A Transformative Typology of Pragmatic and Ethical Responses to Common Corporate Crises: Interaction of Rhetorical Strategies, Situational Contingencies, and Influential Stakeholders

J. D. Wallace, Denise P. Ferguson, & Robert C. Chandler

Lubbock Christian University/Indiana Wesleyan University/ Pepperdine University

Scandals, accidents, product problems, criminal activity, deception or fraud, misconduct, harassment, discrimination, financial or regulatory improprieties, malfeasance, misappropriations, or ethical breaches can not only damage the reputation of corporate executives but can reek financial havoc on the value of a company's brand "assets." When companies face these types of crises they are compelled to act quickly and decisively in order to limit their brand and image losses and seek to repair the "black eye" to their corporate "face" as effectively as possible. Although companies will attempt a wide range of actions and messages as symbolic appeals to that organization's constituent publics, there is little certainty about what types of actions and messages are persuasive (Benoit, 1997; Coombs & Holladay, 2002; Kim, Ferrin, Cooper & Dirks, 2004; Seeger, Sellnow, & Ulmer, 1998).

This study uses William Benoit's (1995) widely cited typology of image restoration strategies employed in corporate crisis communication. The Benoit typology is divided into five macro strategies: denial, evading of responsibility, reducing the offensiveness, corrective action, and mortification. Fourteen specific message strategies fall within these five broad categories. Silence, or no comment, was dropped as a possible rhetorical response in early explorations of this typology (Benoit, 1995; Len-Rios & Benoit, 2004). However, in the case of Enron and elsewhere silence impacts negative perception and is connected with social morals (Rogers, Dillard, & Yuthas, 2005; Trinkaus & Giacolone, 2005). Discussion of the use of silence in image repair and crisis communication literature has been sparse beyond the recognition that this strategy should be an area examination (Kim et al., 2004). Table 1. Provides summary definitions for the 14 strategies and also for silence.

Table 1. Summary Definitions of Crisis Communication Rhetorical Strategies

	Categories	Strategies	Working Definition
1	Corrective Action		Restore situation or prevent reoccurrence
	Denial		
2		Simple Denial	Contradiction of accusation
3		Shifting Blame	Pass the guilt to another party
	Evading of Responsibility		
4		Accident	Unintentional action or effect
5		Defeasibility	Didn't know about or not in control
6		Good Intentions	Motives were good
7		Provocation	Responding to an offensive act
8	Mortification		Admission and acceptance of responsibility
	Reducing the Offensiveness		
9		Bolstering	Relate positive features of the offender
10		Minimization	Reduce importance of the offense
11		Differentiation	Less offensive than other actions
12		Transcendence	Viewed favorably in larger/different context
13		Attack	Counterattack accuser
14		Compensation	Reimburse victims
15	Silence		No comment or ignoring accusation

Little is known about which rhetorical strategies are perceived by crisis management stakeholders to be pragmatically attractive and/or ethical (Coombs & Holladay, 2002; Kim et. al, 2004). It seems reasonable that individuals in journalism/news media, legal, and public relations professions might have different views concerning their pragmatic utility, desirability and ethicality (Seitel, 2001). Therefore this study advances the following research questions.

- Research Question # 1 – Do different communication stakeholders differ in their view of crisis strategies?
- Research Question #2 – Do different communication stakeholders vary in terms of their strategic ranking?
- Research Question #3 – Does the type of crisis make a difference in terms of pragmatism and ethicality among different communication stakeholders?

Method

A survey instrument was designed using a five point Likert-type scale. It asked respondents to rate 15 image repair strategies in four situationally distinct corporate crises. Respondents rated each strategy for effectiveness, their likeliness to recommend, and ethicality. The survey was prepared in a matrix format so that all strategies were simultaneously rated in regard to their respective crises. This produced an instrument encouraging relative comparisons (rankings)

between rhetorical strategies. Rankings are viewed by some as a more robust estimator of survey values even though they may produce some analytical difficulties (Krosnick & Alwin, 1989). The instrument was successfully pilot tested for face validity and usability (Chandler, Ferguson, & Wallace, 2001).

