Gheorghe-Ilie FÂRTE*

How can we evaluate
public relations activities?

Comment peut-on évaluer les activités de relations publiques ?

Résumé: Les changements profonds qui sont survenus dans la société contemporaine – tout d'abord, le spectaculaire et omniprésent phénomène du downsizing – mettent en avant le problème de l'évaluation des activités professionnelles, y compris les activités de relations publiques. Les critères d'évaluation que je vais utiliser sont donnés par les éléments constituants de l'activité humaine en général: l'agent, l'instrument, le contexte, l'objectif et le résultat. Conformément au statut social ou sur le niveau de formation des agents impliqués, nous pouvons distinguer entre les relations publiques pratiquées par des professionnels et les relations publiques exercées par des amateurs. Selon que les théories, les méthodes et les techniques des sciences sociales sont utilisées ou ignorées, on peut distinguer entre les relations publiques scientifiquement fondées et les relations publiques sans fondement. Relations publiques peuvent être qualifiée de constructives ou destructives en fonction de leur impact sur la vie publique et sur l'opinion publique. On peut distinguer entre les relations publiques réalistes et les relations publiques chimériques en fonction du degré de réalisme dans les objectifs poursuivis. Enfin, les activités de relations publiques peuvent être qualifiée comme étant soit efficaces ou inefficaces dans la mesure où elles résultent dans la réalisation des objectifs fixés.

Mots clefs : relations publiques/ public relations, critères d'évaluation des activités professionnelles, niveau de formation des agents impliqués dans les relations publiques.

The radical changes contemporary society undergoes – first of all, the dramatic and pervasive phenomenon of downsizing – bring to the forefront the problem of measuring and evaluating professional activities, including public relations activities. Usually, when an evaluation is made, a set of criteria and standards is employed so that the objects or activities under observation can be clearly distributed in disjunctive classes. For example, human activities can be qualified as effective or ineffective according to the way they succeed or not in accomplishing their objectives, efficient or inefficient relying on whether the ratio of results to cost is profitable or not, moral or immoral depending on their observance of the values adopted (implicitly or explicitly) by that community. The problem of evaluating public relations activities enjoyed the constant attention of theorists

and experts in the field (to mention only over 40 papers on the matter posted on the U.S. Institute for Public Relations website). As the case stands, I do not intend to add new procedures of evaluating public relations, but to systematize a relevant part of the existing contributions. The criteria I will use are given by the constituents of human activities in general: the agent, the instrument, the context, the objective and the result.

Professionalism versus amateurism in practicing public relations

Depending on the social status or on the level of training of the agents involved, we can distinguish between public relations practiced by professionals and by amateurs, although it is easier to assert than to justify this distinction, given the imprecision of the concept of professionalism.

According to Michael Ryan and David Martinson, professionals can be differentiated from unqualified persons in the following aspects: (a) they practice their activity full-time, (b) they master a system of esoteric knowledge in continuous development, (c) they use specialized working techniques, (d) they adhere to certain standards of action, (e) they are members of professional organizations which protect them, but can also call them to order, (f) they are autonomous in relation to other professions, (g) they subscribe to the professional standards of conduct and (h) they hold the public welfare and the client's interest in higher regard than their own material interest (Ryan & Martison, 1990). Similarly and in a more condensed manner, Scott Cutlip states that the professional status can be acquired in a particular field depending on

five criteria: (a) specialized education, (b) catering for a single essential service, acknowledged as such by the community, (c) public service and social responsibility ought to prevail over particular interests, (d) autonomy and responsibility in taking decisions which affect the public and (e) applying an ethical code and performance standards by means of self-adjustment through the associations of one's peers (cf. Saunders & Perrigo, 1998: 58).

When applying the stipulations above to public relations activities, a question arises: are we looking at a healthy rise in the degree of professionalism, or, on the contrary, at professionalism being turned into a sort of fetish (with a view to conceal the precariousness of the theoretical and methodological bases or the insecurity towards other trades)?

