ABSTRACT

The content analysis of news coverage over two years for four major high profile public conflicts provides a natural history of the use of the contingency theory in public relations. The content analysis tracked ingency theory suggests that the changing stances of four organizations (UPS, American Airlines, USDA, Massachusetts Military Reservation) and its public, which respectively moving on the continuum from pure advocacy to pure accommodation, in response to are associated with a number of contingent factors that can just as readily move an organization toward accommodation as toward advocacy. Employing conflict and conflict resolution models from the conflict studies literature to advance the contingency theory in public relations, results confirm that the perspectives of two parties an organization and its public are changed over time, but both parties in each conflict parties involved in high profile conflicts demonstrated overall “advocacy” for their stance during the process. Also, they and employed a “contending” strategy dominantly during the conflict management process. The changing aspects in perspectives and strategies over time predominantly were influenced predominantly by mostly two contingent factors, “internal threats” and “external threats.”
INTRODUCTION

This study aims at identifying the contingency theory in public relations by analyzing the news coverage over two years for the successful conflict resolution cases in organization-public relationships. Within the broad framework of public relations practice, the successful conflict management cases have been chosen to examine the application of conflict or conflict resolution models to an issue of conflict between an organization and its publics in public relations. This study focused on how two parties involved in conflict changed their stances and employed strategies to manage the conflict. It also discussed how a variety of contingent factors are associated with the stances of two parties and the strategies they employed.

Recently, public relations professionals and scholars have placed greater emphasis on the strategic conflict management in developing long-term relationships to obtain sustainable benefits on for an organization-public relationship. Grunig (1992) noted that conflict occurs both when a public moves in a different direction from the organization involved; and when an organization refuses to change its direction after having received input from its public to conclusively suggest the excellence of two-way or accommodative organization-public relationship. Huff (2001) examined the role of strategic analysis as a framework for organizational behavior research. He suggested an organizational strategy in terms of cooperation and fit, which encompass a wide range of situations and variables within organizational behavior research, rather than proposing a strategy in terms of conflict.

Conversely, Cameron and his colleagues (1997; 1999; 2001; 2002) have developed the contingency theory in public relations that seeks to explain why an organization moves toward or alternatively away from accommodation doesn’t not always engage in two-way communication and accommodative strategies when confronted with a crisis or a conflict with a public. They have argued that this movement toward or away from a given public at a given time in the relationship advocacy is inherent in the nature of the conflict in organization-public
relationships, and a number of factors influence the conflict management of public relations. Ganesan (1993) particularly examined the impact of situational factors such as the importance of the issues to be resolved on the use of various conflict management strategies such as problem solving, compromising and aggressiveness, etc.

The previous studies on the contingency theory in public relations left many questions unanswered or require generalization derived from further studies (Cancel, Cameron, Sallot, & Mitrook, 1997; Cancel, Mitrook, & Cameron, 1999). Additional further research has needed to be conducted in an effort to identify and evaluate generate the contingent variables to influence an organization’s stance toward an external public or its strategies to manage the conflict. It also is necessary to further explain how different variables influence an organization’s accommodation decisions in both potentially negative and potentially positive situations. Conversely, a given public’s stance toward an organization or its strategies to handle the conflict has needed to be investigated in the interaction with an organization.

This study integrated a conflict and conflict resolution models from the field of alternative dispute resolution and from conflict studies to the contingency theory in public relations. A conflict or conflict resolution model can be introduced to public relations to identify the stances between an organization and its public. A conflict model can suggest the stances of two parties involved in conflict, and the conflict management models for public relations can also be developed as a guideline suggesting strategies for an optimally beneficial solution for both parties. In this study, the nature of conflict in public relations on a continuum and the possible strategies of conflict resolution in public relations on a range will be developed and suggested for a further development of the contingency theory.

The nature of conflict and the strategies of conflict resolution can be well closely associated with the organization-public relationship. The intersection of the fields of public relations, and conflict or conflict resolution is mixed motive. Mixed motives acknowledge the primacy of organization’s interest and encompass the continuum...
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between symmetrical and asymmetrical communication in the organization-public relations (Plowman, 1998). Almost all conflicts are mixed-motive, containing elements of both advocacy and accommodation (Dutsch, 1994).

Another key element of conflict or conflict management is the “process,” which involves a changing stance and strategy of two parties involved in conflict, and a cyclical life of conflict or conflict resolution. Accordingly, conflict and conflict management has consistently occupied a central role in organization-public relationships because “Public relations is a dynamic process itself. At a certain point, an organization-public relationship can be almost symmetrical, but never remains static” (Shin & Cameron, 2002, p. 4). This dynamism and the factors at play in high profile conflicts offers a look at the natural history of conflict management in public relations. This study can encompass theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, it helps contribute to develop a more complex and comprehensive contingency theory of conflict management as a general theory of public relations. Practically, it can suggest any solution to help identify a conflict between an organization and a public, and the possible strategies in a given situation by identifying contingent factors to be associated with a stance and strategies of an organization and its public involved in conflict.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Conflict Perspective in Public Relations

Public relations is often identified as “the management of communication between an organization and its publics” (Grunig & Hunt, 1984, p. 6). The concept of conflict offers particular promise for the understanding and perhaps even improvement of the public relations work by introducing the nature of difference among individuals, social groups, formal organizations and nations. A conflict or conflict resolution models best describes the public relations behavior when an organization must manage
communication demanded by publics such as journalists, media, government, community, consumers, stockholders, activists and employees.