Career-path students (public relations, journalism, and law) were selected to participate. Each student received a packet of items that contained a survey instrument along with contextually similar situations varying only on the nature of a severe crisis event. The crisis events were an unintentional accident, illegal activity, product safety and social irresponsibility. A hypothetical company was used to help control for historical or perceptual moderating factors (Coombs, 2004; Dean, 2004; Kim, et al., 2004; Pfau et al., 2004).

The use of students has the typical limitations. Since classes were within the respective majors these students are seen as already aligning themselves with the views of their prospective vocations. If nothing else, they can be viewed as representing how various stakeholders view different rhetorical strategies. Surveys were distributed at the end of the academic semester so that respective venues and disciplinary frames of reference would be expected to have the maximum effect. Sixty-nine completed instrument packets were returned. The completion rate for the three surveys varied from 62 to 69, depending on which of the strategies was examined. Serendipitously, 23 returned instrument packets were received from each group.

The instrument used a five point scoring system. Categories ranged from highly unethical to highly ethical. Computational scoring ranged from one for highly unethical to five for highly ethical. Pragmatic saliencies of "effectiveness" and "likelihood to recommend" were scored the same way. Significant differences were calculated with analysis of variance within strategies and between scenarios. Scheffe's multiple comparison procedure was used because of its relative conservative estimation of differences and ability to account for compound comparisons (Reinard, 2007).

Pragmatic and ethical views

Research Questions were addressed in several ways. First, it was determined if there were any differences between professions holistically across all scenarios and saliencies. The appendix provides a breakdown of saliencies with the mean scores of strategies between professions. Second, data was transformed into hierarchical rankings to expose order preferences among the rhetorical strategies. Lastly, contextual differences were examined for consistency. Stakeholders were examined for differences across all scenarios to determine if there was an overarching difference between them. Concerning effectiveness differences were found in 6 of the 15 strategies. These were corrective action ($F=3.333$, d.f. 2, 261, $p \leq .05$), compensation ($F=4.678$, d.f. 2,261 , $p \leq .01$), bolstering ($F=13.442$, d.f. 2,261, $p \leq .001$), minimization ($F=10.559$, d.f. 2,261, $p \leq .001$), differentiation ($F=10.319$, d.f. 2,261 , $p \leq .001$), and silence ($F=5.067$, d.f. 2,261 , $p \leq .01$).

Likeliness to recommend had seven strategies with differences. These were corrective action ($F=4.182$, d.f. 2, 261, $p \leq .01$), compensation ($F=4.760$, d.f. 2,261 , $p \leq .01$), mortification

(F=3.169, d.f. 2,261, p≤.05) bolstering (F=12.027, d.f. 2,260,p≤.001), minimization (F=3.879, d.f. 2,261, p≤.05), provocation (F=7.113, d.f. 2,259, p≤.001), and shifting the blame (F=4.477, d.f . 2,261, p≤.01).

Ethicality had five strategies that were significant. These were minimization (F=3.194, d.f. 2, 260, p≤.05), provocation (F=8.307, d.f. 2,257, p≤.001), shifting the blame (F=6.665, d.f. 2, 260, .002), silence (F=3.523, d.f. 2,261, p≤.05), and simple denial (F=3.946, d.f. 2, 259, p≤.05).

Stakeholder differences

Post hoc procedures revealed that the most common differences occurred between law and one of the other stakeholders (see Table 2.). Only two strategies showed differences between journalism and public relations. These were bolstering and silence.

