

**Course Annotation**

Issue Management deals with the process of shaping public opinion and policy. Areas such as lobbying, dialogue, apologia, and rhetorical approaches to public influence are dealt with, as means of managing organization–public relationships. Issue management provides students with practical frameworks for managing relationships with internal and external publics and techniques for shaping public opinion.

**Goals and Objectives**

- To demonstrate knowledge of the critical/theoretical issues involved in rhetorical issue management.
- To develop an understanding of the role played by the media and activist groups in the issue management process.
- To develop familiarity with environmental monitoring/scanning.
- To demonstrate knowledge of the role of “dialogue” in issue management.
- To develop competence in a specific public policy issue.
- To develop your own unique and effective style of communication.
- To raise ethical questions related to communication.

**Assignments**

As the name implies, issue management is about learning how to manage issues. In order to be successful at the issue management process, a professional must not only understand an issue, but, more importantly, understand the stakeholders/publics involved in the issue, the stage that the issue is in, and what public policy officials/-realms matter in particular situations. In order to help understand this process, you will research several issues as groups (because of the size of the class) and give three detailed issue presentations (with group grades). You will also (individually) write a white paper on the issue your group has selected, as well as write individual research papers on issue management subjects of your choosing. Finally, you will write two reaction papers on class readings of your choosing, elaborating on issues of interest.

*There are some who still fondly imagine that knowledge, casting the clear light of awareness, inspires and contains goodness within itself.*

*Dora Russell,  
The Religion of the  
Machine Age*

<b>Issue Presentation I</b> (Research Organization, VAs + 2 pp. per person of handouts)	10%
<b>Issue Presentation II</b> (Research Issue, VAs + 2 pp. per person of handouts)	15%
<b>Issue Presentation III</b> (Strategic, long-term, issue mgmt. plan, VAs, etc.. as above)	20%
<b>White (Position) Paper</b> (5–7 pp., single spaced, memo form, design elements)	25%
<b>Reaction Paper I</b> (See †, on schedule for due dates)	10%
<b>Reaction Paper II</b> (See †, on schedule for due dates)	10%
<b>Participation</b> (0–10%, my discretion) Ω	0–10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

Ω What I do know from teaching this class for many years is that if only a few students in the class are willing to participate in class discussions and in-class activities, the class content will suffer. You each have something valuable to add to the class. Just because you come to every class does not mean that you “participated,” although “being there” is of course a prerequisite to participation. If you miss no classes but say nothing, I cannot give you more than a few points. Conversely, if you miss many classes, you cannot make up for it by being a big talker when you are here. Both are expected. Come to class and participate.

**Attendance/Participation**

I will take attendance to help get to know your names. Attendance will be taken into account under “participation.” **NB:** group presentations must still be delivered even if a group member (or members) fails to show up. In the case of a missing member, although the group will still get a “group grade,” the missing member(s) may be penalized (with a zero) for not showing up.

## Issue Management Schedule

### **Day 1: Overview of Issue Management & Class | Define Issues**

### **Day 2: Selecting Issues | Researching Issues | Assignment details**

#### **Required**

Jones, B. L., & Chase, W. H. (1979). Managing public policy issues. *Public Relations Review* 2, 3–23.

Crable, R. E., & Vibbert, S. L. (1985). Managing issues and influencing public policy. *Public Relations Review* XI(2), 3–16.

#### **Optional**

Dionisopoulos, G. N., & Goldzwig, S. R. (1992). The atomic power industry and the new woman. In E. L. Toth, & R. L. Heath (Eds.), *Rhetorical and critical approaches to public relations* (pp. 205–224). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

### **Day 3: † Issue Management Overview**

#### **Required**

Heath, R. L. (1997). *Strategic issues management: Organizations and public policy challenges*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.—Chapter 1, “A foundation of community: Issue management as an organizational and academic discipline.”

#### **Optional**

Heath, R. L. (1997). *Strategic issues management: Organizations and public policy challenges*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.—Chapter 3, “Scouting the terrain: Strategic planning based on scanning monitoring and analysis.”

Bostdorff, D. M. (1992). “The decision is yours” campaign: Planned Parenthood’s character-istic argument of moral virtue. In E. L. Toth, & R. L. Heath (Eds.), *Rhetorical and critical approaches to public relations* (pp. 301–313). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

### **Day 4: † Rhetorical/Critical**

#### **Required**

Boulding, K. D. (1977). *The image: Knowledge in life and society*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 1(1), 1–14.