Rubin et al. (1994) defined conflict as any situation in which two or more parties of individuals, groups, organizations or communities perceive a divergence of interests. Essentially, the perceived difference between two parties’ values results with conflict. Brickman (1974) also defined conflict as a “situation in which parties must divide or share resources so that, to some degree, the more one party gets, the less others can have” (p. 74). Conflict may be encapsulated as a competition between two parties for scarce resources, prestige and power (Laue, 1995), or “an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce resources and interference from the other party in achieving goals” (Hocker & Wilmot, 1991, p. 12). Brickman (1974) also defined conflict as a “situation in which parties must divide or share resources so that, to some degree, the more one party gets, the less others can have.” Plowman (1995) characterized that two parties in conflict have consequences for each other.

These definitions of conflict offer particular promise for the understanding, and perhaps even improvement of organization-public relationships by introducing the communicative nature, interdependence of parties in roles and needs, difference of power, perceived incompatibility of goals or values with scarce resource and consequences for each other. When an organization is engaged in conflict with a public, this situation suggests that the public is activated with a different goal, value, role or interest beyond a certain knowledge or involvement. The interests as constrained by scarce resources or the environment must be considered in the organization-public relationship. Furthermore, another important consideration of the conflict is important in the conflict between an organization and its public, and the conflict management is whether an organization changes or does not change its direction when a public moves in a different direction. From the organization involved, also the interests as constrained by to seek for its interest under scarce resources or constrained the environment must be considered. Furthermore, power, which each entity has in the organization-public relationship, is a crucial factor to that influences movement toward or away from accommodation, advocacy or any combination of the
hybrid two parties in the conflict or conflict management process. After all, the conflict or conflict management process directly is involved in any all consequences of each entity party as a whole.

An organization-public relationship itself has a connotation that both the organization and public engage in is that results with involved in conflict from with its own interest, and accordingly, they are both often advocate rather than accommodate in the relationship. “Certain types of conflicts virtually require asymmetric public relations efforts” (Murphy, 1997, p. 130), and “most conflicts are mixed-motive conflicts in which the parties involved in the conflict have both cooperative and competitive interests” (Deutsch, 1994, p. 22). Gurnig (2001) recently introduced the idea of mixed motive to the Excellence theory, but overlook the continuum of mixed motive.

In organization-public relationship, power balancing can be only sought through the process of conflict or conflict resolution (Shin & Cameron, 2002).

In this study, the conflict between an organization and various publics, i.e. employees, government, community are analyzed to see if the conflicts between an organization and different constituencies are mixed-motive conflicts where an organization and its publics are changing their status over time. Employee relations are considered as an internal public relations because they can create internal threats, which may influence the relationship between the organization and an external public. Cutlip, Center, and Broom (1994) pointed out, "No organizational relationships are as important as those with employees..." (p. 86). Government public relations is another important function of public relations because government regulation poses a potential external threat to an organization (Harriss, 1991; Lee, 1999). Also community is receiving attention in public relations practice as one of the critical external publics. Many scholars have suggested that public relations community relations particularly can contribute to community building from a relational perspective (Lendingham, 2000; Heath, Bradshaw, & Lee, 2002). This study can provide a useful means to identify how the conflict between an organization and various publics appear on the news stories by examining their approach to the conflict or conflict management.
Pure Accommodation to Pure Advocacy

Developing the prevailing thought of two-way symmetrical public relations (Grunig, 1992; 2001), many scholars have reconceptualized the two-way symmetrical and one-way asymmetrical models (Cancel, Cameron, Sallot, & Mitrook, 1997; Cameron, Cropp, & Reber, 2001; Plowman, 1998). Hellweg (1989) suggested the notions of two-way symmetrical and one-way asymmetrical depend heavily on one’s perspective, which varies on a continuum. Murphy (1991) proposed the mixed motive view from conflict to cooperation. Leichty (1997) discussed the limits of collaboration, that is, collaborative public relations is unfeasible in some situations. Public relations activities practically involve asymmetric or win-lose situations. Individual public relations practitioners’ lack of power within an organization increases the limitation of collaboration. Murphy (2000) explored the complexity in public relations by introducing the concept of power and accommodation to “uncontrollable” public relations. Duffy (2000) even argued that there is no two-way symmetric public relations.

Cameron and his colleagues (1997; 1999; 2001; 2002) developed the idea of the continuum from pure advocacy to pure accommodation mixed motive or collaborative advocacy into the basis for the contingency theory in public relations. They suggested a welter variety of factors limiting accommodation in public relations, with accommodation not viewed as an absolute state such as capitulation to others, but as the degree of willingness to entertain change for the benefit of others. Particularly, Cancel, Cameron, Sallot, and Mitrook (1997) Cameron and his colleagues offered the contingency theory of conflict management as a new direction for research in public relations to better understand how the public relations field manages conflict and reaches out to publics in the internal or external communication environment in turbulent times. They suggested that the continuum from pure accommodation to pure advocacy captures the subtleties in can encompass the the stance or of an organization, and the perspective of the involved publics rather than only one or the other symmetrical or the asymmetrical view.
According to Cancel et al. (1997), accommodation is defined as some degree of willingness to accept the other party’s stance, or pleading another’s cause or (pleads) in support of something or seeking to create public acceptance for a particular idea or commodity at the one’s stance. On the other hand, accommodation is defined as willingness to accept the other party’s stance. They stated that the notion of advocacy to accommodation on a continuum “represents an organization’s possible wide range of stances taken toward an individual public … True excellence in public relations may result from picking the appropriate point along the continuum that best fits the current need of the organization and its publics.” (p. 187).

The concept of advocacy or accommodation is well closely associated with a notion of concern for self or concern for others in conflict management literature. The conflict management literature identifies various types of conflict management within two dimensions comparable to advocacy and accommodation. Blake, Shepard (1964) early modeled conflict management styles within two motivational dimensions, i.e. a self-oriented and an other-oriented concern. However, they have been criticized for lacking styles that involve high concern for both self and other, and styles that involve a high concern for neither self nor other (Killman & Killman, 1977).