Table 2. Mean Differences between Stakeholders

	Effective			Recommend			Ethical		
	Law	PR	Jour	Law	PR	Jour	Law	PR	Jour
Corrective Action	4.56	4.80	4.79	4.6a	4.81	4.84b	4.71	4.8	4.81
Compensation	4.14a	4.47b	4.47b	4.24a	4.48	4.58b	4.62	4.53	4.64
Mortification	4.08	4.08	4.34	3.86	4.18	4.28	4.49	4.46	4.54
Bolstering	3.08bbb	3.92a	3.3bb	3.31bb	3.87a	3.08bb	3.75	3.73	2.97
Good Int.	2.76	2.88	3.16	2.81	2.64	2.97	2.45	2.66	2.57
Minimization	2.43a	3.26bbb	3.02bb	2.71a	2.56b	2.78	2.6	2.5	2.51
Defeasibility	2.76	2.75	3.08	2.34	2.64	2.76	2.59	2.38	2.47
Differentiation	2.31a	3bbb	2.94bb	2.36	2.83	2.46	2.45	2.39	2.12
Transcendence	2.41	2.75	2.64	2.50	2.60	2.40	1.99	2.35	2.08
Accident	2.23	2.30	2.54	2.30	1.98	2.13	1.97	1.86	1.79
Provocation	2.44	2.28	2.16	2.35a	1.85bb	1.82bb	2.14a	1.74b	1.62bb
Attack Accuser	1.99	2.39	2.25	1.74	1.94	1.99	2.02a	1.65bb	1.79b
Shifting the Blame	2.20	2.07	2.26	1.98a	1.6bb	1.61bb	1.64	1.75	1.62
Simple Denial	1.77	1.47	1.91	1.69	1.44	1.72	1.6a	1.32	1.29b
Silence	1.67	1.58a	1.74bb	1.58	1.35	1.36	1.34a	1.23	1.13b

Different letters differ significantly

b =p≤.05

bb =p≤.01

bbb=p≤.001

Stakeholders and Rhetorical Strategy Hierarchy

Table 3 ranks the mean scores in the saliencies within the three professions based on aggregate means across all scenarios. This was done to more clearly expose hierarchy of items rather than a

particular valence. Rank standard deviation is used as a measure of variation among the stakeholders.

Table 3. Profession Ranks of Image Restoration Strategies

	PR Eff	Lik	Eth	Journalism Eff	Lik	Eth	Lawyers Eff	Lik	Eth	Rank St. Dev Eff	Lik	Eth
Corrective Action	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Compensation	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	0	0	0
Mortification	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	0	0	0
Bolstering	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0
Defeasibility	7	6	8	5	5	7	5	5	6	1.15	0.58	1
Minimization	9	9	6	6	6	6	5	6	5	2.08	1.73	0.58
Good Intentions	5	5	9	7	8	9	8	8	11	1.53	1.73	1.15
Differentiation	6	7	5	8	7	5	10	10	7	2	1.73	1.15
Transcendence	8	8	7	9	9	8	9	7	7	0.58	1	0.58
Accident	11	10	10	10	10	10	11	11	12	0.58	0.58	1.15
Provocation	12	12	12	13	12	12	7	9	9	3.21	1.73	1.73
Attack Accuser	10	11	11	12	11	12	13	13	13	1.53	1.15	1
Shifting the Blame	13	13	14	11	14	14	12	12	14	1	1	0
Silence	15	14	13	14	13	10	14	14	10	0.58	0.58	1.73
Simple Denial	14	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	0.58	0	0

Contextual variations

When crisis situations were taken into account there were few differences. Because of the sheer number of comparisons those with no significant difference are not detailed here. Those that differed included bolstering, minimization, differentiation, and provocation. Table 4 displays the significant findings among crisis events.

Table 4. Strategic Mean Differences Between Professions

		Accident Bols.	Illegal Activity Bols.	Min.	Product Safety Bols.	Diff.	Provo.	Social Irrespons. Diff.
Effective	PR	4.22 a	3.87 a	3.35 a	3.96 a	3.26 a	2.48	2.95
	Jour.	3.57	3.32	3.18	3.23	2.73	1.95	3.05 a
	Law	3.35 b	2.90 b	2.29 b	3.05 b	2.24 bb	2.52	2.19 b
Recommend	PR	4.17 a	3.87 a	2.57	3.83 a	2.70	2.09	2.65
	Jour.	3.52	2.95 b	2.50	2.91 b	2.36	1.55 a	3.00
	Law	3.30 b	3.29	2.43	3.33	2.05	2.48 b	2.33
Ethicality	PR	4.09 a	3.64 a	2.09	3.74	2.70	2.04	2.85
	Jour.	3.26 bbb	2.68 bb	1.86	3.18	2.55	1.64	2.55
	Law	3.43 b	3.14	2.10	3.29	2.29	2.33	2.57

