GLOBAL PROTOCOL ON ETHICS IN PUBLIC RELATIONS

Chris Skinner[1], Gary Mersham[2] and Jean Valin[3]

Abstract

This article explores the creation of a Global Protocol on Ethics in Public Relations. It begins by looking into the global ethical debate. It examines existing Codes of Ethics of a selection of public relations institutes and associations around the world, provides comparative analysis of these codes and discusses the pros and cons of their enforcement. It suggests that the immediate way forward in a highly litigious world is to provide some values-based guidance to member associations together with access to an evolving database of case studies illustrating ethical problems. In the medium term more effective sanctions may be possible, although not immediately obvious.

Key words: public relations, ethical behaviour, moral responsibility, social conscience, norms of acceptability, value orientations, need for benchmarking, enforcement, code of professional standards, moral regeneration.

Introduction

Commentators point to a postmodern crisis of moral responsibility and a paralyzing sense of inability to 'make the difference' in a complex world (Coolen 1987:41; Kaufmann 1995:75). Castells (2000:4) refers to this as "the implicit assumption of society's powerlessness over its destiny".

Many incidents and issues are commonly cited as indicators of the contemporary malaise. The following discursive fragments characterize the ethical crisis discourse:
'the collapsing technology and media bubble'
'the cult of the CEO'
'Enron, Xerox, WorldCom and Arthur Andersen'
'the investment bank scandals'
'the crisis of accounting'
'the rise of the NGO and civic society'
'the rise of religious fundamentalism'

Ethics is of particular concern for public relations practitioners, not the least because "practitioners are aware that public relations has a reputation for unethical conduct" (Aronoff & Baskin 1983). This concern is highlighted given that the ethical dimension of all human activities in a networked and globalized world has been thrown into stark relief by recent events. The question of ethical behaviour, from the level of the

[1] Chris Skinner (tsstoti@mweb.co.za) is HOD Public Relations, Durban Institute of Technology, PO Box 494, Umbogintwini 4120, South Africa, Tel (+2731) 904 3315, Fax (+2731) 904 2594.
[2] Gary Mersham (gmersham@pan.uzulu.ac.za) is Professor and HOD, Department of Communication Science, University of Zululand, Private Bag X1001, Kwadlangezwa, 3886.
[3] Jean Valin (jean.valin@justice.gc.ca) is Associate Director general-Communications at the Canadian Department of Justice and Chair-elect of the Global Allaince, 284 Wellington st Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8….

individual, through the totality of organisational manifestations to the level of national and international bodies, has become the number one issue on the global agenda.

Business is not immune to this concern and can no longer hide behind the motto “the business of business is business”. Vogl (2002) points out that never before has there been so many social responsibility issues on the agenda to threaten trust in business.

Old concerns, new models

According to the philosopher Kurt Bayertz, the classical model of moral and ethical responsibility relates almost exclusively to accountability or imputation. It has three basic elements:

1. the causation of certain negative effects by the actions of a particular human agent or agents

2. the presence of certain subjective factors, such as the intention to inflict harm and foreknowledge of the effects of one's actions

3. the application of a set of moral values attributed to a particular society.

   (Bayertz 1995:14-15).

In this classical model, a person or organisation is morally in error if the elements of causation, intention or foreknowledge and a societal framework of accepted moral values can be specified.

However, the impact of globalisation and new technologies (not the least being information technology and other automated technologies that do not require direct intervention of human agents (see Ladd 1991:666 and De Villiers 2002:18) and the resultant interconnectedness and complexity they bring, can make such causality linkages difficult to establish. Additionally, the application of a set of moral values acceptable in one society or country may not necessarily be acceptable in another society as developed, developing and under-developed sectors of the world find themselves inexorably drawn to finding common ground.

One might immediately ask, “What are the commonalties in the codes of ethics laid down by public relations associations throughout the world?”.

Castells (2000) in his book *The rise of the network society* sets out a theory which casts some light on the impact of the communication revolution, in which public relations practitioners play a major role, in terms of globalization. He argues that “for the first time in history, the basic unit of economic organization is not a subject, be it individual (such as the entrepreneur, or the entrepreneurial family) or collective (such as the capitalist class, the corporation or the state)… *the unit is the network*, made up of a variety of subjects and organizations, relentlessly modified as networks adapt to supportive environments and market structures” (Castells 2000:214, original emphasis).