Chris Lewis pointed out, concerning that issue, that the world of business is more interested in the value of the work rather than in professionalism (Lewis et alii, 2003: 211), by „value" understanding the capability of goods, services or activities to satisfy a need or to offer benefit to a person or to an organization (Haksever et alii, 2004: 292). The public relations practitioner isn't required to be a sort of Johnny Mnemonic – a courier for (difficult or practically impossible to apply) data –, but a good solver of social problems, in love with his work and always trying to improve. Obviously, on the one hand, even the best problem solver should have a solid theoretical background, even for knowing why he has achieved a good result and how he can repeat certain accomplishments in the future; on the other hand, however, the need for a theoretical background shouldn't become a pretext for leading on novices in the field of PR to a state of dependence and unfounded vulnerability.

As to the use of specialized methods and techniques – only to enumerate (partially and randomly): focused group interview, Delphi technique, data mining, panel, content analysis, in-depth interview, benchmarking, questionnaire, opinion survey, ethnographical research etc. –, it almost goes without saying that any professional practitioner has to be familiar with them and use them in various circumstances: (a) evaluating the attitudes towards the organization, towards the products and the services provided by the organization or towards the problems it faces, (b) identifying and acknowledging the targeted audience, (c) discovering the problems affecting the organization-audience relation, (d) identifying the best means to communicate with the audience, (e) measuring the diffusion of a message in the mass-media, (f) measuring the public participation in an event, (g) evaluating the persistence of an event or message among the target audience, (h) measuring the changes in the behavior of the target audience, (i) drawing up a message and pre-testing it, (j) understanding the perspective of the people in the press on the messages of the organization etc. (Ryan & Martison, 1990: 383).

Two problems arise here. On the one hand, despite of the emphasis laid on quantitative research techniques, they are mastered and used to an insufficient degree by many practitioners and even many more teachers; interpretive speculation is more often preferred. On the other hand, other practitioners and teachers in the field of public relations fall prey to the determinist scientism, by uncritically transferring the methodology of natural science to the study of human actions. According to the determinists, every man has a particular nature, given by a set of definable attributes which make

him act in a particular way. In fact, man has no innate knowledge on how he can survive and thrive, and that is why he learns on the way – by means of trial and error – what goals and means he must adopt in order to be successful in his actions (Murray, 1960). Conscience and freedom of choice are the human characteristics which require prudence in using the quantitative research techniques and in interpreting the data they furnish. Professionalism implies a fair combination of quantitative research techniques, observation and introspection.

The adherence to a set of performance and morality standards seems to be the sine qua non requirement of professionalism. Being part of the PR professionals' corps is manifested by following particular patterns of acting, so that in similar circumstances the people involved behave in similar ways, at least from the procedural perspective. Performance standards should be associated with a series of moral values – honesty, sound reasoning, integrity, maintaining confidentiality etc. –, according to the saying that ethics without competence has no substance, while competence without ethics has no direction. Unfortunately, the adhesion to performance and morality standards is much sooner declared than practically applied, as in the well known Enron, WorldCom or Parmalat scandals. The financial bankruptcy of great corporations also brought about the moral bankruptcy of public relations agencies and departments.

The statement that professionals give prominence to public welfare and to the client's interest over their own profit is also debatable. On the one hand, I don't think that all PR practitioners understand the same thing by serving the public interest. When do we serve the public welfare? (a) When we act in order to

satisfy the best interest of the client? (b) When, besides the particular interest of the client, we serve public welfare? (c) When, like lawyers or physicians, we provide PR service to people or organizations in need? or (d) When we contribute to the qualitative improvement of debates concerning public welfare and to the development of the public sphere? (cf. Bivins, 1993) As for me, I am in favor of the fourth interpretation of serving the public welfare, but enough arguments can be brought to support the other views. On the other hand, loyalty to the client is often debatable, especially in the case of PR agencies. In the field of politics, at least, many PR advisors behave like indifferent mercenaries.

To conclude the considerations on the professionalism of PR experts, one has to mention the challenge brought by the democratization of information by way of the Internet. By controlling the possession, evaluation and distribution of knowledge, practitioners organized in professional associations used to have a quasi-monopoly on quality expertise. But the Internet brings about the interesting phenomenon of the disconnection of information from the source (Harshman et alii, 2005: 231). In the future, one may resort to the knowledge of successful anonymous amateurs, without taking into account the absence of their being formally legitimized by any professional organization.

