

Strategic Communication

Opportunities and Challenges of the Research Area¹

Derina Holtzhausen and Ansgar Zerfass

Strategic communication is a term that has become quite popular in communication science education in the second decade of the twenty-first century. Originally only used for a niche, that is, communication programs in the domain of national governments and the military (Farwell, 2012; Paul, 2011), it is now increasingly popular as an umbrella concept embracing various goal-directed communication activities usually covered by public relations, marketing and financial communications, health communications, public diplomacy, campaigning, and so forth. In the United States, many universities have merged formerly distinct public relations and advertising programs into strategic communication curricula. In Europe, strategic communication is often used to signal a managerial approach to the field of integrated communications for all kinds of organizations. In Asia and Australia, strategic communication is a concept used in the professional field, in education and in literature alike (e.g., Mahoney, 2013).

However, strategic communication is not just a term used in substitution for disliked or ill-reputed concepts. It is a distinct approach focusing on the process of communication which offers complementary insights and open up new fields for interdisciplinary research. This chapter will review the original definition (Hallahan, Holtzhausen, Van Ruler, Verčič, & Sriramesh, 2007) and its expansion (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2013). Subsequently it will reflect on those perspectives on the field's theoretical foundation that have emerged over the past few years, and consider the factors that contribute to successful strategic communication practice.

Evolution of the Concept

Since the publication of the article "Defining Strategic Communication" (Hallahan et al., 2007, p. 243) in the inaugural issue of the *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, the definition put forward in that article has been used to explore, limit, argue, debate and study strategic communication. By the end of 2013 the article had been cited numerous times in other journal articles and had been downloaded more than 2,000 times. Not much has changed since 2007 in terms of the definition of strategic communication. However, much has been clarified and at this time a better picture emerges of what goes into a strategic communication process, what defines its success, what the impact is on the public sphere and what the commonalities are among different areas of strategic communication practice.

The 2007 article brought about an identity crisis, particularly in the public relations scholarly community, which has long held that strategic communication is its specific domain. This anxiety is

unnecessary because the study of strategic communication has never been intended to replace other areas of practice but has merely tried to explore what the different communities of practice can learn from each other and so break down the silos we have erected around ourselves.

Four reasons why the study of strategic communication is necessary and prudent were provided in the 2007 article: problems in differentiating between traditional communication activities; the changes in technology that makes it increasingly difficult to differentiate between different forms of communication; the increase in methods organizations use to communicate directly to stakeholders; and the fact that purposeful communication is “the fundamental goal of communication by organizations” (Hallahan et al., 2007, p. 10).

There is indeed a great deal of overlap between the different domains of practice, as this volume shows, and many of the developments in the field of strategic communication have emerged from public relations scholars. On the other hand, scholars of advertising, political, health and crisis communication, public diplomacy, management communication and marketing have since 2007 made important contributions to researchers’ understanding of strategic communication.

Defining the Field

Hallahan et al. (2007) defined strategic communication “in its broadest sense, (as) communicating purposefully to advance (the organization’s) mission” (p. 4). They also held that strategic communication “implies that people will be engaged in deliberate communication practice on behalf of organizations, causes, and social movements” (p. 4). The article further elaborated on the concept of *strategy* and argued that being strategic does not necessarily mean being manipulative, because practitioners often decide that being inclusive and collaborative will be more strategic and effective than being propagandistic or manipulative. However, influencing the levels of knowledge, changing or maintaining attitudes and influencing the behaviors towards issues, products or services remain the preferred outcomes for strategic communication.

Yet another property of the first definition was a focus on practice or action and on the role of the practitioner who serves as an agent communicating on behalf of others. Thus, rather than merely concentrating on the strategic communication process it also focused on the factors that enable or prevent communicators to execute a communication plan. Finally, the article pointed to the importance of *communication* in the strategic communication process as opposed to a strategic organizational process that does not necessarily revolve around communication. The strategic communication process typically is a communication process that follows from an organization’s strategic plan and focuses on the role of communication in enabling the organization’s strategic goals and objectives. Two communication models were discussed. The transmission model followed from Shannon and Weaver (1949) and eventually evolved in discussions of two-way symmetrical and two-way asymmetrical communication in public relations literature (L. A. Grunig, Grunig, & Dozier, 2002). The interactive or ritualistic model of communication, following Carey (1989), has its foundation in symbolic interactionism and organizational communication and focuses on how messages and people themselves are shaped during the communication process.

This foundation remains largely intact at this time, although Holtzhausen and Zerfass (2013) proposed a more comprehensive, single definition incorporating most of the attributes above, with the inclusion of the public sphere. They proposed the following definition: “Strategic communication is the practice of deliberate and purposive communication that a communication agent enacts in the public sphere on behalf of a communicative entity to reach set goals” (p. 74). Following Holtzhausen (2008), communicative entities “cover the full spectrum of economic and social sectors, such as trade and industry, politics, nonprofit and government agencies, activist groups, and even celebrities in the sports and entertainment industries” (p. 4849). While strategic communicators indeed do a great deal of work outside of the public sphere, such as managing communication programs and

communicating with internal stakeholders, the ultimate aim is to maintain a healthy reputation for the communicative entity in the public sphere.

Set against this more advanced definition, this chapter will review each of the attributes of the definition with the purpose of assessing previous and new theoretical approaches to the study of the field. First, it will review the philosophical foundations of strategic communication, particularly as they pertain to the public sphere, before moving to the role of practitioners and the organizational environment in which strategic communication is practiced, and finally to an assessment of the actual communication process in its various contexts.

Strategic Communication and the Public Sphere

The notion of control of public dialogue has always been inherent in the debate on the role of strategic communication. Habermas (1979, 2006) in particular has been critical of the ability of those in power to hire powerful agents to communicate on their behalf and so influence and skew public debate. His work was largely influenced by the reality that, at that time, the media were crucial in shaping and instigating public discourse, with the assumption that the media were neutral in this role and thus open to influence by strategic communicators.