Different letters differ significantly within salience

b =p≤.05
bb =p≤.01
bbb=p≤.001

Discussion

This study examined a range of rhetorical message strategies employed in organizational crises, which vary in their relative transformative nature of organizational perceptions. While organizational stakeholders include many constituents, three primary groups were targeted. These included stakeholders representing the journalism, law, and public relations professions. Both pragmatic (effectiveness and recommendation likelihood) and ethical issues were examined. These were contextualized within four common reputation crisis scenarios (Accidents, Product Safety, Illegal Activity, and Social Irresponsibility). Four general findings seemed to emerge from the data. First, while the level of valence differs among these groups; the hierarchal positioning (from highest to lowest) is relatively stable indicating more positively and negatively perceived rhetorical strategies. This was true for both pragmatic and ethical issues. Second, three distinct identifiable categories emerged. Positively received strategies include corrective action, compensation, mortification, and bolstering. Third, minor exceptions to this general trend were primarily between stakeholders identifying with public relations and legal positions. To simplify discussion respective professions will be used to represent the stakeholder groups.

Pragmatic and ethical differences in stakeholders

In general, PR respondents had higher (saliency rating) regard for message strategies than did Journalism/Media and Law respondents. This was true throughout pragmatic and ethical views. However, in terms of differences, those stakeholders representing PR and Law differed most. There was a clear split in the scores between PR and Law regarding perceptions of effectiveness especially in regard to bolstering. These differences were not as pronounced in likelihood to recommend and ethicality.

The number of differences where one stakeholder saw a strategy as positive and another negatively was small. For example, bolstering was seen as more effective by PR and not as effective by Law in the Illegal Activity situation. Interestingly, law stakeholders are inconsistent – although they do not see bolstering as effective, they would be willing to recommend it.

Strategic hierarchy

Some strategies were consistently seen as more salient than others. Distinctions or tiers were established by inspecting rhetorical hierarchies to see if there were clusters that consistently were ranked higher or lower within the strategic set. Exceptions were identified by categorizing rhetorical strategies within clusters and marking those that fell more than one rank outside of the cluster demarcation. What emerged were three tiers that seemed to be tapping into a similar cognitive construction regardless of salience or even type of scenario (See table 5.).

Table 5. Organizational Image Restoration Hierarchy in Pragmatism and Ethicality

Tier One	Tier Two	Tier Three
Corrective Action	Defeasibility	Accident
Compensation	Minimization	Provocation
Mortification	Good Intentions	Attack Accuser

Bolstering	Differentiation	Shifting Blame
	Transcendence	Silence
		Simple Denial

To put this into perspective these tiers held up against the two pragmatic measures, one measure of ethicality, three different organizational stakeholders within four different crisis situations. Thirty-six different views of the hierarchy were examined and most rhetorical strategies were categorized within a single tier 100% of the time, regardless of profession, or crisis scenario. Accident (94%), bolstering (97%) and provocation (97%) varied slightly from this consensual trend. In the case of the accident strategy, while valenced negatively, it was more likely to be recommended in the Product Safety and Social Irresponsibility scenarios. Provocation, also negatively valenced, was considered more effective in the Social Irresponsibility scenario. Bolstering was the single case where there was a shift in valence and a move between tier one and tier two. This shift was in regard to recommending it as a strategy within the Product Safety scenario. Law stakeholders were responsible for shifts within the Social Irresponsibility scenario and Journalism was responsible for shifts in the Product Safety scenario.

Situational variations

As indicated in table 4 differences were rare among stakeholders and even less substantial when contextualized with hierarchy. Significant differences were only found in four rhetorical strategies. These were bolstering, minimization, differentiation and provocation. Often rhetorical choices are not based on preference but rather on availability making hierarchy a somewhat more useful measure. This caveat being understood, there were some emergent features regarding the respective stakeholders and their interactions with particular situations.

In the majority of cases, the three professions tended to have a homogenous view of the strategies across the different scenarios. However, PR respondents had significantly higher saliency for message strategies in general than did Journalism and Law. Most of these differences were with Law.

