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Abstract

The theory and practice of public relations are largely based on a modernist understanding of organization that privileges management perspectives and a strategic focus in the field. This article explores the possibility of postmodernism as an alternative theoretical approach to public relations. Postmodernism rejects the manager as a rational being who has the ability to determine organizational outcomes through strategies. Modernist public relations is examined as a hegemonic practice that interpellates practitioners into the system to legitimize the perspectives and actions of corporate managers as objective knowledge, particularly through discursive practices in organizational media. Public relations’ media relations role is critiqued for its creation of a hyperreality and the resulting crisis of representation. The paper concludes with suggestions for a postmodern research agenda based on reflexivity.
1. Introduction

Most existing public relations theories have been developed within the context of public relations as a management function. This is typical of a modernist approach to organizations, which privileges a management discourse and emphasizes upper management’s goals for the organization as given and legitimate. In this approach, organizations and their functions are evaluated in terms of economic contribution and “rational” economic goals. The aim of the modernist approach is a world that can be controlled through administrative procedures, the elimination of dissension and conflict, and the blind acceptance of organizational goals and roles. The role of communication in this approach is to ensure information transfer from the supervisor to the subordinate to gain compliance and to establish networks to ensure the organization’s power in relations with the public. This perspective includes the concepts of strategic message design, management of culture, and total quality management. Theoretical approaches include covering laws, systems approaches and an emphasis on skills development, particularly in the areas of communication and management.

Based on this explication, modernism is reflected in many areas of public relations practice, theory and research. The management emphasis in public relations is eminent in several definitions of public relations. Public relations management highlights organizational effectiveness, the strategic management of the function through the strategic identification of publics, and issues management to prevent crises. This approach emphasizes membership of the dominant coalition and strategic planning of public relations with measurable outcomes, preferably in economic terms. The dominance of this approach is understandable. The modernist, or functionalist, approach to organizations remains largely dominant in North America and most likely in most Western countries.

This focus on management and strategy, however, might well have brought public relations to the biggest crisis of its relatively short academic existence. While public relations scholars focused on establishing public relations as a legitimate business discipline, a school of thought in organization theory and organizational
communication that challenged these dominant functionalist concepts started to emerge during the late 1980s. In particular, critical and postmodern theorists have started to challenge the legitimacy of managers setting the goals for the organization and the “rationality” of management decisions.[8] As a result a number of texts started to challenge the very bases of the modernist (functional) paradigms on which public relations theory and practice have built their current foundations. [9]

This focus has largely been absent in public relations. As McElreath and Blamphin[10] and McKie [11] rightly observed, the field of public relations has been slow to come to grips with the shift in paradigms taking place in other fields. This shift should not have come as a surprise, if public relations researchers and scholars took more note of the critical work in the field, particularly that of Pearson. [12] Pearson briefly touched on the postmodern skepticism of rational knowledge, and some scholarly work in this area has been forthcoming during the second half of the 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century. [13] It is this postmodern skepticism of rational knowledge that now challenges public relations scholars and researchers to evaluate and research public relations through a different lens.

2. The modern versus the postmodern

To understand a postmodern approach to public relations it will be appropriate to briefly review the main philosophical differences between the modern and the postmodern, particularly as it pertains to the organizational environment in which public relations practitioners operate.[14] The focus here is the scrutiny of public relations through a postmodern lens because it might help practitioners to “understand the many contradictions in public relations and might explain why their well-intended practices do not always come up with the expected results.” [15]

The postmodern approach applied here is based on a two-step process. The first is to deconstruct the language of management that has led to the exploitation of organizational participants who have been “excluded, marginalized and exploited through the modernist project.”[16] This is done through a process of discourse analysis. The second step is to propose affirmative actions that support the postmodern stance against “racism, sexism, eurocentrism, bureaucracies, and colonialism.” [17]

