The new publicity: From reflexive to reflective mediatisation
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ABSTRACT

In the second half of the 20th century, more than 150 studies explored relations between public relations and the mass media and they found that between 20 and 80% of the journalistic media content was influenced by some sort of 'information subsidies' provided by public relations. In the past 30 years, the number of journalists per 100,000 Americans dropped from .36 to .25. At the same time, the number of public relations practitioners per 100,000 Americans rose from .45 to .90. Now there are five public relations practitioners per one journalist. From providers of information subsidies, public relations is transforming into media producer and distributor, and creator of news and stories. The paper suggests that new mediated realities of public relations go beyond traditional publicity.
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1. Introduction

The emergence of public relations in the early 20th century was largely fuelled by the rapid mediatisation of society. As journalists gained power as middlemen between organisations and society, framing news and setting the public agenda in the mass media, organisations (corporations and governments alike) responded by introducing counter-parts on their side: public relations practitioners as middlemen between the mass media and organisations (Merten, 2004). Public relations practitioners enabled organisations to become reflexive to the mass media expectations and adjust their behaviours to journalistic needs – i.e. influence the news media (Hall Jamieson & Kohrs Campbell, 1997). Media relations – management of relations between organisations and the mass media, ‘an area of public relations that many nonpractitioners see as the only function of public relations’ (Zoch & Molleda, 2006, p. 279) – is the most practiced area in the public relations sector (Swirling, Thorson, & Tenderich, 2012; Wilson & Supa, 2013; Zerfass, Vonhoveven, Trench, Moreno, & Verčič, 2011). In the second half of the 20th century, more than 150 studies explored relations between public relations and the mass media and they found that between 20 and 80% of the journalistic media content was influenced by some sort of ‘information subsidies’ provided by public relations (Cameron, Salott, & Curtin, 1997; Merten, 2004). But that was when journalism as a profession was at its peak and public relations was only becoming an aspiring practice. The numbers on changes in the relative weights of the two sides since the middle of the previous century speak for themselves. In the past 30 years, the number of journalists per 100,000 Americans dropped from .36 to .25. At the same time, the number of public relations practitioners per 100,000 Americans rose from .45 to .90 (McChesney & Nichols, 2010). From less than one public relations practitioner per one journalist in 1960 (the ratio was 0.75-to-1 [McChesney & Nichols, 2010]), there are now five public relations practitioners per one journalist (Williams, 2014). Between 2000 and 2009, the newspaper advertising revenue in the US dropped from $49 to $22 billion. Between 1997 and 2007 revenues of the US public relations agencies went up
from $43.5 to $8.75 billion. The number of US newspaper reporters and editors dropped from 56,900 in 1990 to 41,600 in 2011. The number of people employed by the US public relations agencies increased from 38,735 in 1997 to 50,499 in 2007 (Sullivan, 2011). These numbers are from the US and they are different around the world, but the trend seems to be the same in the whole Western Hemisphere: in relative balance between journalism and public relations, public relations is gaining and journalism is losing (Lloyd & Toogood, 2015).

While the introduction of public relations practitioners since the 1920s has led to reflexivity in media relations, what is emerging today leads to a new phenomenon of reflective mediatisation: non-core-media organisations (business companies and government agencies, NGOs and movements) are reflectively mediatising themselves. From providers of information subsidies (Gandy, 1982), public relations is transforming into media producer and creator of news and stories. The Coca-Cola Company is experimenting with its own ‘brand journalism’ in its digital magazine – http://www.coca-colacompany.com (Working, 2013). In September 2013, Alex Aiken, the Executive Director of the UK Government Communications, declared: ‘The press release is dead’ (Magee, 2013). In January 2014, Kim McKinnon, the Canadian Government’s Communications Community Officer, published the following statement on the Canadian Government official website: ‘The Government of Canada is retiring the traditional press release format in favour of a more digital-friendly product that makes the key messages of announcements clearer, quick facts more accessible and integrates more effectively with social media channels’ (McKinnon, 2014). These examples highlight changes in relations between public relations and the media (PR Daily, 2014).

The article starts with the notion of reflexive media relations, presents reflective mediatisation, and raises questions on organisational and societal consequences of these processes and the described changes.

2. Reflexive media relations

Media are extensions of our senses (McLuhan, 1964) and we use them to make sense of the world beyond our physical reach. Media systems help us in a wide world by reducing its complexity for us. Until the invention of the newspaper in 1609, knowledge of the world was limited by authentic observation; newspapers increased breadth of knowledge but at the expense of its authenticity. While media are reflexive in constructing reduced (edited) media realities for us, it is only natural that we as parts of that reality try to influence its construction. That is how Merten (2004) sees the role of public relations (reducing it to media relations): ‘Public relations is a strategy for using communication processes to generate desired effects by constructing desired realities’ (p. 45). No wonder then that so much of public relations work is focussed on the media (Sriramesh & Verčič, 2009).