PR differed with other profession five times concerning effectiveness. All of these were with law. PR saw minimization as effective and Law ineffective in regard to Illegal Activity. A similar difference was seen in the Product Safety scenario concerning differentiation.

PR differed from the other professions in three scenarios concerning likelihood to recommend. All three scenarios involved the bolstering strategy. PR differed from law concerning the Accident scenario. They also ranked bolstering higher than journalism concerning the Illegal Activity and Product Safety scenarios.

Concerning ethicality, PR considered bolstering more ethical than either journalism or law in the Accident scenario and with journalism in the Illegal Activity scenario. Noteworthy is that in this last difference PR viewed bolstering as extremely ethical while journalism regarded it as an unethical strategy. This may be an important consideration for those crafting rhetorical strategies for media consumption.

Journalism was more pessimistic than PR. In the five of the six strategies where significant differences were found it was the low mean. The singular exception was in terms of effectiveness. This was concerning the differentiation strategy in the Social Irresponsibility scenario where it had a valence split with law.

Journalism differed in two scenarios concerning likelihood to recommend. It viewed bolstering as less salient than PR in the Illegal Activity and Product Safety scenarios. It also viewed provocation as less salient than law did in the Product Safety scenario. Concerning ethicality journalism viewed bolstering as less salient than PR in the Accident and Illegal Activity scenarios.

Law, as previously described, differed most with PR. The only significant difference that it had with journalism was in terms of seeing the differentiation strategy in the Social Irresponsibility scenario as less effective. In the likelihood to recommend salience law differed with PR in the Accident scenario. Law was more likely to recommend provocation than journalism in the Product Safety scenario. In terms of ethicality, bolstering under the Illegal Activity scenario was laws single difference.

Different points of views among stakeholders

There were a few areas where there were not only a difference but stakeholders were also holding opposing views. Table 5 isolates these findings in a common table. While the cell sizes have as few as 22 observations the effect sizes are large and do invite some interesting speculation. PR considers minimization an effective strategy for responding to Illegal Activity whereas Law does not. Perhaps law's occupational frame for illegal acts tends to cause them to view illegal acts as inherently resistant to minimization. Perhaps, PR tends to see the valance of illegal acts as more negotiable than does law. In Product Safety, one possible speculation is that PR is concerned with public opinion and law with legal adjudication.

Table 5. Valence Splits between Stakeholders

| | | Illegal Activity | | Product Safety | | Social Irresp. |
		Bols.	Min.	Bols.	Diff.	Diff.
Effective	PR		3.35 a		3.26 a	
	Jour.					3.05 a
	Law		2.29 b		2.24 bb	2.19 b
Recommend	PR	3.87 a		3.83 a		
	Jour.	2.95 b		2.91 b		
Ethicality	PR	3.64 a				
	Jour.	2.68 bb				

In social responsibility situations, Journalism views differentiation as effective while Law sees it as substantially less effective. Perhaps one explanation for the Social Irresponsibility finding is that guilt is frequently linked to newsworthiness. Or perhaps, legal stakeholders tend to hold rigid responsibility links that are more difficult to evade or elude. In general, bolstering was regarded favorably. However, Journalism deviates from this trend and regards bolstering as less ethical in the Illegal Activity scenario. It might be that Journalism regards bolstering as a deceptive "change of topic" or more than simply irrelevant but deliberately trying to obfuscate. Perhaps this reflects a fundamental difference of agenda. It might be that PR sees overall reputation as the issue at hand while journalists tend to see the specific act, given instance, or the behavior under investigation.

Some of the differences in stakeholders might stem from assumptions of likely attributions that might be made by the public. It is possible that PR considers higher utility than the other professions in assessing the effectiveness of given strategies. For example, in terms of minimization in Illegal Activity and differentiation in Product Safety PR views the strategies as effective. Perhaps they may be figuring that audiences will tend to follow predictable patterns.

Conclusions

While many of the findings in this study invite interesting speculation they should be considered no more than that until validated by additional study. That being said there were some pronounced findings that appeared robust from a variety of perspectives.