Scientifically founding public relations

Depending on whether the theories, methods and techniques of social sciences are used or ignored, one can distinguish between scientifically founded public relations and groundless public relations.

To begin with, it seems reasonable enough to accept the fact that founded public relations activities should have certain family similarities, given by the communication instruments used – announcement, official statement, informative bulletin, broadcast speech, letter, interview, press conference, banner, exposition, organized event, website etc. – and by the domains of applications for those instruments: employees relations, analysis of the corporative image, marketing, communicational audits, analysis of the publicity, identification of trends and problems, institutional publicity, relation with the public administration and with the local communities, financial relations, political competitions etc. These family similarities may arise through the generalization – in its easiest form, plain imitation – of good practices or through the solid theoretical founding of information and action. Obviously, only when a rigorous theoretical frame is ensured can one speak of scientifically founded public relations.

According to a generally accepted definition, theories are systematic ensembles of concepts, ideas, hypotheses and laws which describe, explain and possibly predict facts or events in particular domains or categories of phenomena. Any proper theoretical model meets six fundamental values – validity, predictability, precision, consistency, completeness and utility –, insofar as it ensures (a) the correspondence of its parts to the elements of the domain to which it applies, (b) the possibility of predicting the objects and facts in the field, (c) the precision of its comprisal of the observed objects in the spheres of the concepts employed, (d) the consistency or non-contradiction of the stated assertions, (e) the generalization of the obtained partial results to the whole

domain dealt with, and (f) special benefits brought to social life (Redmond, 1995: 29).

In the light of the considerations above, scientifically founded public relations seem to be rather an ideal than a reality. PR isn't a distinct social yet, but more of a meeting place of a number of social sciences: social psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, marketing, management, political science, communication theory, cultural studies etc. Most of the theories, methods and techniques employed in the field of public relations aren't specific to it, belonging to the field of social sciences in general.

Apart from the lack of specificity, the theories employed in PR (e. g. magic bullet theory, hypodermic needle theory, cognitive dissonance theory, social learning theory, theory of planned behavior, rational agency theory etc.) don't seem to wholly observe the six above-mentioned fundamental values (neither individually, nor as a whole). For example, invoking various socio-psychological theories in a rhapsodic manner didn't prevent the troublesome situation of not having a generally accepted definition of the concept of public relations and also didn't provide even a rough map of the domain in question. Unfortunately, the partiality of the conceptual system is doubled by such an explosion of secondary distinctions, that one can cry out like Socrates: "Let us call Prodicos!" It would be interesting to follow the sequence of concepts: audience, active audience, public, interested public, involved public, strategic public, stakeholder…

As to the way PR theory and practice are made up, it remains to be seen to what extent we are dealing with systematical manners of research, knowledge and transformation of the domain in question – manners which are mainly characterized by objectivity, accuracy, validity and comparability – or on the contrary, with fortuitous approaches whose results cannot be extrapolated and generalized.

The standards of a good methodology are unanimously approved only declaratively, but are often violated in the performed activities. Among the diseases of which PR theoreticians and practitioners suffer I would like to mention biases, the investigation of nonexistent phenomena and deception. Thus, in agreement with the definitions of some renowned experts in the field, we unreservedly acknowledge that PR practitioners should have in view to consolidate the relation of the organization with its stakeholders, to stimulate the participation, to achieve consensus and to increase the visibility, among others. But a public person or organization is also engaged in nonvoluntary relations with certain audiences, so that the optimal way of interaction seems to be distancing rather than consolidating or intensifying relations. Large scale involvement of the audiences in the activity of an organization is beneficial provided that the conditions of homogeneity and competence are met, but otherwise, it can prove pernicious by blocking the normal course of activity of the organization. (If the citizens and the non-governmental organizations got massively involved in the process of legislation – according to the stipulations of Law no. 52/2003 concerning decisional transparency in the public administration – it would all soon come to a dead-end.) Consensus is desirable when the organizations and the audience enjoy a supportive climate, but cannot be reasonably expected when there are divergent legitimate interests. In an open society, some irreducible relations of opposition are justified and should be dealt with as such. Finally, increasing the visibility is by no