The first step, the deconstruction of language systems, is based on the postmodern concept of discourse, which is one of the basic tenets of postmodernism. Discourse refers to the use of language, which, in its postmodern context, can only be understood within a broader, social environment. It challenges the modernist concept of a single truth and objective knowledge. Discourses differ “with the kind of institutions and social practices in which they took shape, and with the positions of those who speak and those whom they address.”[18] Meaning does not always originate from spoken and written discourse but also through signs, which may be verbal or non-verbal. Meanings are to be found only in the concrete forms of differing social and institutional practices and there is no objective meaning in language per se. [19] A postmodern approach to public relations would therefore focus on public relations as an institutional process and its role in organizational discourse. It would in particular be critical of how public relations is used to create perceptions of truth and
to devalue certain terms and positions to create and promote organizational ideology. [20]

Contrary to the modernist endeavor, which “sought universal explanations that could approach … the status of natural laws,”[21] postmodernism represents a broad theoretical approach and postmodern philosophers and theorists stress that there is no central postmodern theory. In response to the modernist emphasis on single, dominant theoretical perspectives and philosophies, referred to as metanarratives, postmodernists revel in multiplicity and diversity, and in even questioning their own theoretical perspectives. Lyotard says, “Theories themselves are concealed narratives (and) we should not be taken by their claim to be valid for all times.” [22]

Although some scholars view postmodernism as a critical approach,[23] others view postmodernism as a distinctly different discourse. [24] Postmodernism focuses on issues such as the link between knowledge and power, dissensus rather than consensus, and “micropolitical processes and the joined nature of power and resistance.” [25] Other postmodern trends are the link between power and ideology, the concept of hyperreality, the challenge to rationality, the rejection of the distinction between truth and falsity, the rejection of metanarratives, and the lack of representation of minorities and marginalized groups. [26]

The use of language in maintaining and shaping power relations is the thread that ties all these postmodern issues together. In addition to focusing on how public relations is used to sustain managerial power in organizations, this article uses the postmodern lens to also focus on alternative ways to practice public relations. This lens does not only provide a different perspective on public relations practices but is also used to refute some of the modernist expectations of public relations practice mentioned before.

The postmodern approach that is used in this article is a combination of two approaches described by Boje et al.,[27] namely epistemological postmodernism and critical postmodernism. In epistemological postmodernism Derrida’s deconstruction methods are applied to organizational discourse. This is done to reveal “formal organization to be the ever-present expression of an autonomous power that masquerades as the supposedly rational constructions of modern institutions.” [28] This reflects a skeptical postmodern perspective that is critical of modernist organizations without proposing alternative organizational practices. Critical postmodernism on the other hand takes an affirmative position. [29] Critical postmodernism is a mid-range position that moves seamlessly between applying postmodern perspectives to modernist organizations. Although in practice there is a transition from modern to postmodern organizing, it “is in its infancy. Modernism, modernist organization, and positivist science rule the day.” [30] Nonetheless, critical postmodernism has a tradition of suggesting alternative practices that would allow organizations to operate on postmodern values. In addition, these two approaches allow for a cross-over approach between otherwise incompatible theorists such as Bourdieu, Gramsci, Foucault and Lyotard who would not all necessarily be viewed as postmodern. [31]

As is emphasized throughout this article, and as supported by scholars such as Best and Kellner,[32] Kincheloe and McLaren, [33] Mumby, [34] and Deetz, [35] the
The postmodern movement originated from France, and particularly from philosophers such as Lyotard, Derrida, Foucault, Baudrillard, Deleuze and Guattari, and Laclau and Mouffe. It is the thoughts of these postmodern philosophers that in broad terms guide the arguments in this article. Four themes are recurrently used here in the discussion of the implications of a postmodern approach to public relations theory and practice. These are as follows:

1. the postmodern challenge to rationality and the implications of the emphasis on public relations as a management function. This will include Lyotard’s interpretations of the links between knowledge and power, and Lyotard’s concept of language games to critique the dominant focus on strategy in public relations;

2. a postmodern interpretation of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony, read in conjunction with Bourdieu’s concept of agency and symbolic capital, that focuses our attention on the role of the public relations practitioner as part of the dominant coalition;

3. Baudrillard’s concept of hyperreality that focuses our attention on the media relations role of public relations, and the postmodern concept of discourse that highlights the role public relations practitioners play in disseminating information through the use of language;

4. Lyotard’s critique of consensus, which enlightens and rejects the domination of two-way symmetry as a viable public relations practice.