First, while the level of valence differs among stakeholders, the hierarchal positioning is relatively stable indicating there is a general hierarchy regarding perceptions of rhetorical strategies. This was true for both pragmatic and ethical issues. In the simplest of terms this means that most rhetorical strategies are either viewed good or bad regardless of context or stakeholder.

Second, three identifiable tiers emerged regarding this hierarchy. While there was considerable shuffling within tiers very few strategies jumped far beyond the tier's border. Positively received or "good" strategies include corrective action, compensation, mortification, and bolstering.

Third, minor exceptions to this general trend tended to be between public relations and legal positions. Bolstering emerged as the locus of variation in three of the four scenarios examined. While clearly perceived superior to most, it would not be suitable to view it with the same level of ubiquity as the other "good" strategies. This study's intriguing empirical support regarding the interaction of occupational orientation, crisis situation and rhetorical strategies warrants the need for these factors to be simultaneously considered in future examinations.

Bibliography

Benoit, W. L. (1997). Image repair discourse and crisis communication. Public Relations Review, 23, 177-186.

Benoit, W. L. (1995) Accounts excuses and apologies a theory of image restoration strategies. SUNY Press: Albany.

Benoit, W. L., & Drew, S. (1997). Appropriateness and effectiveness of image repair strategies. Communication Reports, 10, 153-163.

Benoit, W. L., & Lindsey, J. J. (1987). Argument strategies: Antidote to Tylenol's poisoned image. Journal of the American Forensic Association, 23, 136-46.

Botan, C. H. (1993). A human nature approach to image and ethics in international public relations. Journal of Public Relations Research, 5, 71-81.

Brinson, S. L., & Benoit, W. L. (1996). Dow Coming's image repair strategies in the breast implant crisis. Communication Quarterly. 44, 29-41.

Burke, K. (1969). A rhetoric of motives. Berkeley: University of California Press. Burke, K. (1970). The rhetoric of religion. Berkeley: University of California Press. Burke, K. (1973). The philosophy of literary form, 3/e. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chandler, R. C., Ferguson, D. P. & Wallace, J. D. (2001). Image restoration strategies in crisis management situational contingencies: Comparative perceptions of ethicality, effectiveness, and utilization. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Atlanta GA.

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. Hazelton, Jr. (Eds.), Public relations theory (pp. 135-157). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Coombs, W. T. (2004). West Pharmaceutical's explosion: Structuring crisis discourse knowledge. Public Relations Review, 30, 467-473.

Coombs, W. T. & Holladay, S. L. (2002). Helping crisis managers protect reputational assets: Initial tests of the situational crisis communication theory. Management Communication Quarterly, 16, 165-186.

Dean, D. H. (2004). Consumer reaction to negative publicity: Effects of corporate reputation, response and responsibility for a crisis event. Journal of Business Communication, 41, 192-211.

Dionisopoulos, G. N., & Vibbert, S. L. (1988). CBS vs. Mobil Oil: Charges of creative bookkeeping in 1979. In H. R. Ryan (Ed.), Oratorical encounters: Selected studies and sources of twentieth-century political accusations and apologies (pp. 241-52). Westport, CT: Greenwood. 29

Dionisopoulos, G. N., & Vibbert, S. L. (1983). Refining generic parameters: The case organizational apologia. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Fearn-Banks, K. (2001). Crisis Communication. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), Handbook of Public Relations, pp. 479-485. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fearn-Banks, K. (1996). Crisis communication theory and ten businesses hit by news For making crises. In S. G. Amin & S. Fullerton (Eds.), Global business trends (pp. 55-62). Cumberland, MD: Academy of Business Administration.

Fink, S. (1986). Crisis management: Planning for the inevitable. New York: American Management Association.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Fotheringham, W. C. (1966). Perspectives on persuasion. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in public. New York: Basic Books.

Hearit, K. M. (2001). Corporate apologia: When an organization speaks in defense of itself. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), Handbook of public relations (pp. 501-512).

Hearit, K. M. (1995). From "we didn't do it" to "it's not our fault: The use of apologia in public relations crises. In W. N. Elwood (Ed.), Public relations inquiry as rhetorical criticism (pp. 117-131). New York: Greenwood.

Hearit, K. M. (1994). Apologies and public relations crises at Chrysler, Toshiba, and Volvo. Public Relations Review, 20, 113-125.