Based on two dimensions, many scholars recently have developed the variation in conflict management. Deutsh (1973) suggested a conflict management model with a notion that conflict management styles can be arrayed on two dimensions ranging from selfishness (concern about own outcomes) to ability to cooperate cooperativeness (concern about the other party's outcomes). Cameron has argued that thinking in terms of categories such as this lacks both a sophistication found in practice and a sensitivity in measurement.

Hence, (However, they have been criticized for lacking styles that involve high concern for both self and other, and styles that involve a high concern for neither self nor other (Thomas & Killman, 1974). Pure Accommodation to Pure Advocacy

Developing the prevailing thought of two-way symmetrical public relations, many scholars have reconceptualized the two-way symmetrical and one-way asymmetrical
models (Cancel, Cameron, Sallot, & Mitrook, 1997; Cameron, Cropp, & Reber, 2001; Plowman, 1998). Hellweg (1989) suggested the notions of two-way symmetrical and one-way asymmetrical depend heavily on one’s perspective, which varies on a continuum. Murphy (1991) proposed the mixed motive view from conflict to cooperation. Leichty (1997) discussed the limits of collaboration, that is, collaborative public relations is unfeasible in some situations. Public relations activities practically involve asymmetric or win-lose situations. Individual public relations practitioners’ lack of power within an organization increases the limitation of collaboration. Murphy (2000) explored the complexity in public relations by introducing the concept of power and accommodation to “uncontrollable” public relations. Duffy (2000) even argued that there is no two-way symmetric public relations.

Cameron and his colleagues (1997; 1999; 2001) developed the idea of mixed motive or collaborative advocacy into contingency theory. They suggested a welter of factors limiting accommodation in public relations. In the excellent model, communication flows both ways between an organization and a public while both are prepared to change their own behavior, and the result is posited as the most professional, ethical and effective practice. However, contingency theory offers qualifications and reservations of excellence theory with a number of reasons: personal ethics, comfort with conflict, moral conviction, mistrust of public, multiple publics, relative power requiring activism, dominant coalition’s values and style, management pressure, organization precedent setting, stakes for organization, regulatory constraints, jurisdictional issues and legal constraints, societal base, moral ambiguity, qualifying dialogue between an organization and a public, and others.

Particularly, Cancel, Cameron, Sallot, and Mitrook (1997) offered the contingency theory of conflict management as a new direction for research in public relations to better understand how the public relations field manages conflict and reaches out to publics in the internal or external communication environment in turbulent times. They suggested that a continuum from pure accommodation to pure advocacy can encompass the stance or an organization and the perspective of the involved publics rather than only one or the other symmetrical or asymmetrical view.
According to Cancel et al. (1997), advocacy is defined as willingness to accept the other party’s stance, or pleading another’s cause or (pleads) in support of something or seeking to create public acceptance for a particular idea or commodity at the one’s stance. On the other hand, accommodation is defined as willingness to accept the other party’s stance. They stated that the notion of advocacy to accommodation on a continuum “represents an organization’s possible wide range of stances taken toward an individual public . . . . True excellence in public relations may result from picking the appropriate point along the continuum that best fits the current need of the organization and its publics.” The notion of advocacy or accommodation is well associated with a notion of concern for self or concern for others in conflict management literature.

The conflict management literature identifies various types of conflict management within two dimensions comparable to advocacy and accommodation. Blake, Shepard and Mouton’s (1964) early modeled conflict management styles within two motivational dimensions, i.e. a self-oriented and an other-oriented concern. Deutsch (1973) also suggested a conflict management model with a notion that conflict management styles can be arrayed on two dimensions ranging from selfishness (concern about own outcomes) to cooperativeness (concern about the other party’s outcomes). However, they have been criticized for lacking styles that involve high concern for both self and other, and styles that involve a high concern for neither self nor other (Thomas & Killman, 1974). Based on two dimensions may scholars recently have developed the variation in conflict management (Kilmann and Thomas, 1975).

Another comparable concept of accommodation or advocacy is the concept of the aggressor or the defender. The aggressor is a party who makes efforts to exploit the other party, and the defender is the other party which makes efforts to resistance to the aggressor’s efforts. However, the notion of the aggressor or the defender is not necessarily associated with the notion of advocacy or accommodation. The aggressor aggressor often reveals the same stance of advocacy as defender the defender in a conflict; but the aggressor-defender model is useful to suggest the continuum by explaining escalation as due to a party’s efforts to exploit other and other’s resistance to these efforts in spiral of the conflict (Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 1994).
his study melds concepts from conflict literature with continuous variable orientation to trace the stances of an organization and its public—which is changed from accommodation to advocacy on a continuum overtime. At a certain point, they (what is they?) a organization-public relationship can be almost symmetrical, but they are not static in the power relationship (Shin & Cameron, 2002). The resulting practice of the successful conflict management cases analyzed in this study can be neither symmetrical or asymmetrical, but do indicate mixed motives, in which “each side retains a strong sense of its own interests, yet each is motivated to cooperate in a limited fashion in order to attain, at least, some resolution of the conflict” (Murphy 1991, p. 125). It will be valuable to identify the continuum of public relations practice in actual successful cases.

Conflict Management Strategies in Public Relations

The conflict in an organization-public relationship requires public relations to manage the conflict for the purpose of organizational interest. Long and Hazelton (1987) defined the managerial perspective of public relations as "a communication function of management through which organizations adapt to, alter, or maintain their environment for the purpose of achieving organizational goals." (p. 6). Public relations should help the organization change its public to the organizational perspective. Kasch (1995) viewed public relationship through a goal-directed, functional and strategic lens. Public relations is “organized by conscious and tacit intentions, and purposes, and is thus, strategic communication… thus impact other’s interpretations (thoughts and action) and thus maximize the change of goal attainment” (p. 4). Strategy essentially explains the choices, plans, or action one makes in attempting to translate one’s goals in a particular situation.