means a cure-all. It is opportune when it is correlated with an increase in the quality of the activities of the organization, but it is wholly inadequate when the organization has major deficiencies. Apart from the pitfall of prejudice, public relations are confronted with the risk of subjecting social pseudo-phenomena to „scientific" examination. Unlike natural phenomena, social facts have an institutional nature, as their existence depends on the concord of the members of a society, mediated by language. The mediation of language is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for the existence of a social phenomenon. Connecting the elements of speech to certain social phenomena without using Ockham's razor would mean to fallaciously attribute reality to fiction. It has been said that the ruling ideas of a society are the ideas of the ruling class. Mutatis mutandis, the changes in the language of a community – including the emergence of phrases referring falsely to social life – are the products of the ruling class of that community. In the present stage of development of the society, it seems that the prevailing position is held by the great corporations, therefore we should probably be more careful to the „language innovations" they put into use, especially through … the PR departments or agencies. It is worth questioning ourselves more seriously whether, for example, corporate social responsibility is a real social phenomenon, or rather a fabrication used in the effort to win the favor of the public opinion. Unfortunately, misleading the public – by manipulating so-called scientific research – isn't uncommon in social sciences and, implicitly, in public relations. The contradictory results of opinion surveys which raise questions regarding the validity and relia-

bility of the questionnaires which were used are obvious proofs for that.

Constructive and destructive public relations

Public relations can be qualified as constructive or destructive according to their impact on public life and on the public opinion, to how they contribute to their development and ripening or, on the contrary, to their degradation and dissolution.

In agreement with Dejan Verčiči (2001: 376), we think that PR means working in public, with the public and for the public, i.e. cultivating relations between people and organizations in the public sphere. To make this statement more acceptable, we will try to distinguish, with sufficient clarity, the public sphere from other spheres i.e. the private sphere and to indicate concisely the way how the public opinion takes shape (cf. Fârte, 2005: 88-89).

The public sphere is different from the private sphere in four fundamental aspects: (a) openness, (b) transparency, (c) external evaluation and (d) external regulation. All the four aspects are present, for example, in the case of the activities of a university or of a law court, but not in the domestic life of a family.

Apparently, the boundary between the public and the private sphere seems to have become blurry – under the pressure of the measures taken to fight terrorism, under the influence of reality shows, under the incidence of the new communication techniques, under the impact of new behavior models etc. –, we can nevertheless decide in any circumstance (keeping with the four above-mentioned ingredients) whether we deal with the public or private sphere, whether it is adequate to employ public relations activities.

Having thus defined the public sphere, we can say – in agreement with Albert Oeckl – that PR experts should have the amelioration of the communicational state of society as their fundamental objective, which can be achieved by combining the following actions: (a) information, (b) adaptation and (c) integration (cf. Kunczik, 2003: 172). In other words, PR professionals should improve information flows, for the members of highly differentiated open societies to be able to adjust their behavior and to find the most adequate social positions and roles.

The extent and quality of the public sphere has to do with the public opinion, i.e. that sui-generis authority that governs any democratic society. Far from being a mere sum of individual opinions, public opinion takes shape and develops depending on (a) the number of persons involved in public life and (b) the level on which public affairs are discussed.

Therefore, either when serving a particular organization, or the public, public relations practitioners influence the public opinion by strengthening or, contrarily, by undermining this high regulating instance of democratic societies. They prove their professionalism and morality not so much by identifying and assuming a hypothetical mutual advantage for the organizations and publics involved, as by rooting the citizens on various levels of the public sphere.

To conclude the considerations above, I would like to say, as an illustration, that the activities of spokespersons in the public administration can be considered constructive when they facilitate the dissemination of information of public interest and stimulate the debate (on a superior level) of major public issues and, on the contrary, can be considered destructive the activities of a PR agent in showbiz who tries to convey his client's private life in the public sphere, in order to ensure him notoriety.

Realistic and chimerical objectives

One can distinguish realistic (or effective) public relations from chimerical (or unrealistic) public relations depending on the degree of realism in the pursued objectives. In order to operate this distinction on PR activities we should take into consideration some current characteristics of the organization-public relation and some tendencies manifesting in marketing communication.