Popular understanding of the public sphere has changed, particularly during the past decade, with the increasingly important role of the Internet, which brought a radical expansion of the public sphere and a marginalization of the major public media. While Bentele and Nothhaft (2010) argued the virtual sphere can only exist in a solid and real society that surrounds it, they also contended that

The dominant characteristic (of the public sphere) is that the communication sphere, to a degree, collapses structural constraints, such as time, distance, technical limitations, and physical handicaps of the person, to mention a few. The public sphere is not a place of gathering as the *Tingstead* any more (sic). Neither is it a force field of media attention constituted by a limited amount of actors. It is a network of points of interest. Something, e.g., a brand, the swine-flu, a politician or any other topic, is in the public sphere because communicators, who are points in the network of communications, communicate about it.

p. 112

They argued that the public sphere is now controlled by the truthfulness of the statements issued in the public communication sphere as perceived by the public. If strategic communicators can argue that their communication is in the public interest and contributes to the wellbeing of society, and if their arguments are accepted as such, they will make a contribution to the public sphere, even if they use their own communication platforms to do so.

In an analysis of the contribution of Dewey to the understanding of the public sphere, Self (2010) argued that Dewey believed discourse in the public sphere already was action, which was preserved in the form of shared meaning. Thus, for Dewey, discourse was already action that shaped the public sphere and subsequently society. Similar to Bentele and Nothhaft (2010), Self (2010) argued that the public became activists through participating in the public sphere, which eventually led to solving society's problems. Whereas in the past the consequences of public deliberation, because of mediators, only vaguely reflected the public debate "now the relation between public communication and public action seems to grow more and more ominous" (Bentele & Nothhaft, 2010, p. 114).

What sets the current public sphere apart from that of the 20th century is that it is more participative rather than representative. There still are some major media who contribute to the public sphere but *contribute* here is the key word rather than *mediate*. Whereas the media was the main force in presenting different viewpoints representing society in the 20th century, digital media now allows members of the public to directly participate in public debate without going through these mediated

channels. Thus the public sphere has become participative rather than representative. Now everybody matters in what is a communication sphere rather than a public sphere.

Public versus Private

To understand the role of strategic communication in the public sphere it is important to briefly review the difference between the public and the private, which also is called "The good Life" (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1984, pp. 229–230). Traditionally the public sphere was viewed as the arena where the wealthy, aristocratic and well-connected were expected to make a contribution. Women, peasants and tradespeople were typically excluded from the public sphere because they were viewed as second-class citizens who did not have the necessary competency, education and background to make decisions for themselves. Thus, the public sphere belonged to a very select group of people; it was a place where equals met, that is, the free and the privileged. This perspective led to the well-known quote that "The Personal is Political" (Hanisch, 1970), also often presented as "The private is political."

Although this scenario has now changed with a public sphere that is more accessible to a variety of voices than ever before, it nonetheless highlights the split between the public and the private, which also frames the role of strategic communication in the public sphere. If strategic communicators are participants in the public sphere and the role of the public sphere is to solve society's problems, they have a responsibility to present debatable issues to the public sphere. If not, their work will be ridiculed. Individuals who wish to manipulate the public sphere to their own benefit without bringing ideas and arguments that contribute to the public debate will be rejected, as is the case in the United States when Donald Trump used his own brand to make unfounded political statements about President Barack Obama's birthplace (Swindell, 2011). Trump has no elected status and has never run for office and the way he used his public profile to insert himself into a political debate was met with ridicule. Since that public humiliation Trump has been quite absent in the public sphere. This is an example of how arguments in the public sphere are rejected when they are not authentic or do not contribute to the improvement of society.

The inclusion of the public sphere in a definition of strategic communication is therefore valuable in debating the role of the practice. In addition to its many other attributes the role of strategic communicators should surely include helping others gain access to the public sphere through good, thoughtful arguments that can advance the interests of the communicative entity while contributing to the improvement of society. That in itself already represents strategic action, as per Dewey (1954). Furthermore, many strategic communicators will attest to the notion that the pervasiveness of the public sphere makes them more thoughtful about what and how they communicate about issues, even when they communicate in the marketing and branding context. As Bentele and Nothhaft (2010) succinctly pointed out, the public sphere has become "a corridor that limits your maneuverable space when trying to make sense out of reality" (p. 114).

While technology facilitates public communication, there also are indicators that it might pose a future danger to that very important contribution through the process of "datafication", which means putting phenomena "in a quantified format so it can be tabulated and analyzed" (Mayer-Schönberger & Cukier, 2013, p. 77). Datafication is the process underlying the concept of big data, and which allow people to collect vast quantities of data through the use of algorithms. While it allows for the collection of vast amounts of data, it simultaneously allows for the collection of unique data from individuals, which already is used to target communication with those individuals, particularly on the Internet. Anybody who has shopped online will know how the products and services searched beforehand keep cropping up while one is using the Internet.

What people do not realize is the extent to which they offer up information willingly in the era of big data simply because the nature of this kind of data is so different from what we generally perceive as data. Mayer-Schönberger and Cukier (2013) described datafication as the ability to

(take) information about all things under the sun – including ones we never used to think of as information at all, such as a person’s location, the vibrations of an engine, or the stress on a bridge – and transform it into a data format to make it quantified.

p. 15

This data is vastly different from statistical data, as the authors explain. Because of the sheer quantity of data available it questions the need for statistical analysis, which is based on random sampling and analysis of subsets of populations. Because big data focuses on real-time data and the collection of multiple data sets on, for instance, one individual, “the danger shifts from privacy to probability: algorithms will predict the likelihood that one . . . will default on a mortgage (and be denied a loan), or commit a crime (and perhaps get arrested in advance)” (p. 16). There is already evidence that gaming companies are collecting evidence on gaming behavior of individuals and translating that into a profile of the individual that determines her or his suitability for certain types of jobs based on how the individual progresses through a game (Wheatley, 2013).