He suggests that there is a common cultural code of values that forms the glue of the network, but that it is transient in nature. It is made of “many cultures, many values,

many projects, which cross through the minds of and inform the various participants in the networks, changing at the same pace as the network's members", constantly seeking a forever moving horizon of consensus. It is, he argues, "a culture of the ephemeral, a culture of each strategic decision, a patchwork of experiences and interests, rather than a charter of rights and obligations" Castells 2000:214). The implication for the practice of public relations is challenging and begs the question "How can we understand and track this dynamic and shifting consensus?"

Ethics and the organization

Organizational theorists long have recognized that bureaucratic organizational structures allow people to avoid taking responsibility for unethical actions (Conrad & Poole 1998:413). In some cases the structure or 'standard operating procedures' of an organization have the unintended effect encouraging unethical decisions. Lower-level employees are allowed only to implement established policies and procedures, not to make them. As long as they act in ways that are consistent with those policies, they can claim not to be responsible for their actions, even if they are illegal or unethical. Upper-level employees also are able to deny responsibility because they only establish policies and procedures (which almost never are illegal or unethical in themselves), and not make the illegal or unethical decision (Jackall 1983; Scott & Hart 1989).

As a result, in bureaucratic organizations, it is easy to rationalize ethical considerations as 'somebody else's responsibility'.

In addition, in very large or very complex organizations, tasks usually are broken into very small components. Each employee deals with such a small part of an overall process that she or he may not realize that the activity as a whole is improper or will be revealed as such with hindsight. Secretaries shred paper, not knowing that the documents have been subpoenaed by a court of law; truck drivers dump their loads in landfill dumps, not realizing that their cargoes contain asbestos that will have long term impacts on people's health; accountants artificially reduce costs or artificially increase income through 'creative accounting' that eventually lead to financial crises; marketers promote pharmaceuticals that eventually lead genetic defects; while their public relations counterparts communicate messages that present their organizations as 'green', 'caring', 'trustworthy' and 'ethical'.

A final, 'hidden' factor revolves around the 'unobtrusive control' generated through 'corporate culture' (Conrad & Poole 1998: 119-120; 413). One characteristic of so-called 'strong culture' organizations is the high level of commitment shown by their employees. These employees are 'created' through cultural strategies of organizing highly capable individuals who are committed to their organization and its success and willing to take risks and act creatively to ensure that it succeeds. Unless prohibitions against illegal or unethical activities is a core organizational value to which employees feel they have contributed to in terms of policy formulation, other cultural strategies of organizing may actually encourage it. Indeed, given the herd mentality of entire industries –not to mention stock market players- core organizational values transcend individual organizations and affect the mindset of all. Hence the need for global guidance in the area of ethics.

Neither the bureaucratic structure of traditional organizations nor cultural strategies of organizing are intended to encourage employees to decide to act in illegal or unethical ways. But they create opportunities and incentives for them to do so. An unintended consequence of ethical environments in which ethical codes are confusing, ambiguous, and not discussed is to encourage employees to act in unethical ways and to do so even if they have highly ethical personal moral codes. As a result, employees become 'ethical segregationists' who use one moral code at work and another in their outside lives. Negative ethical environments and rules of organizational survival can overcome personal moral codes (Conrad & Poole 1998:414). Gandy (1989:131-6) avers that "public relations dominates policy debates through its ability to mobilize information resources on behalf of powerful policy actors". Public relations then cannot escape the responsibility of facilitating communication and debate to bring about formulation of ethical policy among not only organizational stakeholders, but also among members of its own profession.

In the current philosophical debate in the field of ethics, the model of negative, retrospective moral responsibility (a past action leading to the attribution of moral blame) is increasingly being challenged by a notion of positive, prospective moral responsibility (Bayertz 1995:42-7; Jonas 1984:123; Mitcham 1987:22-7). This lends further credence, in the public relations context, to efforts by organisations – and particularly those that profess to represent the interests of public relations practitioners – to proactively seek ways of avoiding and unmasking unethical behaviour.