These approaches not only focus our attention on the dominant themes in public relations theory and practice and their implications for practitioners, but also on the implications for a future postmodern research agenda for public relations.

Because postmodernists do not recognize an objective truth and emphasize the role and subjective interpretation of the researcher in the process of theory building this researcher does not try to distance herself from her arguments through discursive techniques but uses the term “I” where appropriate.

3. Postmodern applications in public relations

3.1. Strategic management in public relations

The focus on public relations as a management function has possibly made the biggest contribution to establish public relations as a serious field of study. At the beginning of the 1980s public relations was in the right place at the right time and the management focus has generated numerous perspectives on the strategic management of public relations, with strategic as the key word. Some of these focus areas are issues management; strategic relationship management; the strategic management of public relations programs and campaigns through Management by Objectives (MBO); the strategic management of publics and the organization’s external environment; and ultimately the strategic management of the public relations function as a whole.
It is this focus on management that is one of the main points of a postmodern critique of public relations. Postmodern philosophers do not believe in the rational subject who can objectively observe her/his environment and direct it strategically to a desired outcome. Management rationality in the form of strategies is nothing but an effort to classify and regulate all forms of experience through a systematic construction of knowledge and discourse, which makes all human experiences accessible for administration and control. Postmodernists reject the manager as a rational being. In the organizational context, managers, through their strategies, play nothing more than “language games.” In stead of using the public relations function to ensure inclusiveness of all voices that are affected by the organization and thereby benefiting the publics as well as the organization itself, in the modernist tradition practitioners focus on strategies that are nothing less than efforts to exert power and control over the organizational environment. This constitutes a deeply political act on behalf of the organization. Even when the stated aim of these strategies is two-way symmetrical communication in the final instance practitioners are tools of the organization’s management.

The public relations emphasis on membership of the dominant coalition stems from the desire to have influence and power, which is most likely to happen when practitioners internalize and identify with the interests of the dominant group in the organization. Strategies as forms of expert knowledge are therefore not more than “hidden mechanisms through which a society conveys its knowledge and ensures its survival under the mask of knowledge.”

Strategies are also often not based in reality. Organizational actors try to make sense of their environment by creating strategies; however, strategies are not objective realities but rather “objectivized by our subjective orientations toward them.” From a postmodern perspective all strategies are futile exercises and are nothing but personal plans on how to proceed in a particular organizational function. They are not rational and also not representative of all organizational viewpoints.

Because public relations researchers and theorists are desperate to prove that public relations is a discipline to be taken seriously, much of the research in public relations is focused on quantitative analyses of publics, or the contribution to the bottom line. The focus is on professionals’ ability for rational decision making that can explain their own and their publics’ behavior through “mathematical and economic models, hence making power irrelevant as an explanatory construct.” Postmodernists are extremely critical of these efforts, which they believe, are used to normalize people through the elimination of all social and psychological irregularities and the production of useful and docile subjects. An example of this is the quantitative measurement of relationships that has become so prominent in recent public relations research and that ignores how relationships between people are in a continuous state of flux, shaping and being shaped. Harland’s explanation of how meaning is shaped, comes to mind: “Endlessly unbalanced and out of equilibrium in causal chains, toppling one another over like lines of fallen dominoes.”