Cameron and McCollum et.al and his associates (2000) pointed out that, “An organization doesn’t adopt an appropriate strategy because of corporate culture and other constraints.” (p. 221). Cameron has developed a contingency theory of conflict management in public relations that seeks to explain why an organization may or may not always engage in two-way communication and accommodative stance or cooperative strategies when confronted with a crisis or a
conflict with some publics. In addition to pointing out when factors drive accommodation, he has identified proscriptive factors that prevent such moves. For example, he has contended, “symmetrical communication to achieve mutual understanding and accommodation doesn’t occur because both sides have staked out highly rigid positions and are not willing to compromise their strong moral positions. It is unlikely that the “prolife” and “prochoice” forces will ever achieve mutual understanding and accommodation (1997, p. 183).

Coombs (2000) interestingly added that an organization’s response may vary on a continuum from defensive to accommodative. And, he suggested the related strategies additions from accommodative strategies (ingratiation, corrective action, full apology) to defensive strategies (attack accuser, denial, excuse). He noted, “Accommodative strategies emphasize image repair, which is what is needed as image damage worsens. Defensive strategies such as denial or minimizing, logically becomes less effective as organizations are viewed as more responsible for the crisis.” (p. 187).

Plowman and his colleagues (1995) similarly employed the concept of contending, avoiding, compromising, collaborating and accommodating from the conflict management literature and developed the conflict management model in public relations “that is based on an organization recognizing the mixed motives intrinsic to most situations and stakeholders” (p. 240). According to Plowman et al. (1995), contending involves one party forcing its position on another party. Collaborating suggests that both parties work together to reconcile basic interests and reach a mutually beneficial solution. Compromising is an alternative agreement that stands part way between the parties’ preferred positions. Avoiding is when one or both parties leave the conflict either physically or psychologically. And, accommodating suggests that one party partially yields on its position and lowers its aspirations.

As earlier stated, the conflict management literature identifies various types of conflict management within two dimensions of assertiveness (attempting to satisfy one’s own concerns) and cooperation (attempting to satisfy the other person’s concerns), which are comparable to advocacy and accommodation. Based on the two dimensions of assertiveness (attempting to satisfy one’s own concerns) and cooperation (attempting to...
satisfy the other person’s concerns), Kilmann and Thomas (1977) developed five conflict styles: competing, compromising, collaborating, accommodating and avoiding. Competing is a mode in which one seeks for one’s own concerns at the other party’s expense. Compromising is a mode in which both parties satisfy at least some of their concerns. Collaborating is an approach in which one attempts to work with the other party to find a mutually satisfying solution. Accommodating is a mode in which one ignores one’s own concern to satisfy the concern of the other party. Avoiding is a mode in which one is not either assertive or cooperative. Rahim and Bonoma (1979) similarly modeled five styles in conflict management including integrating, obliging, dominating, compromising, avoiding on two dimensions of concern for self and concern for others.

The intensity of conflict often involves heavy tactics, which impose great costs on the other party in conflict. Litigation and litigation public relations is an emerging conflict communication management of enormous contemporary significance (Gibson & Padilla, 2000). Thus, this study incorporated dispute resolution processes to analyze the high profile conflict in organization-public relationships. Riskin and Westbrook (1997) divided dispute resolution strategies into three main categories including adjudicative processes (i.e. court and administrative proceedings, arbitration, private tribunal), consensual processes (i.e. ombudsmen, fact finding, negotiation, mediation, conciliation) and mixed processes (mediation-arbitration, mini-trial, summary jury trial, early neutral evaluation, order process). Ware (2001) also provided a useful classification, i.e. adjudication, arbitration, conciliation, early neutral evaluation, litigation, mediation, “mediation-arbitration,” mini-trial, negotiation, non-binding arbitration, private judging, settlement conference, summary jury trial. However, they excluded other important forms of dispute resolution processes such as contending, avoiding, etc., and lakes. More fundamentally, there are a variety of views about what constitutes a process of dispute resolution.

Lan (1997) proposed a comparatively comprehensive framework of dispute conflict resolution strategies, i.e. common goal establishment, consensus-building, joint problem-solving, negotiation, informal arbitration, mediation, nonbinding mini-trial,
conflict enlargement, conflict containment, partnering and outlets for emotion. This study integrates conflict management resolution strategies and dispute resolution processes based on previous studies, particularly Lan’s (1997) conflict resolution framework, to create the analytical scheme of conflict resolution management strategies in public relations. This analytic scheme is underlying the content analysis of high profile conflicts done in this study. It includes ombudsmen, fact finding, litigation, arbitration, mediation, negotiation, mediation, negotiation, mixed process, mini-trial, summary jury trial, neutral case evaluation, punitive sanctions, contending, avoiding, joint problem-solving and outlet of emotion. (Appendix 1).

**Contingent Factors of Conflict Management in Public Relations**

Public relations is a function of organizational activities (Broom & Dozier, 1986; Grunig, Grunig & Dozier, 2002; Wilcox, Cameron, Agee, & Ault, 2002). Public relations professionals employed within an organization must work under the constraints imposed by the organization, i.e. public relations department, top management and any other internal factors. These constraints involve how public relations is practiced in the scope of organization. On the other hand, public relations professionals fundamentally serve as conduits between organizational management and external constituencies for the total communication of the organization, which interacts with the economic, political, social and cultural environment and is often threatened by external publics (Baskin & Arnoff, 1992; Cutlip, Center, & Broom, 1994; Newsom, Turk, & Kruckeberg, 1996).