Public relations practice more than ever depends on how well the profession adapts to current shifts and changes in economic, social and business paradigms and the way in which accommodates the interplay of cultural differences among different societies (Sriramesh & White 1992: 597) Practising ethical public relations has become one of the greatest challenges facing practitioners in the 21st century because it impacts on the management of strategic relationships within the complex dynamics and interrelationships of a global context.

PR as social conscience

Public relations practitioners are often cast as the 'social conscience' of the organization, playing a role in the development of ethical standards within institutions. As long ago as 1959, David Finn argued that public relations should act as "the anvil against which management's moral problems can be hammered". When a public relations policy is being established for an organization, this process entails answering "significant ethical questions" (Finn 1959:9). Other authors such as Mersham *et al* (1995: 44; 85; 123; 142;) draw attention to the increasing need to address the ethical dimensions of public relations practice with regard to corporate social investment. Grunig and White (1992) emphasized the importance of ethical decision-making through the symmetry between personal and professional values, the values of the client organization, and the values of the publics with which the organization has relations in the two-way symmetrical model of public relations practice. They refer to a 'universal moral code, or 'Golden Rule': Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Public relations people should think of how they would like to be treated by others and then treat others in the same way" (Grunig and

White 1992 46).

Public relations has long been criticized for what its antagonists consider to be it's integral bias. At its simplest level, critics argue that the practitioner is simply the robot agent of 'his master's voice'. The reality is quite different. An individual's conduct is measured not only against his or her conscience but also against some norm of acceptability that has been societally, professionally, or organizationally determined (codes of professional conduct or codes of ethics).

At an individual level, the difficulty in ascertaining whether an act is ethical lies in the fact that individuals have different standards and perceptions of what is 'right' and 'wrong.' Often the situation is not black or white, but falls into the grey area. A person's philosophical orientation can also determine how he or she acts in a specific situation. Moreover, the gray areas offer fertile ground for descending into a slippery slope of 'gray' decisions that, in the final analysis, loose perspective and may eliminate all pretense of acting as one would like to be treated.

Wilcox *et al* (1992:117) identify three basic value orientations, namely (1) absolutist, (2) existentialist, and (3) situationalist. The absolutist believes every decision is either 'right' or 'wrong,' regardless of the consequences. The existentialist, whose choices are made without a prescribed value system, decides on the basis of immediate rational choice. The situationalist's decisions are based on what would cause the least harm or most good.

It can be reasonably argued that most practitioners, depending on the actual situation, probably choose a course of action somewhere along the continuum of the three types. We make decisions on the building blocks of truth-telling, promise-keeping, loyalty, and commitment. Public relations professionals have the dilemma of making decisions that satisfy (1) the public interest, (2) the employer, (3) the professional organization's code of ethics, and (4) their personal values. In the ideal world, the four would not conflict. In reality, however, they often do.

Public relations theories have largely emphasized public relations as a strategic management function, a hegemonic practice with its emphasis on dominant Western discourses. These approaches present a world that can be controlled through administrative procedures, the elimination of dissension and conflict, and a stress on 'rational' economic goals (Holtzhausen 2002:32-33). Even when the stated aim of public relations management strategies is two-way symmetrical communication (Grunig 1989:29), practitioners are in the final instance a tool of the organization.

These introductory remarks make it clear that the idea of a global code of ethics for the public relations practitioners around the world is a complex one, fraught with paradox and contradiction yet nonetheless an important imperative. Toth & Heath (1992) have cogently argued that critical approaches to public relations must constantly strive for higher ethical standards, which will be achieved only through a constant scrutiny of its role in society. We would modify this to say that this project must be undertaken in terms of its ethical role within the interlinked plurality of the global context.

This article describes the first steps made in addressing this problem through an international partnership, the Global Alliance for Public Relations and Communications Management Association, formed at the 2000 World Public Relations Congress. Consisting of leaders from 22 international associations the global alliance is committed to elevating the standards of the PR profession and its practitioners around the world.