#### **Optional**

Heath, R. L. (1992). Critical perspectives on public relations. In E. L. Toth, & R. L. Heath (Eds.), *Rhetorical and critical approaches to public relations* (pp. 37–61). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pearson, R. (1992). Perspectives on public relations history. In E. L. Toth, & R. L. Heath (Eds.), *Rhetorical and critical approaches to public relations* (pp. 111–130). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

### **Day 5: † .....Issue Presentation I**

### **Day 6: † Rhetorical/Critical**

#### **Required**

Osborn, M. (1967). Archetypal metaphor in rhetoric: The light-dark family. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* LIII(2), 115–126.

Burke, K. (1984). Permanence and change: An anatomy of purpose. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.—“Occupational Psychosis.”

**Optional**

Cheney, G., & Vibbert, S. L. (1987). Corporate discourse: Public relations and issue management. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 165–194). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Condit, C. M., & Condit, D. M. (1992). Smoking or health: Incremental erosion as a public interest group strategy. In E. L. Toth, & R. L. Heath (Eds.), *Rhetorical and critical approaches to public relations* (pp. 241–256). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

**Day 7: † Crisis**

**Required**

Coombs, W. T. (1999). *Ongoing crisis communication: Planning managing and responding*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.—pp. ix–58.

**Optional**

Benoit, W. L. (1995). *Accounts, excuses, and apologies: A theory of image restoration strategies*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.—pp. vii–61.

**Day 8: † ..... Issue Presentation II**

**Day 9: † Crisis | Class Activities**

**Required**

Hearit, K. M. (2001). Corporate apologia: When an organization speaks in defense of itself. In R. L. Heath, & G. Vasquez (Eds.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 501–511). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Ulmer, R. R., & Sellnow, T. L. (2002). Crisis management and the discourse of renewal: Understanding the potential for positive outcomes of crisis. *Public Relations Review* 28, 361–365.

**Optional**

Aly, B. (1969). The gallows speech: A lost genre. *Southern Speech Journal* XXXIV(3), 204–213.

Ware, B. L., & Linkugel, W. A. (1973). They spoke in defense of themselves: On the generic criticism of apologia. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59, 273–283.

**Day 10: † Dialogue..... Position (White) Papers Due**

**Required**

Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web. *Public Relations Review* 24(3), 321–334.

Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review* 28(1), 21–37.

**Optional**

Pearson, R. (1989). Business ethics as communication ethics: Public relations practice and the idea of dialogue. In C. H. Botan, & V. Hazleton, Jr., (Eds.), *Public relations theory* (111–131). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

**Day 11: † Lobbying/Public Hearings**

**Required**

Hansen-Horn, T. L., (2005). Lobbying (encyclopedia entry). In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of public relations: Volume I* (pp. 492–493). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taylor, M. (2005). Hearing (encyclopedia entry). In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of public relations: Volume I* (pp. 385–387). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taylor, M. (2005). Government relations (encyclopedia entry). In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of public relations: Volume I* (pp. 370–372). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Terry, V. (2). Lobbying: Fantasy, reality or both? A health care public policy case study. *Journal of Public Affairs* 1(3), 266–280.

**Optional**

Bacot, H. A., McCabe, A. S., & Fitzgerald, M. R. (1998). Articulating environmental policy decisions to the public. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 6(3), 129–136.

Heath, R. L. (1997). *Strategic issues management: Organizations and public policy challenges*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.—Chapter 7, “Legislative, judicial, and regulatory constraints on issue communication.”

**Day 12: † Relationship Management**

**Required**

Bridges, J. A. (2000). Issues management: A relational approach. In J. A. Ledingham, & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 95–115). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cheney, G., Dionisopoulos, G. N. (1989). Public relations? No, relations with publics: A rhetorical–organizational approach to contemporary corporate communications. In C. H. Botan, & V. Hazleton, Jr., (Eds.), *Public relations theory* (111–131). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

**Optional**

Kruckeberg, D. (2000). Public relations: Toward a global professionalism. In J. A. Ledingham, & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 145–157). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

**Day 13: † International Public Relations**

**Required**

Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.—Various Pages.

Taylor, M. (2000). Cultural variance as a challenge to global public relations: A case study of the Coca-Cola scare. *Public Relations Review* 26(3), 277–293.

**Optional**

Taylor, M., & Kent, M. L. (1999). Challenging assumptions of international public relations: When government is the most important public. *Public Relations Review* 25(2), 131–144.

Taylor, M., & Kent, M. L. (2000). Media transition in Bosnia: From propagandistic past to uncertain future. *Gazette* 62(5), 355–378.

**Day 14: † Advocacy Advertising .....All Reaction Papers Due**  
Readings TBA

**Day 15: ..... Issue Presentation III**

**Day 16: † Issue Presentation III | Papers Due**