Accordingly, outlining public relations functions by organizational framework may yield useful insights regarding an organization's communication with publics and insights available for the conflict management in public relations. Cameron and his associates (1997; 1999; 2001; 2002) investigated a number of contingent factors to influence public relations practice by interviewing top public relations practitioners to learn what affected the stance they took toward various publics and by surveying public relations practitioners to learn what factors matter most in their public relations practice.
They thematically categorized 86 factors to influence public relations practice into 11 categories, including threats, industry environment, political/social/cultural environment, external publics, issue under question, organization’s characteristics, PR department characteristics, management characteristics, internal threats, individual characteristics and relationship characteristics. Also, they divided the contingent factors into two dimensions of external variables and internal variables, since public relations practitioners work for an organization, which has its internal environment and its external surroundings. Their most recent study suggests that internal variables such as top management or public relations department are influential to public relations activities, signaling that public relations practice is under the umbrella of an organization.

This study aims at identifying the contingent factors in the conflict management of public relations. This study focuses on what contingent factors appear to move the stances of an organization and its public involved in conflict on a continuum and what contingent factors appear to alter the conflict management strategies of the organization and the public. The results remarkably can explain how the advocacy/accommodation continuum works by investigating how different predisposing and situational variables combine to influence an organization’s accommodation decisions or a public’s accommodation decisions.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

By incorporating conflict and conflict management models into the analysis of the conflict between an organization and its public, this study aims at quantifying the major aspects of the contingent theory model. This theory model, which represents the continuum from accommodation to advocacy, and encapsulates the contingent factors, which are associated with the continuum of stance and the strategies of an organization and its public involved in conflict. To that end, the present study has addressed four specific research questions, two addressing the organization’s stance on conflict and two addressing the organizations’ conflict management strategies.
(1) **Does the “stance” of Are an organization and its conflicting public that are in conflict with each other moving on the advocacy/accommodation continuum from pure advocacy to pure accommodation over time?**

(2) **What “strategies” do the organization and the conflicting public in conflict with each other employing for the conflict management?**

(3) **What contingent factors appear to influence the “stance” of the organization and the conflicting public in conflict on the continuum?**

(4) **What contingent factors appear to influence the conflict management “strategies” of the organization and the conflicting public in conflict on the continuum?**

**METHODS**

This study employed the content analytical method to approach the conflict and conflict management in organization-public relationships. It also examined whether their stance and strategies of an organization and its public were moving or changing on the continuum, whether their strategies are changing over time, and conclusively what contingent factors were associated with their stance and strategies. The investigation analyzed the content of news stories involving the successful conflict resolution stories between an organization and its public.

Within the broad framework of conflictual public relations practice, the successful conflict resolution cases were chosen to examine the application of conflict or conflict resolution models to an issue of conflict between an organization and its public in public relations. The conflict resolution cases with favorable outcome were purposively selected from the book, *The Consensus Building Handbook* (1999), and the website, [http://www.crinfo.com](http://www.crinfo.com), which was recommended by experts in conflict resolution.

Some criteria for the purpose of this study were applied to the process of searching a specific conflict resolution case from the book and the website: (1) Two parties involved in conflict are identified; (2) One of the parties is an organization, i.e. corporation, non-profit organization, government or etc. since this study dealt with the conflict management in public relations; (3) The conflict was resolved with favorable
outcome or an optimally beneficial solution for both parties, and the case is a successful story. Four successful conflict resolution cases were identified: (1) UPS management and its employees; (2) American Airline management and the company’s employees; (3) Department of Agriculture and black farmers; and (3) Seattle Airport and the community residents; (4) Massachusetts military reservation and the state government. After identifying the cases, the news stories for each case were found searched to analyze by using the search engine, Lexis-Nexis. These articles are the news stories written by reporters for “all the time” – over two years. They were searched with keywords for each case: (1) 148 news stories of UPS were identified with keywords, “UPS” and “strike”; (2) 36 news stories of American Airline were identified with keywords, “American Airline” and “employee(s)” ; (3) 65 news stories of the Department of Agriculture and black farmers were identified with keywords, “the Department of Agriculture” and “black farmers”; (3) 12 news stories of Seattle Airport were identified with keywords, “Seattle Airport” and “noise”; (4) 76 news stories of Massachusetts military reservation and the state government were identified with keywords, “Massachusetts military reservation” and “government.” All the keywords were related to an organization, its publics or issue involved in conflict.

The content analysis instrument was designed to evaluate the stances and strategies of an organization and publics, and the contingent factors associated with the stance and strategies of the conflict resolution process in the news stories. A total of 325 news stories were coded for 12 variables, i.e. case source, news story number, party A involved in conflict, party B involved in conflict, overall impression on the stance of party A toward party B, overall impression on the stance of party B toward party A, strategy employed by party A, strategy employed by party B, contingent factor moving the stance of party A, contingent factor moving the stance of party B, contingent factor influencing the strategy of party A, contingent factor influencing the strategy of party B.

The operational definitions of stance, strategies and contingent factors were based on a decision scheme developed by Jae-Hwa Shin and Glen T. Cameron from the contingency and conflict management literature. The decision scheme included the
characteristics of each variable arranged to make identification of each variable in the news story. Two types of measurements analyzed the entire news story as the unit of analysis. One measurement asked for the coder’s overall impression on the stance of each party in the news story. Overall impression was measured on a 7 point Likert scale, where 1 was “very advocate,” and 7 was “very accommodate.” One item asked (1) if each party involved in conflict was an aggressor, a defender or neither of those in the story; (2) what strategies each party employed, along 156 dimensions; (3) what contingent factors influenced the stance of each party, along 112 dimensions; and (4) what contingent factors influenced the strategy of each party, along 11 dimensions. The other measurement asked for the coder’s overall impression of each party in the news story. Overall impression was measured on a 7 point Likert scale, where 1 was “very advocate,” and 7 was “very accommodate.”