As Priscilla Murphy rightfully noticed, the complex organization-public system is characterized by five main traits: (a) adaptability, (b) nonlinearity, (c) co-evolution, (d) temporary and unpredictable equilibrium and (e) self organization. In other words, (a') social agents don't take decisions relying on long-term strategies of maximizing the profit, but on a permanent adjustment of behaviors depending on the current circumstances, (b') flagrant disproportions may arise between the means employed in an action and its end, (c') organizations and publics develop at the same time, (d') the balance between demand and supply, expectations and achievements or projects and results can be only sporadically achieved and only in partially predictable circumstances, and (e') open societies have such a degree of redundancy, that, in spite of the disorders, changes or conflicts, they can generate spontaneous order (cf. Fârte, 2005: 104-105).

Being part of a highly differentiated open society and of a very fragmented market, the consumer-citizen targeted in public relations activities is – at least theoretically – sufficiently well-informed to decide what, where and when to buy,

vote, watch, listen to, choose etc. being fully aware. He not only has multiple possibilities to inquire, but also an even higher ability to filter unwanted content. Corroborated with the atomization of mass-media, this makes it even harder to convey the message to the target audience to the desired extent and effects.

Companies require PR specialists to win over new clients, to keep and mature the existing clients and to consolidate the products portfolio; non-governmental organizations require them to increase their notoriousness, thereby stimulating fundraising; the authorities and the public institutions require them to secure their public support; showbiz personages ask them to make them popular, thus obtaining profitable contracts etc. Taking into account the challenges of the social environment, this variety of requirements can make PR practitioners engage in pursuing objectives which surpass their resources by far and discredit the reputation of their trade. For example, it is entirely hazardous for a PR practitioner to guarantee (all by himself) the increase of the profit of a company, the win of the elections by a particular candidate or the improvement of the reputation of an organization.

Public relations can be described as realistic only if they are centered on properly systematized objectives which are then judiciously correlated with the necessary resources. Thus, according to Fraser Likely (2000), the objectives of PR activities can be distributed on the following levels: (a) of the products, (b) of the communication programs and (c) of the strategic positioning.

On the technical level of the products one can pursue the elaboration, dissemination, reception, media coverage and the use of various means of communications: official statements, speeches, news bulletins, announcements, photos, brochures etc.

On the level of communication programs one can mark and measure the acknowledgement, the consolidation vs. changes in attitude and the manifestation of desirable behavior towards the activities of the organization.

Finally, on the level of the strategic positioning, PR practitioners can try to create in the minds of the targeted audience a favorable image for a brand as opposed to the rival organizations' brands. A good strategic positioning consolidates organization-public relations based on loyalty, trust, satisfaction and benevolence.

The objectives in the products category can be achieved by PR practitioners by themselves on the short term, while objectives on the level of programs and positioning can be achieved only in the long run, with the collaboration of professionals in other fields (human resources, marketing, management, development, finance etc.). Ignoring the complexity level of the objective results in engaging oneself in chimerical and expensive PR. What manager would possibly assign substantial funds to the PR department to achieve an improbable strategic positioning after a six-month publicity campaign?

Evaluating public relations with regard to the achieved results

Public relations activities can be qualified as either effective or ineffective according to the way they result or not in the achievement of the planned objectives, and depending on the ratio of the results to the cost, they are more or less efficient.

The effectiveness and efficiency of PR can be equally emphasized on the level

of products, communication programs and strategic positioning through the use of quantitative techniques in the case of products and qualitative techniques in that of programs and strategic positioning. Generally speaking, counting, registering and questioning can be useful in measuring the results of PR activities, but only if used prudently regarding validity, accuracy and extrapolation.

On the level of the products, one should have in view (a) the input, (b) the throughput and (c) the output of PR activities (Likely, 2000).

The category of input comprises the given directives, the established objectives, the gathered data, the obtained approvals etc., the accuracy and completeness of the data base ensuring effectiveness, and the small number of steps taken in the process of its establishment securing efficiency. The input can be measured with regard to the effectiveness and efficiency by means of audit (advisably external).