In the same way big data poses a danger to individual privacy it also poses a danger to the public sphere. It will be very tempting to strategic communicators to rather communicate with individuals on issues, products and services based on algorithms that expose attitudes and behaviors than to communicate with them through open and public communication. This issue highlights the tension between the role of the public and private spheres in society. Although it is not apparent, the danger of big data for individual privacy is directly linked to the public sphere. When this kind of data and the ability to communicate with individuals did not exist, the public sphere was the way in which people were informed and educated themselves on social issues. This also ensured that policy and other issues were debated openly and transparently. When the need for communicating publicly on issues of public concern disappears society loses its ability to collectively protect itself from less transparent practices. For instance, hypothetically a pharmaceutical company might develop a controversial product such as a vaccine and only market it to doctors and individuals who, based on big data, have the potential to develop the disease. At present such a product will most likely be advertised and discussed in the media in an effort to promote it. The company might, however, be tempted to keep the information from the public sphere because it is controversial. Because they have the names and profiles of people who might be possible patients they can with ease personalize messages to those individuals and keep all controversy from the public.

Thus, although certain communication can and should sometimes be private, it is crucial that some information be released in the public sphere for debate and discussion. It will be important for strategic communicators to keep the balance between these two interests and not to be tempted to keep private communication that should have been public and transparent.

The Nature of Communication in the Strategic Process

The notion that communication can be controlled and regulated is now largely redundant. In fact, one of the most important emerging perspectives in strategic communication is the rejection of linearity in the communication process. It is indeed tempting to still teach and adhere to Shannon and Weaver’s (1949) transmission model, which is simple and easy to grasp. It also still has a use in the sense that it reminds practitioners in particular to think about media used for a particular communication process, message construction, and target audiences (Boromisza-Habashi, 2013). As Bell, Golombisky, and Holtzhausen (2002) argued, the transmission model only investigated “how we get information from here to there” (p. 5). While this remains a valid question, the more important one really is: “What happens to communication in that process and how is meaning shaped and co-created?”

Both symbolic interactionism (Bauer, 1964; Blumer, 1969; Carey, 1989; Thayer, 1968) and postmodernism (through the extensive writings of Michel Foucault and Jean-François Lyotard)

have deeply changed perspectives on the role of communication in organizations and society, and they both form the basis of today's communication theories. Collectively known as the constitutive model of communication, these theories represent "a dialogical-dialectical disciplinary matrix" (Craig, 1999, p. 120) that represents seven different theoretical approaches to communication theory and, broadly speaking, focuses on how individual and shared meanings are shaped through the communication process itself. What is particularly important here for the communication strategist is to understand that all meaning is constructed through a communication process that often focuses on opposing arguments, through what Ermarth (2001, p. 211) referred to as the "linguistic in-between." Without communication there cannot be co-construction of meaning. For the strategic communicator this might occasionally be in a face-to-face context but it mostly relates to communication through other channels.

Whereas the transmission model focuses on how to get information from one point to another, constitutive communication focuses on the importance of communication to bring about actual change and action, as Dewey (1954) argued. From this perspective the role of the strategic communicator is not to send information via the most effective channel, although that is an important starting point. More importantly, the role of the practitioner is to send information that can act as the point of departure for meaning creation between a communicative entity and its stakeholders, which can actually lead to social change and social action. Indeed, an organization has to act publicly (Hallahan, 2010). Instead of transmitting information, with the underlying assumptions that one can control communication so transmitted, strategic communication increasingly focuses on the process of communication, which might take place over long periods of time and stretch over time long after a message has been transmitted.

With their focus on action, it is also important for strategic communicators to understand and utilize "mediatization," which "*is a concept used to analyze critically the interrelation between changes in media and communication on the one hand, and changes in culture and society on the other*" [italics in original] (Couldry & Hepp, 2013, p. 197). Mediatization goes beyond media effects:

Put simply, something is going on with media on our lives, and it is deep enough not to be reached simply by accumulating more and more specific studies that analyze this newspaper, describe how that program was produced, or trace how particular audiences make sense of that film on a particular occasion.

p. 191

As "social" communicators strategic communication practitioners and audiences use the media on a daily basis, meaning here media in their broadest sense to include all forms of Internet and electronic communication. In the past strategic communication largely focused on mediatization from an institutional perspective. In this perspective media are institutions that have to be understood through "media logic"—understanding how the media operate—and is the reason why politicians and other interest groups who wish to have access to the media hire communication practitioners to do this work for them (p. 196). However, following the constitutive model of communication described above, it is important for communication practitioners to also be aware of how the media are and can be used to shape social and cultural realities.

From a theoretical perspective it is the convergence of these two strong theoretical traditions in communication that sets strategic communication apart from other communication disciplines. It forces academics and practitioners alike to consider both the constitutive nature of all communication and the role of media in the strategic communication process. Thus, instead of only viewing media as channels of communication and audiences as the receivers of messages, strategic communicators need to consider how meaning is shaped in the interaction process involving stakeholders and the media practitioners use and how stakeholders interpret and recreate media content in the

process. Only then will strategic communicators truly understand how their practices impact and shape society and bring about change.

The Concept of Emergence

When one lets go of control of communication and meaning creation, the sheer messiness of the communication process can be overwhelming. However, to have a realistic and pragmatic perspective on communication one has to embrace the messiness, risk taking and chaos of communication practice.