Heath, R. L. (2001). A rhetorical enactment rationale for public relations. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), Public relations handbook (pp. 31-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 30

Heath, R. L. (1992). The wrangle in the marketplace: A rhetorical perspective of public relations. In E. L. Toth & R. L. Heath (Eds.), Rhetorical and critical approaches to public relations (pp. 37-61). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Heath, R. L., &Abel, D. D. (1996). Types of knowledge as predictors of company support: The role of information in risk communication. Journal of Public Relations Research, 8, 35-55.

Heath, R. L., & Gray, C. D. (1997). Risk communication: Involvement, uncertainty, and controls effects on information scanning and monitoring by experts' stakeholders. Management Communication Quarterly, 10, 342-372.

Hirson-Shea, D., & Benoit, W., (1996). Doonesbury versus the tobacco industry: The smoke starters coupon. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Kim, P. H., Ferrin, D. L., Cooper, C. D. & Dirks, K. T. (2004). Removing the shadow of suspicion: The effects of apology versus denial for repairing competence-versus integrity-based trust violations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 104-118.

Krossnick, J. A. & Alwin, D. F. (1989). A test of the form resistant correlation hypothesis: Ratings, rankings, and the measurement of values. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52(4), 526-538.

Kruse, N. W. (1981). The scope of apologetic discourse: Establishing generic parameters. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 46, 278-91.

Len-Rios, M. E. & Benoit, W. L. (2004). Gary Condit's image repair strategies: Determined denial and differentiation. Public Relations Review, 30, 95-106.

Lerbinger, O. (1997). The crisis manager: Facing risk and responsibility. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Miller, G. R. (1989). Persuasion and public relations: Two "Ps" in a pod. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazelton, V. Jr. (Eds)., Public relations theory (pp. 45-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Olaniran, B. A., & Williams, D. E. (2001). Anticipatory model of crisis management: A vigilant response to technological crises. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), Handbook of public relations (pp. 487-500). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pfau, M., Compton, J., Parker, K. A., Wittenberg, E. M., Chasu, A., Ferguson, M. et al. (2004). The traditional explanation for resistance versus attitude accessibility: Do they trigger distinct or overlapping processes or resistance? Human Communication Research, 30, 329-360.

Reinard, J. C. (2007). Introduction to communication research (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Rogers, R., Dillard, J. & Yuthas, K. (2005). The accounting profession: Substantive change and/or image management. Journal of Business Ethics, 58, 159-176.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). Impression management: The self-concept social identity, and interpersonal relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schonbach, P. (1980). A category system for account phases. European Journal of Social Psychology, 10, 195-200.

Schultz, P. D., & Seeger, M. W. (1991). Corporate centered apologia: Iacocca in defense of Chrysler. Speaker and Gavel, 28, 50-60.

Seeger, M. W., Sellnow, T. L. , & Ulmer, R. R . (2001). Public relations and crisis communication. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), Handbook of public relations (pp. 155-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seeger, M. W., Sellnow, T. L., & Ulmer, R. R. (1998). Communication, organization, and crisis. In M. E. Roloff (Ed.), Communication yearbook 21 (pp. 230-275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seeger, M. W., & Ulmer, R. R. (2003). Explaining enron: communication and responsible leadership. Management Communication Quarterly, 17,58-84.

Seitel, F. (2001). The practice of public relations. Upper Saddle River, NJ-. Prentice Hall.

Sellnow, T. L. (1993). Scientific argument in organizational crisis communication: The case of Exxon. Argumentation and Advocacy, 31, 138-150.

Sellnow, T. L., & Ulmer, R. R. (1995). Ambiguous argument as advocacy in organizational crisis communication. Argumentation and Advocacy, 31, 138-150.

Semin, G. R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1983). The accountability of conduct: A social psychological analysis. London: Academic Press.

Trinkaus, J., & Giacalone, J. (2005). The silence of the stakeholders: Zero decibel level at Enron. Journal of Business Ethics, 58, 237-248.

Tedeschi, J. T., & Reiss, M. (1981). Verbal strategies in impression management. In C. Antaki (Ed.), The psychology of ordinary explanations of social behavior (pp. 271-326). London: Academic Press.