A practitioner handbook explains: ‘One of the primary functions of public relations is to get fair – or, even better yet, favourable – coverage from the media’ (Kosmicki & Bona, 1996, p. 59). A marketing textbook explains the importance of public relations in the following way: ‘Public relations uses several tools. One of the major tools is news’ (Kotler & Armstrong, 2014, p. 473). From a public relations academic point of view: ‘Publicity is probably the most widely visible tool of public relations’ (Pavlík, 1987, p. 53). Public relations is a broader term than media relations, covering all communication between organisations and their various stakeholders: ‘Public relations/communication management describe the overall planning, execution, and evaluation of an organization’s communication with both external and internal publics – groups that affect the ability of an organisation to meet its goals’ (Grunig, 1992, p. 4). The importance of media relations within the totality of public relations is supported by empirical research (Swirling et al., 2012; Wilson & Supa, 2013; Zerfass et al., 2011), yet Larsson (2008) notes that ‘the PR-media relation is an underdeveloped research area’ (p. 2997).

Within liberal democracies of the 20th century, mass media were largely divided in two parts. One was reserved for advertising and it was for sale. Commercial interests were in principle free to publish whatever they needed as long as they were able to pay for time or space. The other part was what was defining mass media (print, radio, and TV) in liberal democracies, edited news content. That part was in the focus of public relations in its media relations function. Hall Jamieson and Kohrs Campbell (1997) list several strategies organisations can use to influence news coverage: manipulating deadlines (e.g. by releasing important information late in relation to a broadcast or print deadline it is likely that it will be reported uncritically), manipulating access (e.g. if there are more journalists interested in reporting an event than there are available places, selection of who gets access can influence the tone of reporting), manipulating news assignments (e.g. by releasing stories to selected journalists), using media competition (e.g. by using coverage in one important medium to influence other media), selection of language and symbols, manipulating live coverage (which is practically impossible to edit), prepackaged news (pseudo-events, news feeds, news conferences, and prepared editorials). In Zoch and Molleda’s (2006) words:

Becoming proficient in media relations is a complex process involving a deep understanding of media routines, interpersonal relations, and message construction; a savvy regard for timing, organizational factors, and news values; good research, both internal and external; awareness of current and potential environmental and public issues; and familiarity with organizational stakeholders, publics, and interest groups. Each of these areas holds potential for further research into the media relations process. (p. 302)

But understanding PR-media relations only in terms of PR influencing the media is incomplete. Günter Bentele, Tobias Liebert, and Stefan Seeling developed an ‘interference model’ to conceptualise how the media and public relations mutually work upon each other (Bentele & Nothaft, 2008). This goes well beyond influencing news coverage on the media side: organisations and their leaders are not only ‘preparing managers to interact with journalists in interviews or news
conferences’ (Ryan, 2013, p. 556); corporations are working strategically on ways to position their CEOs internally and externally, including in the media (Zerfass, Verčič, & Wiesen, 2014). Organisations and their leaders not only talk to media, they behave in ways to become attractive to the media and their audiences – the media affect other organisations as much as organisations affect the media.

There are different advantages and disadvantages for organisations in using advertising or publicity (earned content in the editorial part of the media) to enter traditional media (press, radio, and TV; c.f. Hallahan, 2013) when considering promotion of a product, a service, or its corporate brand and interest, but the major one concerns credibility: it is assumed that the publication in the editorial (journalistic) part of a medium is more credible if compared to the publication in the advertising section (Verčič, 2013).

3. Reflective mediatisation

At the turn from the 20th into the 21st century, the information and communication technology (ICT) revolution facilitated important changes in production and consumption of the media. Without going into much detail, traditional mass media (print, radio, and TV) are going down and not-so-new-any-more media (the Internet, social, and mobile media) are going up. But while the traditional media in liberal democracies praised the Chinese wall between advertising and journalism as the constituting element of fair journalism and news-reporting, the so-called new media tear that wall down.

Changes are happening at two levels. First, the difference between paid (advertising) and earned media (news) content is blurring. And second, media production itself is decentring from core media houses (publishing and broadcasting corporations) to all types of organisations.