One outflow of this reality is the now-familiar concept of *emergence* (Mintzberg, 1990; Quin, Mintzberg, & James, 1991), which often describes strategizing in organizations, and that follows from the concept of constitutive communication, that is, a ritualistic rather than a linear process. Emergent strategy is dependent on the participation of many people including external stakeholders to provide a true richness to the process. Notions of strategy as control have largely been dispelled, depending on how the strategic planning process is executed.

Nonetheless, there is place for both a functionalist and an emerging strategic process in organizations, which depends on transformational and visionary leadership and broad stakeholder participation (Sloan, 2006). Even in transformational leadership the concept of emergence embedded in leadership communication has taken hold (Mitra, 2013). The dialogic activities of the transformational leader allow for change and transformation and result in the transformation of the leader herself. Mitra argues the processes of “both leadership and transformation are incredibly complex, contingent, and interconnected through communication” (p. 397), which all contribute to the messiness of the organizational communication environment.

Communication therefore remains the foundation for both transformational leadership and stakeholder participation, as Sloan (2006) argued. Hafi and Howard (2005, p. 243) argued strategy takes place at an intellectual and practical level and consists of five elements, namely, a leader’s statement, a community’s statement, a guide, building competitive advantage, and a relationship with the environment. Communication underscores all facets of strategizing, albeit functionalist or emergent.

A functionalist approach to communication planning requires a regular review of the strategic plans. While emergent strategy similarly focuses on the continuous shaping of strategy through communication, it also is closely linked to daily strategic thinking and actions of communication practitioners at all levels, focusing on practice and tactics to support the overall strategy. Creativity and innovation is an essential part of strategy execution (Bigler, 2004).

Lastly, emergent strategy emphasizes an important role for strategic communicators, namely, to ensure broad participation of stakeholders, particularly internal stakeholders. This has the potential to be a stumbling block for communicators because they have to convince organizational leaders that internal stakeholders can add value to the process, and have to assuage the fears of middle managers who often feel threatened by communicative processes that might expose their weaknesses. Holtzhausen (2012) argued strategy is “the most inclusive, although conflicting and contradictory, descriptions of the field of communication practice” (p. 158). It is inclusive because it “emphasizes communication as a management practice . . . (and) allows for the study of participatory communication practices, which include stakeholder communication, change management, and complex analyses or organizational environments and their contribution to emergent strategy” (p. 158). It also, as mentioned, requires the application of both the overarching theoretical approaches in communication, namely constitutive communication and mediated communication.

Communalities Across Areas of Practice

Despite many attempts to formulate global theories of communication practice, they all fall apart in the face of situational variables such as culture; economic, political and media systems; organizational

variables such as culture, products or services; and many other factors (e.g., Bardhan & Weaver, 2011; Sriramesh & Verčič, 2003). The result is that strategic communication practice is highly situational and that a normative theory of the field is neither practical nor desirable. There are, however, a few practices, approaches or problems that relate to most areas of practice, whether in public diplomacy, politics, government, non-profit or for-profit, and that became evident from the works published in strategic communication specifically since the Hallahan et al. (2007) article and also the chapters in this volume. The most obvious communalities are stakeholders and audiences, media channels, the desire for behavioral outcomes, reputation management, and agency.

Stakeholder–Audience Concepts

In strategic communication stakeholders come in different names and forms, depending on the nature of the communication. For instance, in political communication they might also be called constituents or voters and in non- and for-profits they might come in the form of communities, volunteers, consumers, shareholders, and so forth. Each area of strategic communication practice has several individuals or groups of people with unique features who are affected by the organization or have the ability to affect the organization. So, for the purposes of this discussion, let us call them stakeholders (Phillips & Freeman, 2010).

Depending on the issue at hand, stakeholders can indeed be defined very broadly. For instance, a corporation or industry that benefits greatly from tax breaks needs to view the taxpaying community as a stakeholder group to whom it should be accountable. Although this does not mean that a group of taxpayers should be involved in the strategic planning process, it does mean that transparency and fiscal responsibility should be priorities in the strategic communication process.

One of the biggest problems in strategic communication is the segmentation of stakeholders based on the pre-determined skill sets of the communication practitioners involved, e.g., human resources practitioners communicate with employees, marketing communicators communicate with consumers, public relations practitioners communicate with publics and the media, other practitioners target business-to-business, and so forth. Although these communicators need to work together, this often does not happen because they do not have the knowledge to communicate beyond their expertise or are cautious of exceeding their scope of responsibilities. This leads to unnecessary fragmentation of strategic communication activities in organizations. This is often exacerbated in education when communication practice is taught as public relations, advertising, marketing, political or health communication (Holtzhausen, 2008).

From the onset the strategic communication project focused on finding those commonalities in practice that will alleviate this problem. One way of determining what a strategic communication practitioner should do is to originate the strategic communication process with the stakeholder-centered approach once the strategic plan has determined the different stakeholder groups. This means instead of determining communication activities on the skill set or specific organizational charge of the communicator, strategic communicators should have the ability to communicate equally well with stakeholders who are consumers, activist groups, communities, other businesses, individual power holders, to mention a few, as well as the media. That is what a unified body of strategic communication should mean, and it is the reason why many universities have ceased to teach students in previously defined professional categories in favor of broader professional communication education. This allows graduates with the requisite skill sets and knowledge bases to communicate equally well with all stakeholder groups using all available media channels and so provide a more holistic approach to strategic communication practice.

Channels

New communication technologies now also demand this broader knowledge of strategic communicators. In the past, media channels were much more controlled and acted as true communication

intermediaries. Holtzhausen (2008) argues that new media platforms, such as the Internet and social media, allow strategic communicators to overcome these divisions and provide them with much more opportunity to follow a holistic approach that allows for both persuasive and collaborative communication depending on the stakeholders involved. Adopting a stakeholder-centered approach helps strategic communicators to use a wide variety of communication techniques while maintaining consistent messages across communication platforms. These can include purchased media space; owned media such as websites, blogs, and social media; and earned media, which refers to publicity, retweets, Facebook Likes, and comments to online postings.