A key research area identified by the Global Alliance was to establish which countries, through their respective professional bodies (public relations institutes and associations) have established Codes of Ethics as part of their charters. This initial benchmark study was carried out by the Canadian Public Relations Society (CPRS) between 2000 – 2002 under the direction of Mr. Jean Valin and the Public Relations Institute of Southern Africa (PRISA). Annexure A provides a comparative analysis of some 17 public relations associations around the world that responded to the request for information and show that some 60% of associations have based their code on the original Code of Athens. Some of the larger bodies however, for example the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) have drafted their own code.

Further research was undertaken into analyzing the similarities between the various codes particularly identifying key words and concepts used in the definition of individual associations. The words values, honesty, transparency, loyalty and conduct were used extensively. However, much more in-depth benchmarking research is required to draw any final conclusions on what key words or phrases should be used in a universal declaration.

The debate also looked at the pros and cons with regard to the enforcement of national codes of ethics. Some seven representative bodies were approached for their views and their differing viewpoints/approaches are summarized in annexure C. What has become clear from this particular survey is that practically every association differs in the way it enforces its code, that very few complaints are received and that in recommending a course of action there is a very real danger involving individuals and associations in costly litigations.Those who have had experiences with litigation argued the loudest for a different approach based on a less than satisfactory outcome due in large part to the unregulated state of the profession and unclear membership entry rules, at least from a legal standpoint.

The original team consisting of Jean Valin, APR, Fellow and Don LaBelle, Fellow of CPRS – Canada and Chris Skinner, APR, Fellow of PRISA – Southern Africa was expanded to include Jim Lukaszewski, ABC, APR, Fellow of PRSA – USA, Nigel O' Connor, IPR – UK, Tony Muzi Falconi – Italy and Ulli Sats – Estonia in March 2002 to draft and circulate a proposed global code and an early draft was discussed at the Global Alliance meeting held in Bled, Slovenia in June 2002. At this meeting the partners decided to re-circulate more formally the draft proposal and after due consideration the following global protocol was adopted at the GA meeting in New Zealand in February 2003.

GLOBAL PROTOCOL ON ETHICS IN PUBLIC RELATIONS

Declaration of Principles

A profession is distinguished by certain characteristics or attributes, including:

- Mastery of a particular intellectual skill through education and training
- Acceptance of duties to a broader society than merely one's clients/employers
- Objectivity
- High standards of conduct and performance

We base our professional principles therefore on the fundamental value and dignity of the individual. We believe in and support the free exercise of human rights, especially freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the media, which are essential to the practice of good public relations.

In serving the interest of clients and employers, we dedicate ourselves to the goals of better communication, understanding, and cooperation among diverse individuals, groups, and institutions of society. We also subscribe to and support equal opportunity of employment in the public relations profession and lifelong professional development.

We pledge:

- To conduct ourselves professionally, with integrity, truth, accuracy, fairness, and responsibility to our clients, our client publics, and to an informed society;

- To improve our individual competence and advance the knowledge and proficiency of the profession through continuing education and research and where available, through the pursuit of professional accreditation;

- To adhere to the principles of the Code of Professional Standards for the Practice of Public Relations.

CODE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

We are committed to ethical practices, preservation of public trust, and the pursuit of communication excellence with powerful standards of performance, professionalism, and ethical conduct.

Advocacy
We will serve our client and employer interests by acting as responsible advocates and by providing a voice in the market place of ideas, facts, and viewpoints to aid informed public debate.

Honesty
We will adhere to the highest standards of accuracy and truth in advancing the interests of clients and employers.

Integrity
We will conduct our business with integrity and observe the principles and spirit of the Code in such a way that our own personal reputation and that of our employer and the public relations profession in general is protected.

Expertise
We will encourage members to acquire and responsibly use specialized knowledge and experience to build understanding and client/employer credibility. Furthermore we will actively promote and advance the profession through continued professional development, research, and education.

Loyalty
We will insist that members are faithful to those they represent, while honoring their obligations to serve the interests of society and support the right of free expression.

CODE OF PRACTICE
We believe it is the duty of every association and every member within that association that is party to the Code of Professional Standards to

- Acknowledge that there is an obligation to protect and enhance the profession.
- Keep informed and educated about practices in the profession that ensure ethical conduct.
- Actively pursue personal professional development.
- Accurately define what public relations activities can and cannot accomplish.
- Counsel its individual members in proper ethical decision-making generally and on a case specific basis.
- Require that individual members observe the ethical recommendations and behavioral requirements of the Code.