Blurring of paid and earned media content is visible in many forms. Even a high-quality traditional newspaper, as The New York Times is, publishes live news feeds on its homepage in which journalist and publicist pieces are altered in the same stream, which has brought the notion that social media may be becoming new press releases (Meyer, 2014). Three terms appear in this context: native advertising, content marketing, and brand journalism. They are widely used and discussed in practice, but they have not received enough research interest and they are conspicuously absent even in the newest editions of public relations, advertising, and marketing textbooks (Belch & Belch, 2012; Broom & Sha, 2013; Kotler & Armstrong, 2014; Shimp & Andrews, 2013; Tench & Yeomans, 2014).

3.1. Native advertising

Native advertising is a new term for placement of paid content in the editorial media environment. BBC economics editor Preston (2014) explains:

‘Native ads’ is a terrible Orwellian Newspeak phrase for ads that look like impartial editorial. They could be articles written by a commercial company, or features written about a commercial company by the journalists of a news organisation but sponsored by that company. Or they may be videos either sponsored by a business or produced by the business. Of course each of these will say something like ‘sponsored content’ at the top of the page. But it is very easy to miss this signposting when the article simply pops up in the middle of a run of stories on a website. As a reader, you have to be on your guard to distinguish the native ads from the proper journalism. And many of us may well be in too much of a rush most of the time when online to notice the distinction. Which is, I fear, pernicious.

Preston is talking primarily about online media, but one can see the same processes emerging in the traditional, off-line media (press, radio, TV).

3.2. Content marketing

The idea of content marketing is a simple one: ‘The overarching practice of using information and entertainment to promote a brand or product’ (DeMers, 2014). The Content Marketing Institute (2007–2014) explains the term as follows: ‘Content marketing’s purpose is to attract and retain customers by consistently creating and curating relevant and valuable content with the intention of changing or enhancing consumer behaviour. It is an ongoing process that is best integrated into your overall marketing strategy, and it focusses on owning media, not renting it’ (bolded emphases in the original). Macnamara (2014) still calls it ‘21st century corporate publishing’ (p. 747).

3.3. Brand journalism

The term brand journalism is a new name to what used to be known as industrial journalism, and DVorkin (2012) explains it as ‘digital publishing and social media to speak directly to consumers’. As a capture to an illustration to his story says: ‘Content is Content: News consumers value information from a wide array of sources’ (italics in the original). He lists companies like SAP, Microsoft, Dell, Meryl Lynch, United Airlines, and Toyota among its users. Brand journalism assumes that media consumers equally value media content from whatever source it comes and however it is paid for, as long as it is attractive to catch our attention. Light (2014) highlights the subversive nature of brand journalism:
“The concept of brand journalism is not only shaking up traditional views of brand management, it is also shaking up traditional views of journalism. Brand journalism is evolving into content creation, using journalistic skills; it is redefining what news is and how it should be communicated on behalf of a brand.”

while DVorkin (2012) frankly admits that

“content marketing initiatives can be discomforting for traditional journalists. They needn’t be. Those of us with long careers in journalism have moved in and out of the gray zone between journalism and advertising. Special features, special sections, sponsored content and similar revenue-driving content features involve editorial conflicts that result in professional compromises, some more uncomfortable than others. Products like BrandVoice draw a bright shiny line between journalist and marketer for all to see. The critical requirement is transparency, which means proper identification and labeling.”

Brand journalism is not about hiding the identity of the communicator. McChesney and Nichols (2010) write that media relations activities of the public relations function must be invisible to audiences: ‘If people understand a PR campaign exists, by definition it has failed’ (p. xiii). Not necessarily. Native advertising, content marketing, and brand journalism operate in the sunlight, or as Filloux (2014) writes: ‘Corporations are tempted to take over journalism with increasingly better content’.

The trio of native advertising, content marketing, and brand journalism was enabled by the rapid development of the ICT and media production technology. Today, all major corporations, from American Express to Burger King, consider themselves media companies (Iezzi, 2012). But the most successful in this trend is probably Red Bull, a producer and marketer of a canned energy drink, which transformed its communication into a separate and profitable business – Red Bull Media House, operating print, TV, online, mobile, music, games, and cinema programmes (http://www.redbullmedialhouse.com/).

The reality is that journalism and public relations/media relations are in a process of hybridisation and that (mass) media production is being decentralised from media to all types of organisations.

4. Discussion

To communicate is to select (Luhmann, 1984/1995) and it is primarily through selection of media that organisations select meanings for themselves and for their ‘significant others’. That is covered in McLuhan’s dictum the medium is the message (McLuhan & Fiore, 1976) and in the term mediation as defined by Silverstone (1999) – ‘the circulation of meaning’ (p. 13).