Furthermore, as discussed earlier in this chapter, new analytics now provides the ability to micro-segment audiences or even to target individuals, providing more opportunities to tailor messages to individual stakeholder needs. New communication technologies support many different networks, which bring many different kinds of people together in multiple networks (Barney, 2004). Stakeholders belong to many different networks simultaneously and each network represents a different stakeholder identity. This further emphasizes the need for a thorough knowledge of different stakeholder groups, an understanding of the different networks they participate in and the communicator's ability to reach them through different media and platforms.

Behavioral Outcomes

A cohesive focus on the behavioral outcomes of stakeholders has consistently been one of the most neglected areas in strategic communication, although this is one metric most expected from practitioners. This also is partly due to the differentiation between areas of practice. Public relations practitioners generally focus their attention on attitudes and communicative action as outcomes of their work, whereas advertising practitioners and marketers focus on Return on Investment (ROI).

However, in the case of advertising ROI is not a realistic measure either. While advertising contributes to marketing outcomes, it is only a small part of the overall marketing effort. Advertisers struggle as much with measuring the direct outcome of advertising initiatives as public relations practitioners do with assessing the outcomes of their efforts. This is evident from two theoretical approaches in advertising and public relations respectively that focus on behavioral communication outcomes, namely the theory of planned behavior in advertising (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010), which mostly focuses on the purchase behavior of consumers, and the situational theory of publics in public relations (J. E. Grunig, 1989, 1997). Both these theories are predictive in the sense that they predict how communication behavior will lead to actual behavior. The situational theory of publics predicts when members of publics will become activists. The theory of reasoned action argues behavioral intent is a reasonably reliable predictor of purchasing behavior, assuming a person is able to act and his or her goals have not changed. Bringing these two theoretical strands together has been the major focus of Werder and Schweickart (2013), who have made considerable strides in this regard.

Nonetheless, the ability of strategic communicators to link their work directly with desired outcomes remains one of the most allusive endeavors of the field. Christen and Hallahan (2013) similarly focus on the need for behavioral outcomes of strategic communication campaigns and argues that even the desired behavioral outcomes are unclear and contested. Hallahan points out that most of the concepts used to measure behavioral outcomes, such as relationships, reputation, engagement, and so forth, are quite vague and once again cannot be tied directly to the work of strategic communicators alone.

One area that strategic communicators have neglected, and which might provide guidance in determining behavioral outcomes, is consumer behavior, typically the domain of marketers. An area of consumer behavior that relates to both the situational theory of publics and the theory of reasoned action is the Behavioral Sequence Model (BSM) (Rossiter & Percy, 1997), which might further enhance researchers' understanding of behavioral outcomes. Despite the fact that many strategic

communicators resolutely ignore the role of visual images in building relationships and reputation, the BSM focuses on the process of decision-making in the purchasing process and is related to a product's brand. Percy and Rosenbaum-Elliott (2012) argued that there is a strong relationship between the purchase of the final product or service and brand awareness and brand attitude. This directly ties media strategy to the decision-making process. Understanding the decision-making process is a key factor. Percy and Rosenbaum-Elliott identify five decision roles in the consumer process: initiator, influencer, decider, purchaser and user. They argue, "An important key to effective marketing communication is to identify the point in the decision process at which a message of some kind might make a positive contribution" (p. 135). What is noteworthy about this approach is the way in which they tie message strategy to desired behavioral outcomes and media selection.

Realistically, the work of strategic communicators might always be viewed as an indirect contribution to organizational goals unless stakeholder behavior can be tied directly to those goals. This might well be possible in the near future when big data and the use of special algorithms can establish the correlation of strategic communication strategies, stakeholder behavior and organizational outcomes.

The Imperative of Reputation

Reputation management has traditionally been the purview of business and management scholars (Carroll, 2013). Lately, the role of communication in establishing and managing corporate reputation has become more prominent in the strategic communication literature but there is no consensus on a definition or the constructs that would measure reputation (Stacks, Dodd, & Men, 2013). It clearly "takes a village" to establish an organization's reputation because its financial performance, corporate citizenship and employee relations, among others, all contribute to reputation.

In a recent study in German corporations top executives and communicators shared the opinion that a communication strategist should mainly foster trust and create positive images (Zerfass, Schwalbach, Bentele, & Sherzada, 2014). These findings illustrate the importance of reputation management. However, although many try to enhance reputation, measuring reputation as a component of strategic communication is at best vague (Liehr, Peters, & Zerfass, 2010). In a summary of key constructs used to measure reputation Stacks et al. (2013) identified visibility, credibility, authenticity, transparency, trust, relationships, and confidence as the drivers of reputation outcomes such as "supportive stakeholder behavior and beneficial business outcomes" (p. 570).

Measuring country reputation has some overlap with corporate reputation measurements but also differs in important ways. Yang, Shin, Lee, & Wrigley (2008) applied the Fombrun-RI Country Reputation Index (CRI) to measure South Korea's reputation and identified emotional appeal; physical appeal; financial appeal; leadership appeal; cultural appeal; political appeal and global appeal as the constructs that should be used to measure country reputation. In a longitudinal study with three waves of data collection over 14 months Fullerton and Holtzhausen (2012) used these constructs and their measures to determine the impact of the 2010 FIFA World Cup on the reputation of the host country, South Africa, among Americans. Their analyses consistently yielded a more parsimonious measurement of country reputation, namely, assessment of the country's leadership, affection for the country, and perceptions of a culture unique to the country. In all three waves these three constructs explained more than 70% of the variance in measuring country reputation. In an attempt to determine the role of country image in determining country reputation the researchers asked respondents to provide five words that came to mind immediately when they thought of South Africa (Holtzhausen & Fullerton, 2013). Although a direct relationship between the quantitative and qualitative data could obviously not be established, an analysis of the 973 different words or short phrases extracted from a total 3,183 mentions did reflect the attitudes of respondents in the reputation scale. This serves to indicate that the images people recall when they think of a country or region are valid units of analysis for determining reputation.