In this process of legitimizing themselves, public relations practitioners fall prey to the modernist desire to guarantee truth by devaluing certain terms and positions through the creation of binary oppositions. Binary oppositions are used to establish dominance and superiority of one term, while suppressing and marginalizing
the opposing term. One such example in public relations is the binary opposition between manager and technician. [64] Although this dichotomy has become pervasive in the understanding of what public relations practitioners do, it denies that technicians also often perform boundary spanning roles. Postmodernists would assert that managers and technicians are mutually influenced by and influencing internal and external role players and publics, thus all shaping an organization’s public relations agenda on a continuous basis.

The management and Excellence foci in public relations have become metanarratives[65] that have drowned out other, equally valid, discourses in public relations theory and research. This points to a lack of reflexivity in public relations theory and practice. Reflexivity is a postmodern process whereby scholars critique their own theories. [66] This lack of reflexivity has not served the field well when compared to other, similar disciplines and threatens public relations theory with future redundancy.

Postmodernism provides alternative perspectives to planning than the pursuit of rational strategies by managers who “vanishes with the myth of human agency.”[67] Boje and Dennehy [68] suggested cutting down on planning meetings to regain control of the bureaucracy. Becoming more career centered than organization-centered will deny corporations the ability to pigeonhole people and will offer them more choices. The corporate ladder needs to be toppled in favor of flatter, network-type organizations and corporate planners need to be taken on because they produce a lot of paper but never implement any of the plans. Diversity is a necessity because the white male dominated corporation will cease to be viable. Entrepreneurship is the postmodern alternative to climbing the corporate ladder. This view is similar to my concept of the public relations practitioner as organizational activist. [69]

3.2. Power and the agency of public relations

Postmodernism also highlights the role public relations plays in maintaining managerialism[70] or corporatism. [71] Postmodernism is not against management per se but rather against managerialism, which is “not merely an abstract shifting of control, but more importantly the development of a new logic and daily practice of corporations, which ‘interpellates’ managers as a particular type of subject, from the empirical individuals who hold management positions.” [72] Through managerialism managers co-opt workers into suppressive workplace practices that benefit managers more than workers and that leads to the formation of a new class system.

Managerialism is discursively constituted, particularly through agents, who are people acting on the behalf of powerful organizational managers. Bourdieu[73] argued agents are interpellated into a system to legitimize the discourse of those in power. In modernism the agent has a “personal, subjective core of awareness in which actions and emotions are coordinated from a knowing self.” In postmodernism agency is “a system of relations between strata” and the agent is a “convenient location for the throughput of discourses.” [74]

This postmodern critique of agency points to a dangerous position for the public relations practitioner. In the modernist context the public relations “agent” is interpellated into the system to legitimize the knowledge of organizational managers
by presenting it as objective knowledge, particularly through the use of organizational media and public relations’ media relations function.

The consistent theme in postmodern philosophy of the intimate link between power and knowledge further enhances the understanding of this role of the agent. Power operates in micrological channels that saturate social and personal existence and that should be recognized as “the full range of hidden mechanisms through which society conveys its knowledge and ensures its survival under the mask of knowledge: newspapers, television, technical schools, and the high school.”[75] In this role, public relations practitioners are nothing but the stooges of powerful corporate managers who use public relations’ agency to create forms of discipline and normalization criteria. This takes place in organizations through public relations’ internal communication function and in society through its external communication function. As a result the organization’s external and internal publics are subjugated to powerful executives through self-control and self-discipline, particularly in the form of moral consciousness. [76]

Public relations practitioners thus become agents who create societal metanarratives that are transmitted through the rules, practices and norms of modernist organizations.[77] Public relations practitioners are the agents used to establish corporate ideologies, a process that is nothing but the creation of meaning in the service of power. [78] By excluding perspectives that do not support these metanarratives public relations practitioners homogenize knowledge and play an important role in perpetuating the normalizing rules and practices that help already powerful organizational role players to sustain their power.