The throughput includes specific communication products elaborated with the support of the established database: newsletters, press releases, brochures, banners, announcement, exhibitions etc. The effectiveness of the throughput is reflected in the concordance between the elaborated products and the communication intentions, in the available communication channels and in the expectations of the target audience, and the efficiency, in the reduction of the cost.

As to the output, we are mainly interested in the degree of dissemination, of reception and use (at the lowest cost) of the achieved communication products. The output can be measured by reckoning and registration, with the mention that one shouldn't exaggerate the relevance of conclusions such as „The quasi-totality of our employees have received our latest informative bulletin", „35 % of our official statements have been broadcast by the main TV channels", „Last month, our website has had almost 11.000 hits", „34 % of the local politicians have picked up and remembered our message" etc. For example, the publishing of a press release in a newspaper doesn't also guarantee its being carefully read, especially when lacking the attributes of an item of news.

On the level of communication programs, the impact of the messages conveyed to the targeted public ought to be evaluated, at least on the rather simplistic model awareness-understanding-attitude-behavior. The results of communication programs can be evaluated by applying questionnaires comprising questions like „Were you attracted by the product?", „Did it draw your attention? ", „Can you remember a particular message?", „Have you kept in mind some information, ideas, data or indications?", „Has the message predisposed you to a certain answer?", „Have you (re)acted in a particular way?". Besides the relativity of the data obtained by applying the questionnaire – the wording and order of the questions can distort measurements – one can accept the idea that the impact of the messages decreases on the way from acknowledgement to action in the manner reported by David Rockland (2003): 15 good opportunities of the reception of the message determine one person to acknowledge the existence of the organization or of the product; out of 10 people reaching the acknowledgement phase, 5 will understand the content of the message, 2-3 will believe what is planned and only one person will manifest the expected behavior. Thus, out of every 150 good opportunities of the reception of the message, only one person will act according to the plan. However inefficient

they might seem, communication programs achieve their goal if we can prove that we have made our voice heard and that it has had a positive impact.

Finally, on the level of strategic positioning, I would like to mention the qualitative version of measuring the organization-public relation suggested by James Grunig (2002). To begin with, Grunig distinguishes two types of relations: (a) the exchange relation and (b) the communitarian relation. In the former case, a party offers benefits to another party only because the latter has offered or will offer benefits in its turn. In the latter case, the persons or organizations involved mutually offer benefits because they are concerned by the welfare of the others, without waiting anything in return. Exchange relations are at the centre of marketing, while communitarian relations hold a similar place in public relations. Accordingly, the task of PR experts would be to persuade the managers of the need to convert the exchange relations with the employees, mass-media and the local community into communitarian relations.

The organization-public relation – embodied by the exchange relation in the initial stage and by the communitarian relation at maturity – is characterized (according to Grunig) by four indicators of quality: (a) mutual control (the extent to which the involved parties in the relation are satisfied by the control they exert on each other), (b) trust (the availability to open to each other, assuming that the organization is honest and accomplishes what it promises), (c) commitment (the intensity with which the involved parties believe and feel that the relation is worth the effort to maintain and develop) and (d) satisfaction (the extent to which the parties are favorable

to each other because they have positive expectations of their relation).

The organization-public relation can be actually measured through a focused group interview or through the application of a questionnaire made up of the following questions:

(a) General questions: „Which are the first thing that come to your mind when hearing the name of this organizations?", „What else do you know about it?", „Do you feel that you have a relation with the organization?", „Why?", „Can you describe your relation with the organization?";

(b) Questions referring to the exchange relation: „Do you feel that the organization is offering something to the public because it expects something in return?", „Can you give examples?";

(c) Questions referring to the communitarian relation: „Do you feel that the organization is preoccupied by the public welfare even if nothing is received in exchange?", „What has it done?";

(d) Questions referring to mutual control: „To what extent do you think that the organization is paying attention to what the public is saying?", „Can you give examples of taking into consideration versus neglecting the interests of the other party?", „To what extent can you control the organizations' activities which affect you?", „Why?";

(e) Questions referring to confidence:„Can you describe honest and lawful actions, dishonest and unlawful actions, respectively?", „On what basis do you think that the organization will (not) keep its promises?", „How much do you trust the ability of the organization to honor its obligations?";

(f) Questions centered on commitment: „Can you give examples to suggest that the organization does (not) want to make efforts to maintain the relation?";

(g) Questions referring to satisfaction: „How satisfied are you with the organization?“, „Explain why“.