The above review of reputational constructs indicates that researchers have some way to go before reaching agreement on the measurement of reputation and also that measuring reputation might be situational. It also shows that isolating the unique role strategic communicators play in establishing reputation is particularly difficult. Nonetheless, it also is apparent that reputation management is one of the roles strategic communicators have in common, no matter the context.

The Agency of Communication Practitioners

The discussion on reputation management as inherent in all strategic communication work also has bearing on the expectations employers have of strategic communicators. The definition of strategic communication put forward in this chapter includes the concept of strategic communicators as acting on behalf of another or others. *Principal-agent theory* holds that principals (owners, shareholders) appoint agents (managers) to act on their behalf (Pratt & Zeckhauser, 1991). This happens when organizations grow too large for principals to do all the work, or when they become geographically dispersed so that principals cannot physically be present. Principals control agents to act on their behalf through contracts, measuring expected outputs and rewards (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013).

Although this is not the only theory of organizational control, it is relevant to strategic communication because of the discipline's agency role in organizations. What makes this problematic for strategic communicators is that there are often divergent expectations of the role of the communication professional in organizations (Zerfass et al., 2014). The success of the relationship between principal and agent is based on the clarity of roles and expectations for outputs against which the performance of agents can be measured. Divergence between the principal and agent on expected performance outcomes can lead to disastrous results for this relationship (see Holtzhausen, 2012 for a comprehensive discussion of communication agency). These discrepancies are often further exacerbated in twenty-first century organizations with less clearly-defined organizational structures and hierarchies (Nolan & Wood, 2003). Traditional approaches propose regulative solutions like mechanisms of control and hierarchical planning to solve the inherent challenges of principal-agent relationships. However, agency in modern organizations is a multi-faceted phenomenon that includes networks of delegation and responsibilities as well as governing structures reaching far beyond markets and hierarchies—values and norms as well as common scripts and shared beliefs are guiding behavior (Zerfass et al., 2014). From this point of view, strategic communication requires a basic understanding and support for its key principles by employers and top executives alike. This means that walls within education have to be torn down—not only within communication schools, but also between the latter and business schools, engineering departments and others, who often stick to transmission models of communication and functional modes of aligning action.

Challenges in Strategic Communication Research Methods

Strategic communication research is also related to the previous discussion, particularly research relating to the measurement of campaign outcomes, roles and performance expectations of practitioners. As mentioned already in this chapter, it is difficult to measure directly the contribution of communicators to ROI and other key organizational metrics. The argument that many communication practices, such as the prevention of crises and monitoring debates among stakeholders to guide strategic decisions, cannot be measured in financial terms remains valid.

This might be changing as big data provide other avenues of directly linking practitioner communication actions to the behavioral actions of stakeholders. For instance, with a smart algorithm a practitioner's post on a company website can follow the person clicking on and reading the post to her subsequent actions generated by that post. The algorithm can compile a quite comprehensive profile of that unique visitor, which can provide an indication of the way in which the original post

affected the reader. Mayer-Schönberger and Cukier (2013) explain that big data not only refers to data sets with millions of data points but also to comprehensive data of, for instance, the complete DNA profile of a single human being. One can thus argue that through the use of big data one can collect a comprehensive data set of a single person's actions and behaviors that can help communicators to better track individual behavior of stakeholders as they relate to communication activities of the organization. While CEOs are still reluctant to embrace big data because of high costs, lack of knowledge and understanding, and the data's inability to provide specific solutions to business problems, 79% of executives believe they will embrace big data in the next five years because it will reach its full potential in the next two to five years (Loechner, 2014).

Big data is already occupying the thoughts of many researchers on the challenges this development brings to traditional data collection methods, for example traditional quantitative survey methodology and qualitative data collection such as the in-depth interview (Boyd & Crawford, 2013; Savage & Burrows, 2007; Smith, 2013). Describing it as a "coming crisis," Savage and Burrows (2007, p. 885) point out that big data will eventually make survey research redundant. Because survey research works with samples of populations it can never provide the same comprehensive data big data provides, particularly in institutional contexts, such as those strategic communicators occupy. They argued that "where data on whole populations are routinely gathered as a by-product of institutional transactions, the sample survey seems a very poor instrument" (p. 891). One example they mentioned is how telephone records of clients of a telephone company can provide better data on communication networks than traditional network analysis could ever accomplish. Another example is Amazon, which bases its marketing of books not on a survey of demographic and socio-graphic data of clients but rather on the information it has collected from each individual client to identify which books he might be interested in. Millions of data points are collected on individuals over their lifetime and as a result these organizations "can hence bypass the principles of inference altogether and work directly with the real, complete, data derived from all the transactions in the system" (p. 891). This is exactly the type of proprietary data that strategic communicators can obtain from their organizations, and that is generally inaccessible to academic researchers.

It will be very important for strategic communicators to become familiar with big data, its benefits and its shortcoming. Smith (2013) raised serious concerns over the thoughtless use of data, particularly that which is collected on the Internet, through social media, or using existing administrative databases as mentioned above. Although he yielded that new communication technologies are useful in the study of public opinion, he believes survey research can still provide a more accurate reflection of public opinion. He argued for the hybrid use of big data and survey research to "boost standard surveys of public opinion and other topics with auxiliary data from alternative sources" such as social media and the Internet (p. 226).

