documentaries: A typological study of advocacy functions among Taiwanese NPO's productions. *Public Relations Review*, 37, 181-183. doi :10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.02.004

Assignment due

- Three discussion questions

Also, please complete an online course evaluation through DuckWeb.

Wednesday, June 3: Crisis communication

Reading due – either the first three studies or the last three studies based on your reading assignment and be prepared to explain what you read, including teaching the other students about the situational crisis communication theory or the blog-mediated crisis communication model (based on your reading assignment)

- Sisco, H. F., Collins, E. L., & Zoch, L. M. (2010). Through the looking glass: A decade of Red Cross crisis response and situational crisis communication theory. *Public Relations Review, 36*, 21-27. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.08.018
- Sisco, H. F. (2012). The ACORN story: An analysis of crisis response strategies in a nonprofit organization. *Public Relations Review, 38*, 89-96. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.11.001
- Sisco, H. F. (2012). Nonprofit in crisis: An examination of the applicability of situational crisis communication theory. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 24*, 1-17. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2011.582207
- Jin, Y., & Liu, B. F. (2010). The blog-mediated crisis communication model: Recommendations for responding to influential external blogs. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 22*, 429-455. doi:10.1080/10627261003801420
- Liu, B. F., Jin, Y., Briones, R., & Kuch, B. (2012). Managing turbulence in the blogosphere: evaluating the blog-mediated crisis communication model with the American Red Cross. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 24*, 353-370. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2012.689901
- Liu, B. F., & Fraustino, J. D. (2014). Beyond image repair: Suggestions for crisis communication theory development. *Public Relations Review, 40*, 543-546. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.04.004

Assignment due

- Three discussion questions

Final Exams Week

Assignment due – Thursday, June 11, at noon

- Final research paper introduction and literature review (due via email, so I can give you a final round of feedback electronically)*

*Give me the graded versions of the second introduction draft and first literature review draft anytime today from 12-1:30 p.m. in Allen 233, which is our final exam time, or feel free to give these items to me earlier.