James Grunig's view is remarkable in that it points out the possibility to measure the results of PR activities at the highest level, that of the strategic positioning. However, one can be rightfully reserved towards certain aspects of his contribution (given the „monetization” of economy and the fact that social life is molded on the exchange relations, it is hard to believe that PR experts will succeed in stimulating the development of communitarian relations; in addition, the four quality indicators don't seem to comply

with the logical conditions of exclusiveness and completeness; furthermore, the questions don't seem to make the indicators of quality operational enough).

In conclusion, the constitutive factors of any human action can be relevant criteria of classification and evaluation for public relations. They allow us to place all practically carried out PR activities on an extended scale, stretching from the upper level of professional, scientifically founded, constructive, realistic and effective public relations to the lower level of amateurish, groundless, destructive, chimerical and ineffective public relations.

REFERENCES

BIVINS, Thomas H. (1993) "Public Relations, Professionalism, and the Public Interest", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12 (2): 117-126.

FÂRTE, Gheorghe-Ilie (2005) "Fundamente ale relaţiilor publice" (II), in *Comunicare şi relaţii publice*, anul III, semestrul I, ID, pp. 81-120, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii „Al.I. Cuza“ Iaşi.

GRUNIG, James E. (2002) *Qualitative Methods for Assessing Relationships Between Organizations and Publics*,
http://www.instituteforpr.org/relationships.phtml?article_id=2002_relationships_org_public

HARSHMAN, Ellen M. et alii (2005) "Professional Ethics in a Virtual World. The Impact of the Internet on Traditional Notions of Professionalism*"*, in *Journal of Business Ethics*, 58 (1): 227-236.

KUNCZIK, Michael (2003) *PR – concepţii şi teorii*, Bucureşti: Editura InterGraf.

LEWIS, Chris, HARRISON, Shirley, MORLEY, Michael, RAWEL, Alan şi FINUCANE, Lisa (2003) "Debate Paper: Professionalism", *Journal of Communication Management*, 8 (2): 211-221.

LIKELY, Fraser (2000), "Communication and PR: Made to Measure", *Strategic Communication Management*, http://www.instituteforpr.org/pdf/SCM_Likely_reprint_2000_b.pdf

MCCOY, Mairead şi HARGIE, Owen (2003) "Implications of Mass Communication Theory for Asymmetric Public Relations Evaluation", *Journal of Communication Management*, 7 (4): 304-316.

REDMOND, Mark V. (1995) "Understanding Interpersonal Communication Research", in Mark V. Redmond (ed.), *Interpersonal Communication. Readings in Theory and Research*, Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers'.

ROCKLAND, David B. (2003) "Is ROI for Public Relations Realistic?", *Public Relations Tactics* (New York), 12 (1): 12.

ROTHBARD, Murray N. (1960) "The Mantle of Science*"*, in Helmut Schoeck şi James W. Wiggins (eds.), *Scientism and Values*, Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand. http://www.mises.org/story/2074.

RYAN, Michael şi MARTINSON, David (1990) "Social Science Research, Professionalism and Public Relations Practitioners*"*, in *Journalism Quarterly*, 67 (2): 377-390.

SANDMAN, Jeffrey (2006) "Understanding and Selling the Value of Public Relations", *PR News* (Potomac), 62 (8): 1.

SAUNDERS, Martha Dunagin şi PERRIGO, Eileen (1998) "Negotiation as a Model for Teaching Public Relations Professionalism*", Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 52 (4): 57-65.

VERČIČI, Dejan et alii (2001) "On the Definition of Public Relations: A European View", in *Public Relations Review*, 27 (4): 373-387.

WEINER, Mark (2005) "Survey Results: How To Set Objectives That Are Reasonable, Measurable and Meaningful*", PR News* (Potomac), 48 (61): 1.