The measurement of social and online media indeed provides new methods for measuring strategic communication outcomes. However, strategic communicators still have to come to grips with the real value of these metrics. Baym (2013) argued that although social media metrics and big data are used to determine their economic value, qualitative analysis of social media "may be more appropriate for assessing social and personal values" (p. 1). Unique visitors, site visits and click-throughs might provide data on the number of visitors but they do not provide the rich data that the qualitative analysis of Twitter feeds, retweets and Facebook Likes or comments can provide.

Conclusion

The above discussion does not only reaffirm some of the basic foundations of the field of strategic communication; it also introduces new perspectives and challenges, particularly in terms of how the performance of strategic communicators are measured. The performance expectations of strategic communicators are still ill-defined, which is a direct result of the principal-agent relationship.

Strategic communicators also face a challenge in truly embracing processes of meaning-making beyond the transmission of messages and in bringing about and measuring behavioral outcomes that are aligned with the strategic goals of the communicative entity and the public interest. It will be up to academics, researchers and communication professionals to discuss, debate and investigate these issues. The first decade of the twenty-first century has introduced many new developments that could never even be imagined as little as ten years ago. The chapters in this book are a first attempt to address some of these issues and problems while also providing a map for future research.

Linking research on communication and the public sphere, organizations and stakeholder relationships and strategy and decision-making in multiple agency settings, to the quest to define and evaluate measurable results that drive overall organizational goals, remains a major challenge. Interdisciplinary approaches are needed that deviate from the well-known paths, that is, traditional theories and research methods of single disciplines like public relations, organizational communication, advertising or public diplomacy—to name just a few examples. Combining insights from several fields might, in a first step, result in concepts that could be criticized as being more speculative and less focused than traditional approaches. But the reality of social life and strategic communication is neither segmented in boxes nor dedicated to serving the rules of the academic community.

Strategic communication is a complex and emergent phenomenon that requires appropriate theories and studies. In a review of the articles published in the *International Journal of Strategic Communication* from 2007 to 2013 Holtzhausen and Zerfass (2013) found that the vision set out in Hallahan et al. (2007) to find commonalities in practice across multiple disciplines was well underway. However, strategic communication was still a work in progress and by no means a mature field. The study determined that strategic communication was indeed a process used in many different communication fields but that the process itself might have limited usefulness for many fields. They argued, for instance, that not all health communication is strategic and not all strategic communication is health related. Similarly, the concept of *publics* defines public relations but in strategic communication publics are but one stakeholder group. This also is true for the concept of *consumers* in marketing or *voters* in political communication. Nonetheless, this does point to the most important goal of the strategic communication process: to find commonalities among areas of communication practice that can inform all academics and practitioners and help build a new group of practitioners who have a much broader understanding of what strategic communication truly entails.

Researchers should be courageous and join the journey towards a research agenda that really matters for the practice. Communication science has often be criticized for not being involved in policy-making and not answering key questions of society in the information age—like the distribution of power (Castells, 2009) and privacy (Buchmann, 2013). The field of strategic communication offers multiple opportunities to explore these and other upcoming issues from the point of communicators whose activities shape the field, from their principals who set goals and expect results, from stakeholders who are involved in processes of communication and reality construction, and from the public sphere, which can be served by professional and transparent communication aligned to strategic goals.

Note

¹ The authors wish to thank Kirk Hallahan, Colorado State University, for his insightful review of this chapter.

References

- Bardhan, N., & Weaver, C. K. (Eds.). (2011). *Public relations in global cultural contexts. Multiparadigmatic perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Barney, D. (2004). *The network society*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Bauer, R. A. (1964). The obstinate audience: The influence process from the point of view of social communication. *American Psychologist*, *19*, 319–328.