As mentioned before, the two-way symmetrical model of public relations practice is an example of such a metanarrative. A postmodern approach to public relations does not theoretically sustain the existence of such a model.[79] In addition, two-way symmetry is often portrayed as consensus seeking. Whereas the modernist public relations agent legitimates managerial knowledge through consensus, the postmodern agent, as a “location for the throughput of discourse” has the opportunity to participate in discourse, “a process and a paradox having neither beginning nor end.” [80] This “process” is achieved through conflict and dissensus, which might or might not lead to new forms of understanding and knowledge. [81] Postmodern public relations thus becomes a process that legitimates many different and heterogeneous forms of meaning and understanding, in stead of a modernist approach based on consensus determined by the most powerful, in this case management. If public relations practitioners do not view their role as a process that actively encourages differing and opposing views the public relations agency will be used to “facilitate organisational control and to direct innovation and change” to the benefit of management. [82]

The ultimate aim of managers who utilize the agency of public relations practitioners for their own needs, is the accumulation of wealth, “the ultimate basis of power.”[83] Public relations practitioners are in particular used to create symbolic capital, which is the only way through which economic capital can be accumulated. Symbolic capital is “the unrecognizable, thus socially recognizable form of the other kinds of capital.” Symbolic capital has as its base “symbolic violence … when domination can only be exercised in its elementary form, i.e., directly between one person and another, it
cannot take place overtly and must be disguised under the veil of enchanted relationships.” In this way oppressive relationships are “disguised and transfigured lest they destroy themselves by revealing their true nature; in a word, they must be euphemized.”[84]

This is an appropriate description of how public relations is used in the modernist context. Stauber and Rampton[85] describe this phenomenon in public relations practice when they relate how environmental activists are co-opted to do the will of corporations against whom they are active, thereby “euphamizing” the symbolic violence organizations assert over these activist groups. Another example is the creation of grassroots movements by organizations to act on their behalf under the veil of grassroots democracy.

The above understanding of agency, read in conjunction with Bourdieu’s explication of symbolic capital and symbolic violence, further enhances Lyotard’s concept of micrological power, referred to earlier, which, in the case of public relations, is used to sustain corporate ideology. Organizations use ideology to establish hegemony,[86] which is a discursive practice that “involved attempts by various groups to articulate meaning that are actively taken up by other groups.”[87] This is again an apt description of the role of public relations in current society.

3.3. Representation and public relations

Mickey[88] was the first public relations scholar to grasp the significance of Baudrillard’s concern with the way in which signs and sign systems dominate the individual in a new world order. Mickey used a postmodern cultural analysis to understand the role the public relations agency Hill and Knowlton played in the start of the Gulf War. Through an analysis of the signs put out by Hill and Knowlton, Mickey proposed the firm created a hyperreality that disenfranchised many voices and privileged a small group of people. This hyperreality creates a hypercivilisation where the image and the sign are used to change the course of society.[89]

Postmodern philosophers highlighted the role public relations practitioners play in today’s society. They in particular criticized public relations practitioners for the way in which they create a hyperreality through “image contests, or sign struggles.”[90] Thus, postmodernists indirectly focused on the media relations function of public relations practitioners.

Baudrillard believed a new era of simulation has dawned where society is organized around simulation codes and models that replace production as the organizing principle of society. He coined the term “semiurgic” society in which signs take on a life of their own and that constitutes a new social order structured by models, codes and signs.[91] Through their media relations function public relations practitioners are directly responsible for a crisis of representation, [92] which can be viewed as the “replacement of the factual by the representational”[93] of which the Hill and Knowlton incident is an example. Representation involves the presentation of a reality that does not exist—it is “a perfect copy for which there is no original,” [94] which Baudrillard refers to as a simulacral entity.[95] This desire for a “perfect copy” gives rise to nostalgic feelings for the real object, which has never existed, creating a
sublime state of detachment where the horrors of society are viewed with cynicism and disinterest. [96]