ADVANCING THE CODE
We believe it is the responsibility of each member association to draw upon its own member's experiences to expand the number of examples of good and bad practice so as to better inform members' ethical practices. Experiences should be broadly shared with other members within the association and with the Global Alliance so as to build up case histories that may assist in individual cases throughout the world.

To this end some values-based guidance is provided to members (see Appendix D) and with the help of the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) Board of Ethics a variety of case studies illustrating ethical problems is provided in Appendix E.

The GA recommends that an international committee be established to offer practical advice to practitioners of member associations via the Global Alliance Website and that nominations to this committee be sought from a broad cross section of members representing different parts of the world.

It further recommends that national associations consider the Protocol as a yardstick by which to review and revise their own code within a three-year period (i.e. by 2006).

All national associations seeking membership of the Alliance will be asked to endorse the Protocol upon entry. Such applicant associations will similarly be required to adjust their national codes or certify that they meet the standards within a three-year period.

With the 14 association members of the CONFIARP organisation in Latin America joining the Global Alliance in November 2002, the body now represents more than 100,000 public relations practitioners around the world.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR THE ETHICAL PRACTICE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

A code of ethics and professional conduct is an individual matter that should be viewed as a guide to make sound values-based decisions.
Ethical performance, not principles, is ultimately what counts. No one can dictate precise outcomes for every situation. However, we can apply common values and decision-making processes to arrive at a decision and justify it to others.

In making decisions, we should be guided by a higher sense of serving the public as a whole as opposed to specific constituencies on an exclusive basis.
Consideration should be given to the protection of privacy of individuals and respect for the spirit as well as the letter of applicable laws.

Decision-making guide

1. Define the specific ethical issue/conflict.
2. Identify internal/external factors (e.g. legal, political, social, economic) that may influence the decision.
3. Identify key values that are in question
4. Identify the parties who will be affected by the decision and define the public relations professional's obligation to each.
5. Select the ethical principles to guide the decision-making process.
6. Make a decision and justify it to all parties affected by the decision and to the public if necessary.

CONCLUSION

The research has revealed that there is now a much greater awareness among PR practitioners, management and clients for the need for improved ethical behaviour. More than ever, PR leaders will be required to convince CEO's that being proactive in articulating comprehensive global corporate social responsibility positions is not a matter of choice but a necessity (Vogl 2002).

However, public relations in the majority of countries does not enjoy statutory regulation or protection. Practitioners are not required to register with a professional council before being allowed to practise, as is the case with professionals, for example in the legal, accounting and medical fields (Skinner *et al* 2001:16). As Lukaszewski (2002) argues, without some kind of statutory authority or governmental regulation that provides punitive powers to enforce official codes, enforcement is not feasible. It is clear from the findings of the research that it has not been possible to ensure effective sanctions and therefore it has not been possible to guarantee that practitioners adhere to codes of ethics.

In the Code of Professional Standards' the assumption is that the controlling body has a board or body to deal with ethical violations and that the 'defending' practitioner or organisation is entering a debate where there are counterbalancing arguments and that the board can then make up their minds by weighing the arguments. In reality there may be only one source of information because the defending organisation has the power and resources to put a case whereas the opposition and others may not. If the advocate serves the client and employer interest in that situation, who proposes the countervailing view? What is the public relations professional's duty where there is no such balancing view, given by definition that his or her own will be partisan. Even assuming the individual is truthful, the picture will be partial. What if the public relations professional is perfectly aware that there are different and valid alternative points of view, but these are not in the interests of the employer/client and they remain unvoiced? (Gregory 2003).

Lukaszewski (2002) argues that the Global Alliance is far likelier to gain global cooperation on the basis of a common set of professional behaviour guidelines and aspirations rather than trying to gain consensus on the issues of statutory recognition and mandatory sanctions for offenders. Gregory (2002) agrees that a values based approach is the right one provided there is room for local application within a clear framework.

The current crisis in confidence in business ethics and the growing demand from the public for greater transparency and accountability may however provide just the opportunity that the profession needs to give 'teeth' to its codes. This may therefore be the moment to envisage a situation in which no reputable company will employ a Public Relations company that does not belong to a professional body with strict codes of ethics and no professional body will keep on its books any firm or individual found to transgress such a code.