Two trained coders independently analyzed all the news stories for each case. Their results were compared for intercoder reliability using a technique which takes chance agreement between coders into consideration. An 85 percent agreement between coders was achieved, with initial agreement at 70 percent. Initial disagreements between coders were reconciled in meetings of the coders. Simple percent agreement was computed given the categorical coding, and high agreement was reached through recounts in the second pretest stage.

RESULTS

A general observation from the data indicates that public conflict provides a natural history of the use of contingency theory in public relations. Although the perspectives of two parties were changed over time, but both parties were involved in high profile conflicts throughout the conflict resolution process, demonstrated by their continuous overall advocacy for their stance during the conflict resolution processes. Also, they dominantly employed contending the strategy of contending or avoiding (what does this mean?) during the conflict management processes. The changing
aspects in perspectives and strategies over time were predominantly were associated with two contingent factors, internal threats and external threats.

The first question is whether or not if the two parties in conflict are moving on a continuum from pure advocacy to pure accommodation over time. The research found that the two parties involved in conflict of all of the cases moved on a continuum from advocacy to accommodation in the conflict resolution process. The descriptive information suggested that two parties’ stances in conflict were not static and do changing over time. The descriptive information for the parties in conflict also suggested that they advocated rather than accommodated in the process: The average overall level of perspectives of one party A (M=3.82) and the other party B (M=3.06) indicated that both were generally were advocates in the conflict resolution processes, on a 1-7 scale, where 1 represented high advocacy, and 7 represented high accommodation, and a The public’s stance shown as party B was advocated slightly more advocate than the organization’s stance shown as party A, and a paired samples t-test showed that this difference was significant (t=9.544; p=0.000). Also, the spearman correlations showed that more advocacy by one party, the more advocacy by the other (r= 0.28; p=0.000), suggesting an conflict escalation pattern.

This study introduced the notion of aggressor or defender from the conflict management literature to see how each can be associated with advocacy or accommodation. The descriptive information indicated that in 222 out of 337 news stories when a party is characterized as an aggressor, the other is appeared as a defender; in 222 out of 337 news stories, In addition, and a paired samples t-test showed that this difference was significant (t=3.866; p=0.000). Also, a public is characterized more often as the aggressor, whereas the organization involved in conflict is characterized more often as the defender; In 180 out of 222 news stories, a public is characterized as the aggressor. Also, if it is associated with the overall stance of each party, an aggression stance or clearly makes an impression of advocacy ($\chi^2=148.331; p=0.000$), while a defensive
approach makes an impression of accommodation to advocacy ($\chi^2=97.077; p=0.000$). The Chi-Square tests showed that these associations were significant.

The second question is what strategies the two parties in conflict are employing in the conflict management processes. The research demonstrated that the two parties involved in conflict in all of the cases predominately employed contending strategy dominantly during the conflict management process. The most predominantly employed strategies by an organization and its public were contending (161), litigation (106), negotiation (92), and problem-solving (61). Also, the result showed that a party’s strategies were associated with the other’s strategies ($\chi^2=998.583; p=0.000$). Although the cases were successful conflict resolution stories, both parties involved in the high profile conflicts similarly tended to employ hard tactics, i.e. contending, litigation, during the process.

Insert Table 2 about here

Insert Figure 2 about here

The third question is what contingent factors appear to influence the stances of the organization and the public in conflict on the continuum. The descriptive information suggested that the predominant contingent factors associated with the stances of an organization and its public were internal threats (149), external threats (128), external public (107), organization’s characteristics (88), general political/economic/cultural environment (75) and industry environment (73). The results showed that a party’s stance was associated with the contingent factors ($\chi^2=332.156; p=0.000$). Notably, internal threats predominantly appeared when an organization highly advocated, whereas general political/economic/cultural environment predominantly appeared when a public highly advocated.

Insert Table 3 about here

Insert Figure 3 about here
The fourth question is what contingent factors appear to alter the conflict management strategies of the organization and the public in conflict. The descriptive information suggested that the predominant contingent factors associated with the strategies of an organization and its public were external threats (155), internal threats (101), external public (99), organization’s characteristics (88), general political/economic/cultural environment (73) and industry environment (65). The results showed that a party’s strategies were associated with the contingent factors ($\chi^2 = 230.229; p=0.000$). Notably, external threats predominantly appeared when the organization was highly advocates intensely, but internal threats and external threats, and general political/economic culture similarly appeared when the public was making a strong highly-advocacy push.

DISCUSSION

The content analysis of news coverage over two years of major public conflicts provides a natural history of the use of contingency theory in public relations. This study began by questioning whether an organization and its public involved in conflict are moving on a continuum from advocacy to accommodation over time, what strategies are the organization and the public in conflict employing for the conflict management and finally what contingent factors appear to move the stances and the strategies of the organization and the public in conflict on the continuum.

A general observation from the data indicated that the public conflict resolution processes were on the continuum from advocacy to accommodation over time. Also, although the case-studies examined were examples of successful conflict resolution stories, such hard tactics as contending or litigation rather than problem-solving were predominantly employed by both an organization and its public involved in conflict.
during the conflict resolution processes, although the cases are successful conflict resolution stories. Finally, internal threats are predominantly associated with a party’s stance, whereas external threats are predominantly associated with a party’s strategy. And the organization’s stance mostly was correlated with external threats, whereas the public’s stance mostly was correlated with internal threats.