In public relations this replacement of the real with the hyperreal already starts at college level where students are trained to write, act and think like journalists. The emphasis on writing skills and journalism training is a dominant focus in the training of undergraduate public relations practitioners, particularly at schools and colleges of journalism and mass communications. Through this training the image of the public relations practitioner as journalist is created. Students are taught to use the Associated Press stylebook, and all the formats of news releases, video releases and other media forms. This is done to create the illusion that practitioners think and act like, and play, an impartial role in their boundary spanning function between the organization and its environment,[97] thus comparing it to the role journalists are perceived to play in society. In this way public relations implodes the boundary between simulation and reality.

Baudrillard[98] was particularly critical of the role new technologies play in the creation of the hyperreality. Again, public relations has not allowed this opportunity to pass unutilized. Training of public relations practitioners in web design and in utilizing the internet for a plethora of purposes, from internal communication to lobbying [99] have reached fever pitch at schools of mass communications, as is witnessed by the many advertisements for professors who can teach these new technologies.

Postmodern perspectives on technology, particularly those of Baudrillard, suggest that the media relations function of public relations will be more in demand than ever before. New technologies will tempt the organization to create a hyperreality that does not only obscure the real intentions of organizational actors but also sublimate the underlying power issues that are detrimental to many publics. Public relations practitioners will increasingly be called upon to supply “meaningless communication” that can “become the integration mode of organizations.” This useless information will “fulfil external demands for communication while denying external groups any useful information.”[100] The postmodern practitioner needs to be aware of this meaningless communication and should ensure that all publics are fully informed and participating in organizational debates. This can again be done by privileging the organization’s publics in the communication process, thereby further supporting the activist role of the public relations practitioner.

4. Conclusions

Although theorists might be critical of the above theoretic explication of public relations as a hegemonic practice, the contention in this article is that this nomadic journey across many theoretical borders is a perfectly postmodern phenomenon. Applying theory in this way is also a “playful” act full of irony and ambivalence, which is typically associated with a postmodern approach.[101]

In addition, the above arguments demonstrate the importance of reflexivity in public relations theory and practice to prevent the formation of metanarratives in the field. I, myself, have proposed many of the theories and applied several of the research
methods I have critiqued above. I still continuously emphasize strategy when I teach public relations management, although I stress that it is more a subjective plan for future activities than a rational, objective document produced by the best brains in the organization. To critique my own actions is part of my role as a postmodern theorist.

What I argue here is a stronger emphasis on postmodern perspectives and critiques in public relations. Only in this way scholars and practitioners will be able to keep abreast of new thinking and developments in related fields and how these affect our own. While still focusing on modernist perspectives of control of outcomes, and privileging a management focus in public relations research, others have come to the conclusion that what practitioners are doing, is meaningless and harmful to others.

The above arguments generate a number of questions, which can lead to new research agendas for public relations scholars. Postmodernism challenges public relations researchers to ask, for instance, the following questions:

1. If practitioners cannot manage and control public relations in the ways originally thought, what would be alternative practices for public relations?

2. If quantitative research efforts are challenged, what are appropriate research methods for the field?

3. What are the implications for public relations if other organizational actors have as much of an impact on public relations as the practitioners who are assigned to this task?

4. Who are these actors and what is their role and impact?

5. How do new postmodern organizational forms such as networks influence public relations practice?

6. What would be appropriate organizational structures for public relations to ensure comprehensive participation for all internal and external publics?

7. How does the use of technology as micropractice shape the practitioner’s role as internal and external communicator?

8. How do practitioners and scholars react to accusations of creating a new world order that is based on fiction and what are the ethical implications?

9. How do academics align course content to make provision for these new epistemologies?

10. How should practitioners perform their media relations role in hypercivilisation?

These are but a few of the questions raised by a postmodern approach to public relations but the possibilities are limitless. Ignoring them might endanger the future existence of the field and render it irrelevant in today’s society.
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