In the prevailing climate, the Global Protocol on Ethics in Public Relations would seem to be a first step in a process which ultimately could lead to a charter of wider significance and importance in the business and professional world spearheaded by the public relations profession In an effort to prevent poor ethical conduct and

motivate members to seek guidance, the Global Alliance is launching a global web-based service where practitioners can submit a situation to a team of experts who will then de-identify the case and present advice in the form of an additional case study. This service will be available through the GA web site at www.globalpr.org

REFERENCES

Aronoff, C.E and Baskin, O.W. 1983**. Public relations. The profession and practice**. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing.

Bayertz, K. 1995. **Herkunft der Verantwortung. In idem. Hrsg. Verantwortung. Prinzip oder Problem?**, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 3-71.

Castells, M. 2000. **The rise of network society**. (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Coan, S.2002. 'Ethics to save the world'. Interview with Rushworth Kidder, cited in **The Natal Witness**, 2 May.

Conrad, C & Poole, M.S. 1998. **Strategic organizational communication**. (4th ed) New York: Harcourt Brace.

Coolen, T. M. T. 1987. Philosophical anthropology and the problem of responsibility in technology. In Durbin, P. T. ed. **Technology and responsibility**, Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company, 41-65.

De Villiers, E. 2002. 'Who will bear moral responsibility?' **Communicatio**, 28(1):16-21.

Finn, D. 1959. 'Struggle for ethics in Public'. **Harvard Business Review**, January/February: 9-11.

Gandy, O. 1989. 'Public relations and public policy: the structuration of dominance on the information age'. In Toth, E.L. & Heath, R.L. (eds**) Rhetorical and critical approaches to public relations**. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gregory, A. 2002. Remarks made at the inaugural lecture to the IPR on the Ethics of Public Relations. May.

Gregory, A. 2003. Remarks made via email on draft proposals of the Global Alliance.

Grunig, J.E. 1989. 'Symmetrical presuppositions as a framework for public relations theory.' In Botan, C.H. & Hazleton, V. (eds) **Public relations theory**. Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J., & White, J. (1992). 'The effects of worldview on public relations theory and practice'. In James Grunig (Ed.), **Excellence in public relations and**

communication management (pp. 31-64). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Holtzhausen, D. 2002. 'A postmodern critique of public relations theory and practice'. **Communicatio** 28(1):29-38.

Jackall, R. 1983. 'Moral mazes: Bureaucracy and Managerial Work'. **Harvard Business Review**, 61 (September/October): 99-123.

Jonas, H. 1984. **The imperative of responsibility**, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kaufmann, F.X 1995. Risiko, Verantwortung und gesellschaftliche Komplexität. In Bayertz K. Hrsg. **Verantwortung**. **Prinzip oder Problem?** Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 72-97.

Lukaszewski, J 2002. Personal comments as a member of the GA Global Task Force.

Ladd, J. 1991. Computers and moral responsibility. A framework for an ethical analysis. In **Computerisation and controversy**, Boston: Boston Academic Press, 664 - 675.

Mersham G.M., Rensburg, R; & Skinner, C. 1995**. Public relations, development and social investment : A southern African perspective**. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mitcham, C. 1987. Responsibility and technology. The expanding relationship. In Durbin, P. T. ed., **Technology and responsibility**, Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 3-39.

Scott, W.G. 1989. **Organizational values in America**. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

Sriramesh, I., & White, J. (1992). 'Societal Culture and Public Relations'. In J. E. Grunig (Ed)., **Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management** (pp. 597-614). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Skinner, C., Von Essen, L. & Mersham, G.M. 2001. **The handbook of public relations**. (6th ed). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Toth, E.L & Heath, R.L. (eds). 1992. **Theoretical and critical approaches to public relations**. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vogl, F 2002. Business Ethics and Public Relations. Address to the Conference Board of Canada 5 February.

Wilcox, D.L., Ault, P.H., Agee, W.K. & Cameron, G.T. 2000. **Public Relations: Strategies and Tactics**. 6th ed. New York: Longman.