The power of modern mass media in Western societies (and consequently of media relations function of public relations trying to influence them) is based on the assumption of their effects (Harlow, 2013; Keppelinger, 2015), with agenda-setting being among the strongest (Perse, 2015; Weaver, 2015). “This theory advances the theme that reporters serve as gatekeepers to filter news events and by, their reporting, set an agenda.” (DeSanto, 2013, p. 22). Agenda-setting theory is founded on a chapter from Walter Lippmann’s classic book on Public Opinion titled “The World Outside and the Pictures in Our Heads.” The first level agenda-setting theory addresses the question: “What are the pictures about?” The second-level agenda-setting theory addresses the question: “What are the dominant characteristics of these pictures?” And the third level agenda-setting theory addresses the question: “What are the pictures in our heads?” (Guo, Vu, & McCombs, 2012, p. 54). Journalists set media agenda and media agenda sets public agenda. But what if sources (organisations) bypass journalists and directly communicate with stakeholders they are interested in? And what if they do this not by broadcasting – addressing wide audiences in public space, thus creating public sphere (Bentele, 2013), but by narrowcasting – communicating really only with stakeholders they are interested in? In that case hybrid forms of communication that are focused on content strategy (native advertising, brand journalism and content marketing) not only bypass agenda-setting mass media, they themselves constitute the power of public relations agenda-setting. This is in line with what Ihlen and Pallas (2014) observed: “Tracking the history of mediatisation of the corporation by looking at how the discipline and practice of public relations have grown, the growth of the practice of public relations can be read either as a consequence of increased importance of communication in general and the media in particular or as a consequence of how public relations has outgrown the traditional media relations function.” (p. 435) And here a fundamental question emerges: was not the social role of journalists and the traditional mass media in Western (liberal) societies in that they embedded influence as the circulating medium of the social community, as value commitments were the medium for the fiduciary subsystem, money for economic subsystem and power for political subsystem in Parsons modern sociology (Lidz, 2001)? If so, is it possible that influence if being transferred from journalism to public relations?

5. Implication

This article presented fundamental changes that are happening in the relations between public relations and the media. Historically, the roles of journalists, advertisers, and public relations practitioners in liberal democracies differentiated at the turn from the 19th to 20th century, but it seems that the borders between them started to blur at the turn from the 20th to 21st century. The distinction between paid media content (advertising) and editorial content (news and reports) was sacrosanct, and modern, 20th century liberal journalism was constituted on that distinction. What has happened since the end of the 20th century is that, starting in the so-called new media (the Internet, social, and mobile media), the line between paid and earned media content is becoming invisible, while on the other side the very production of media is
moving from specialist media organisations to non-core-media organisations: more and more companies, governments and their agencies, and non-governmental organisations and movements produce their own media, and these media produced by non-core-media organisations are becoming more and more important with a tendency to take over spaces that were previously occupied by traditional media. The difference between mass media and all other forms of communication is blurring (Castells, 2009), thus levelling paid, earned and social media with mass self-communication (and the newly emerging wearable media) into the same media field.

The newest mediatisation of the Western societies could easily lead to the extremes of a fully manipulated influence environments as presented in dystopic science fiction multimedia stories like The Hunger Games. Originally, The Hunger Games was a science fiction novel written in 2008 by Suzanne Collins that instantaneously became a literary and a cultural phenomenon (Henthorpe, 2012). The author developed it into a trilogy that sold millions of copies in several dozen languages around the world. Transferred into a film it again became a hit and already the first movie based on the first book totalled US$691,247,768 (The Hunger Games, 2012). Muller (2012) sums it as about ‘a dystopian future society in which a punitive ruling elite provide “entertainment” for the masses in the form of mediatised “games” featuring young people who must fight to kill one another until there is only one winner’ (p. 51). It is about a mediatised dystopian future in which communication managers are the true rulers of the society. And this may well be one of the possible futures of a reflectively mediatised world. If non-media corporations became the major providers of what-used-to-be-public communication content, the notion of a general public as a space of public deliberation and representation of a society will probably disappear. Without public communication and publicity there can be no democracy.

Time may be reversible in natural sciences, but it has not been seen as such in social sciences. Restoration of the fallen media structures and organisations seems unlikely and we need new frameworks for understanding the contemporary media and people specialised in their production. If there are fewer and fewer journalists and more public relations/media relations specialists in the field, we need more research into forces at play. Or, as Larsson (2008) concludes: ‘The academic debate about the implications for society of the relationship between the PR industry and the media will certainly continue’ (p. 2998).
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