- Baym, N. K. (2013). Data not seen: The uses and shortcomings of social media metrics. *First Monday*, 18(10), 1–16.
- Bell, E., Golombisky, K., & Holtzhausen, D. R. (2002). *Communication Rules!* School of Mass Communication. University of South Florida. Tampa, FL.
- Bentele, G., & Nothhaft, H. (2010). Strategic communication and the public sphere from a European perspective. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 4(2), 93–116.
- Bigler, W. R. (2004). *The new science of strategy execution. How established firms become fast, sleek wealth creators.* Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: perspectives and method.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Boromisza-Habashi, D. (2013). Which way is forward in communication theorizing? An interview with Robert T. Craig. *Communication Theory*, 23(4), 417–432.
- Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2013). Critical questions for Big Data. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662–679.
- Buchmann, J. (Ed.). (2013). *Internet privacy: options for adequate realisation.* Heidelberg, Germany: Springer VS.
- Carey, J. W. (1989). *Communication as culture. Essays on media and society.* Boston, MA: Unwin-Hyman.
- Carroll, C. E. (2013). Corporate reputation and the multi-disciplinary field of communication. In C. E. Carroll (Ed.), *The handbook of communication and corporate reputation.* (pp. 1–10). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Christen, C. T., & Hallahan, K. (2013). Psychological processing. In R.L. Heath (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of public relations* (2nd ed.) (Vol. 2, pp. 705–709). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2013). Conceptualizing mediatization. *Communication Theory*, 23(3), 191–202.
- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9, 119–161.
- Dewey, J. (1954). *The public and its problems.* Athens, OH: Ohio University Press. (Original work published 1927).
- Ermath, E. D. (2001). Agency in the discursive condition. *History and Theory*, 40, 34–48.
- Farwell, J. P. (2012). *Persuasion and power: the art of strategic communication.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Fullerton, J., & Holtzhausen, D. (2012). Americans' attitudes toward South Africa: A study of country reputation and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 8(3/4), 1–15.
- Grunig, J. E. (1989). Sierra Club study shows who become activists. *Public Relations Review*, 15(3), 3–24.
- Grunig, J. E. (1997). A situational theory of publics: Conceptual history, recent challenges, and new research. In D. Moss, T. MacManus & D. Verčič (Eds.), *Public relations research: An international perspective* (pp. 3–48). London, England: International Thomson Business Press.
- Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (2002). *Excellent public relations and effective organizations. A study of communication management in three countries.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (2006). Political communication in media society—Does society still enjoy an epistemic dimension? The impact of normative theory on empirical research. *Communication Theory*, 16(4), 411–426.
- Hafsi, T., & Howard, T. (2005). Reflections on the field of strategy. In S. W. Floyd, J. Roos, C. D. Jacobs & F. W. Kellermanns (Eds.), *Innovating strategy process.* (pp. 239–246). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Hallahan, K. (2010). Being public. Publicity as public relations. In R.L. Heath (Ed.), *Sage handbook of public relations* (pp. 523–545). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hallahan, K., Holtzhausen, D. R., Van Ruler, B., Verčič, D., & Sriramesh, K. (2007). Defining strategic communication. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 1(1), 3–35.
- Hanisch, C. (1970). The personal is political. In S. Firestone & A. Koedt (Eds.), *Notes from the second year: Women's liberation.* New York: Sulamith Firestone and Anne Koedt.
- Hatch, M. J., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2013). *Organization theory. Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives* (3rd ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Holtzhausen, D., & Fullerton, J. (2013). The 2010 FIFA World Cup and South Africa: A study of longer term effects and moderators of country reputation. *Journal of Marketing Communications.*
- Holtzhausen, D. R. (2008). Strategic communication. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (Vol. 10, pp. 4848–4855). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Holtzhausen, D. R. (2012). *Public relations as activism. Postmodern approaches to theory and practice.* New York, NY: Routledge.
- Holtzhausen, D. R., & Zerfass, A. (2013). Strategic communication—Pillars and perspectives on an alternate paradigm. In K. Sriramesh, A. Zerfass, & J.-N. Kim (Eds.), *Current Trends and Emerging Topics in Public Relations and Communication Management* (pp. 283–302). New York, NY: Routledge.

Opportunities and Challenges

- Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1984). Synopses and detailed replies to critics. In L. Kohlberg (Ed.), *Essays on moral development*. (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Liehr, K., Peters, P., & Zerfass, A. (2010). Reputation messen und bewerten - Grundlagen und Methoden. In J. Pfannenbergh & A. Zerfass (Eds.), *Wertschöpfung durch Kommunikation: Strategisches Kommunikations-Controlling in der Unternehmenspraxis* [Value creation by communication] (pp. 153-164). Frankfurt, Germany: Frankfurter Allgemeine Buch.
- Loechner, J. (2014). *Big data pros and cons*. Retrieved January 28, 2014, from <http://www.mediapost.com/publications/article/216665/big-data-pros-and-cons.html>.
- Mahoney, J. (2013). *Strategic Communication - Principles and Practices*. South Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer-Schönberger, V., & Cukier, K. (2013). *Big Data. A revolution that will transform how we live, work, and think*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Mitra, R. (2013). From transformational leadership to leadership trans-formations. *Communication Theory*, 23(4), 395-416.
- Nolan, P., & Wood, S. (2003). Mapping the future of work. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41(2), 165-174.
- Paul, C. (2011). *Strategic communication: origins, concepts, and current debates*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Percy, L., & Rosenbaum-Elliott, R. (2012). *Strategic Advertising Management* (4th ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, R. A., & Freeman, R. E. (Eds.). (2010). *Stakeholders*. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.
- Pratt, J. W., & Zeckhauser, R. Z. (Eds.). (1991). *Principals and agents: The structure of business* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Quinn, J. E., Mintzberg, H., & James, R. M. (1991). *The strategy process: Concepts, contexts, and cases*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rosser, R., & Percy, L. (1997). *Advertising communication and promotion management* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Savage, M., & Burrows, R. (2007). The coming crisis of empirical sociology. *Sociology*, 41(5), 885-899.
- Self, C. (2010). Hegel, Habermas, and community: The public in the new media era. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 4(2), 78-92.
- Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (1949). *The mathematical theory of communication*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Sloan, J. (2006). *Learning to think strategically*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier.
- Smith, T. (2013). Survey-research paradigms old and new. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 25(2), 218-229.
- Sriramesh, K., & Verčič, D. (Eds.). (2003). *The global public relations handbook*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stacks, D. W., Dodd, M. D., & Men, L. R. (2013). Corporate reputation measurement and evaluation. In C. E. Carroll (Ed.), *The handbook of communication and corporate reputation* (pp. 561-573). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Swindell, C. (2011, May 20). GOP needs viable candidates, *Charleston Gazette*.
- Thayer, L. (1968). *Communication and communication systems in organization, management and interpersonal relations*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Werder, K. P., & Schweickart, T. (2013). *An experimental analysis of message strategy influence on receiver variables: Advancing an integrated model for explaining the communication behavior of publics*. Paper presented at the 16th Annual International Public Relations Research Conference., Miami, FL.
- Wheatley, M. (2013). How The Gambling Industry Is Betting On Big Data. siliconANGLE. Retrieved on July 25, 2014 from <http://siliconangle.com/blog/2013/08/20/how-the-gambling-industry-is-betting-on-big-data/>
- Yang, S.-U., Shin, H., Lee, J.-H., & Wrigley, B. (2008). Country reputation in multidimensions: Predictors, effects, and communication channels. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 20(4), 421-440.
- Zerfass, A., Schwalbach, J., Bentele, G., & Sherzada, M. (2014). Corporate communications from the top and from the center: Comparing experiences and expectations of CEOs and communicators. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 8(2), 61-78.