The findings here suggest describe that public relations is contingent in nature, and depending upon on the contingent factors. As the literature on the contingency theory of conflict management literature has proposed, the stances of an organization and its public are not static, but rather moving from advocacy to accommodation (Cameron et al., 2001; Cancel et al., 1997; Shin et al., 2002). An organization and its public involved in conflict often advocates rather than accommodative. Also, an organization highly advocates when its public also is very very advocates active in advocating its perspective. The reverse also is true; and when a public highly advocates its side, the organization is also is active in advocating its perspectives.

This empirical research It may could imply verify that an organization and its public may not stay at a certain point, and their power organization-public relationship is a process that an organization and its public seek for consequences for each other on a continuum (Shin & Cameron, 2002).

Also, an organization and its public involved in conflict often advocate rather than accommodate. An organization highly advocates when its publics are very active in advocating its perspective. The reverse also is true; the public highly advocates its side, when the organization also is active in advocating its perspective. Their relationship is essentially is related to the notion of “public” since the “problematizing” of unquestioned, absolute allegiance to an organization brings the recognition of the publics that the organization communicates with, in turn encouraging the organization to make a strategic communication choices of the organization to cope with the publics' social and political environment the organization inhabits. These next sentences seem unnecessary and out of place here in the discussion. Dewey (1927) early described a public as a group of people who face a similar problem, recognize that the problem exists, and organize to do something about the problem. Blumer (1966) also
suggested that the inherent role of a public in organization-public relationship is, as a group of people who are confronted by an issue, divided in their idea about how to meet the issue, and engaged in discussion about the issue.]

The nature of conflict in the organization-public relationship closely has been well associated with the contingent factors in the successful conflict resolution processes. Whereas an organization is highly affected by external threats when the organization highly advocates, its public is greatly affected by general political/economic cultures when the public very active in advocating its perspective. It is possible that both an organization and its public is dominated by its higher level of authority: For an organization, external threats around an organizational activity may be crucial, but for its public, general political/economic/social culture may be an important factor that influences its coalition by problematizing.

Interestingly, this study suggests that both an organization and its public employed hard tactics such as contending and litigation, but the strategic approach of an organization and its public also changes over time. It may be gratifying interesting remarkable to see this result combined by the stances of two parties moving on the continuum overtime. The cyclic life of the conflict resolution processes, where both an organization and its public involved in conflict changes their stance and strategies over time by their stance and strategies moving overtime, reinforces the main concept of the contingency theory of conflict management, is “dynamic process” (Shin & Cameron, 2002). The natural history of successful conflict resolutions supports this at contingency perspective of conflict management, which has consistently occupied a central role in the organization-public relationship in a “dynamic process.”

Overall, this study suggests the practical and theoretical implications to public relations practitioners by supporting and further developing providing the contingency theory model with the validity of several the-variables in the conflict management. Public relations practitioners should understand the opportunities and challenges of public relations practice by identifying the contingent factors factors associated with both stances and strategies of either “self (organization)” or “other (public)” in the organization-public relationship.
However, these findings require further research with a larger sample to legitimize how exactly the contingent factors associate or dissociate with each other to influence the stance or strategies of an organization and its publics with a wider sample. A series of studies should be conducted in an attempt to replicate the results and explain how power differences between an organization and its public influence their stance and strategies of an organization and its public are associated with in various types of public relations, i.e. investor relations, consumer relations, interest groups relations, community relations, government relations, employee relations, etc. Also, this study does not deal with unsuccessful conflict resolutions in public relations, which could provide further a more rationale for the contingency theory in the conflict management. Such cases would help develop a more comprehensive public relations theory and move toward a general theory of public relations for the contingency model.
REFERENCES


APPENDIX 1

Conflict Resolution Strategies*

1. Ombudsmen: An official, appointed by an institution, whose job is to investigate complaints and either prevent disputes or facilitate their resolution within that institution. Methods include investigation, publicizing and recommending.

2. Fact Finding: A neutral is selected to find facts. This can aid in negotiation, mediation or adjudication.

3. Litigation: The third party with power imposes a solution upon the disputants. Participants are given opportunity to present evidence and arguments, and usually they do so through representatives, ordinarily lawyers.

4. Arbitration: An informal process in which people in a dispute present their views to a knowledgeable neutral person, an “arbitrator,” who decides how the dispute will be resolved.

5. Mediation: A process in which a trained neutral or impartial person, a “mediator,” helps people in a dispute to communicate with one another, understand each other, and if possible, reach agreements that satisfy the participants’ needs.

6. Negotiation: A person seeks to resolve a disagreement or plan a transaction through discussions, which may include reasoned argument. The discussions may be conducted between the parties themselves or through representatives.


8. Mini-trial: A structured settlement process designed to bring the focus of disputing parties into a final decision generally made by a panel of senior corporate executives from the disputing organizations who are not personally involved with the dispute.


10. Neutral Case Evaluation: A process in which people in a dispute present their views, often in written form, to a knowledgeable neutral person who evaluates their dispute and expresses an opinion about the most likely outcome in court.

11. Punitive Sanction: retributive or reparative justice on the conflictual behavior. There are considerable variations among cultures and subcultures with regard to the rules of punitive sanctions.

12. **Contending:** A strategy that involves an effort by the one party to impose its preferred solution on the other party.

13. **Avoiding:** A strategy that involves moving away from the settlement of conflict, either through inaction or withdrawing escalation, the adoption by one party of heavier tactics now than before.

14. **Problem-solving:** A strategy that involves seeking a mutually satisfactory alternative.

15. **Outlet of Emotion:** A strategy that involves generating heavy emotions such as anger, resentment and frustration and accomplishing the diffusion of emotions.

16. **Others:** None of the above.

**Contingent Factors:**

1. **Threats:** litigation, government regulation, potentially damaging publicity, scarring of organization’s reputation in community, legitimizing activists’ claims

2. **Industry Environment:** changing (dynamic) or static, number of competitors/level of competition, richness or leanness of resources in the environment

3. **General Political/Social Environment / External Culture (level of constraint/uncertainty):** degree of political support of business, degree of social support of business

4. **The External Public** (group, individual, etc.): size/number of members, degree of source credibility/powerful members or connections, past successes or failures of public to evoke change, amount of advocacy practiced by organization, level of communication/involvement of public/s members, whether the public has public relations counselors or not, community’s perception of public: reasonable or radical level of media coverage the public has received in past, whether representatives of the public know or like representatives of the organization, whether representatives of the organization know or like representatives from the public, public’s willingness to dilute its cause/request/claims moves and countermoves, relative power of organization, relative power of public

5. **Issue Under Question:** size, stakes, complexity

6. **Organization’s Characteristics:** open or closed culture, dispersed widely geographically or centralized, level of technology the organization uses to produce its product or service, homogeneity or heterogeneity of employees, age of the organization/value placed on tradition, speed of growth in the knowledge level the organization uses, economic stability of the organization, existence or non-existence of issues management personnel or program, organization’s past experiences with the public, distribution of decision-making power, formalization: number of rules or codes defining and limiting the job descriptions of employees, stratification/hierarchy of positions, existence or influence of legal department

---

business exposure (product mix and customer mix), corporate culture (can you make this any shorter?)

7. Public Relations Department Characteristics: total number of practitioners and number with college degrees, type of past training of employees: trained in PR or ex-journalists, marketing, etc., location of PR department in hierarchy: independent or under marketing umbrella/ experiencing encroachment of marketing/persuasive mentality, representation in the dominant coalition experience level of PR practitioners in dealing with conflict, general communication competency of department autonomy of department physical placement of department in building (near CEO and other top decision makers or not) staff trained in research methods, amount of funding available for dealing with external publics, amount of time allowed to use dealing with external publics, gender: percentage of female upper-level staff/managers, potential of department to practice various models of public relations

8. Characteristics of Dominant Coalition (top management): political values (conservative or liberal), open or closed to change, management style (domineering or laid back), general altruism level, support and understanding of PR, frequency of external contact with publics, department perception of the organization’s external environment, calculation of potential rewards or losses using different strategies with external publics, degree of line manager involvement in external affairs

9. Internal Threats (how much is at stake in the situation): economic loss or gain from implementing various stances, marring of employees’ or stockholders’ perception of the company, marring of the personal reputations of the company decision makers (image in employees’ perceptions and general public’s perception

10. Individual Characteristics (public relations practitioner, dominant coalition and line managers): training in PR, marketing, journalism, engineering, etc., personal ethics, tolerance of ability to deal with uncertainty, comfort level with conflict or dissonance, comfort level with change, ability to recognize potential and existing problems, extent of openness to innovation, extent to which individual can grasp others’ world-views, personality: dogmatic, authoritarian, communication competency, cognitive complexity: ability to handle complex problems, predisposition towards negotiation, predisposition towards altruism, how individuals receive, process and use information and influence, familiarity with external public or its representative, like external public or its representative, gender: female versus male (can you make this shorter?)

11. Relationship Characteristics: level of trust between organization and external public, dependency of parties involved, ideological barriers between organization and public

12. Others: None of the above
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Table 1
The Overall Stances of an Organization (A) and its Public (B) in Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Stance of Organization (A)</th>
<th>highly advocate</th>
<th>advocate</th>
<th>little advocate</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>little accommodate</th>
<th>accommodate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>highly advocate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little advocate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little accommodate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very accommodate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
The Changing Stances of an Organization (A) and its Public (B) on a Continuum Over Time

The Changing Stances of UPS Management (A) and UPS Employees (B) Over Time
Going Head to Head: Content Analysis of the High Profile Conflicts as Played Out in the Press

The Changing Stances of American Airline Management (A) and AA Employees (B)
The Changing Stances of the Department of Agriculture (A) and Black Farmers (B)

The Changing Stances of Massachusetts Military Reservation (A) and the State Government (B)
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Time Order
**Table 2**
The Dominant Strategies Employed by an Organization (A) and its Public (B) in Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Strategy of Organization (A)</th>
<th>The Strategy of Public (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsmen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact Finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Jury Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Case Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitive Sanction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contending</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlet of Emotion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**
The Dominant Strategies Employed by an Organization (A) and its Public (B) in Conflict
Dominant Strategy B

- Fact Finding B
- Litigation B
- Arbitration B
- Mediation B
- Negotiation B
- Summary Jury Trial B
- Contending B
- Avoiding B
- Problem Solving B
- Outlet of emotion B
- Others B
Table 3
The Contingent Factors Associated with the “Stances” of an Organization (A) and its Public (B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingent-Stance</th>
<th>Organization A</th>
<th>Public B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Environment</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Culture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Public</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Characteristics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Threats</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
The Contingent Factors Associated with the “Stances” of an Organization (A) and its Public (B)

The Contingent Factors Associated with the Stances of an Organization (A)
The Contingent Factors Associated with the Stances of Public (B)

Table 4
The Contingent Factors Associated with the “Strategies” of an Organization (A) and its Public (B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingent-Strategy (Organization A)</th>
<th>Contingent Strategy (Public B)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Environment</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Culture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Public</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Characteristics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Threats</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 4**
The Contingent Factors Associated with the “Strategies” of an Organization (A) and its Public (B)

*The Contingent Factors Associated with the Strategies of an Organization (A)*
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The Contingent Factors Associated with the Strategies of Public (B)

Contingent-StrategyA