Ware, B. L., & Lunkugel, W. A. (1973). They spoke in defense of themselves: On the generic criticism of apologia. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59, 273-83.

Appendix A

Effective

	Public Relations			Journalism			Law			Total		
	M	N	SD	M	N	SD	M	N	SD	M	N	SD
Corrective Action*	4.80	89	0.57	4.79	89	0.57	4.56	86	0.89	4.72	264	0.70
Compensation**	4.47	89	0.71	4.47	89	0.74	4.14	86	1.01	4.36	264	0.84
Mortification	4.08	89	1.23	4.34	89	0.92	4.08	86	1.16	4.17	264	1.11
Bolstering***	3.92	89	0.97	3.30	89	1.10	3.08	86	1.26	3.44	264	1.17
Good Intentions	2.88	89	1.17	3.16	89	1.14	2.76	86	1.03	2.93	264	1.12
Minimization***	3.26	89	1.25	3.02	89	1.22	2.43	86	1.21	2.91	264	1.27
Defeasibility	2.75	89	1.27	3.08	89	1.12	2.76	86	1.04	2.86	264	1.16
Differentiation***	3.00	89	1.07	2.94	89	1.11	2.31	86	1.14	2.76	264	1.14
Transcendence	2.75	89	1.09	2.64	89	1.18	2.41	86	1.10	2.60	264	1.13
Accident	2.30	89	1.24	2.54	89	1.17	2.23	86	1.10	2.36	264	1.17
Provocation	2.28	89	1.14	2.16	89	1.12	2.44	84	1.10	2.29	262	1.12
Attack Accuser	2.39	88	1.17	2.25	89	1.10	1.99	85	1.27	2.21	262	1.18
Shifting the Blame	2.07	89	1.17	2.26	89	1.21	2.20	86	1.15	2.17	264	1.17
Simple Denial**	1.47	89	0.80	1.91	89	0.97	1.77	86	1.03	1.72	264	0.95
Silence	1.58	89	0.97	1.74	88	0.96	1.67	86	0.95	1.67	263	0.96

Likely to Recommend

	Public Relations			Journalism			Law			Total		
	M	N	SD	M	N	SD	M	N	SD	M	N	SD
Corrective Action*	4.81	89	0.54	4.84	89	0.40	4.60	86	0.77	4.75	264	0.59
Compensation**	4.48	89	0.76	4.58	89	0.56	4.24	86	0.89	4.44	264	0.76
Mortification*	4.18	89	1.10	4.28	89	0.99	3.86	86	1.34	4.11	264	1.16
Bolstering***	3.87	89	0.91	3.08	89	1.19	3.31	85	1.17	3.42	263	1.14
Defeasibility	2.64	89	1.16	2.97	89	1.23	2.81	86	1.13	2.81	264	1.18
Good Intentions	2.56	89	1.25	2.78	89	1.17	2.71	86	1.18	2.68	264	1.20
Differentiation	2.64	88	1.10	2.76	89	1.41	2.34	86	1.14	2.58	263	1.23
Minimization***	2.83	89	1.18	2.46	89	1.18	2.36	86	1.21	2.55	264	1.20
Transcendence	2.60	88	1.07	2.40	89	1.13	2.50	86	1.19	2.50	263	1.13
Accident	1.98	89	1.14	2.13	89	1.10	2.30	86	1.26	2.14	264	1.17
Provocation**	1.85	89	0.97	1.82	89	0.89	2.35	84	1.19	2.00	262	1.04
Attack Accuser	1.94	88	1.07	1.99	89	0.98	1.74	85	1.05	1.89	262	1.03
Shifting the Blame	1.60	89	0.91	1.61	89	0.78	1.98	86	1.15	1.72	264	0.97
Silence	1.44	89	0.87	1.72	89	0.92	1.69	86	1.00	1.61	264	0.93
Simple Denial*	1.35	89	0.78	1.36	88	0.76	1.58	86	0.91	1.43	263	0.83

<div align="center">Ethical</div>

	Public Relations			Journalism			Law			Total		
	M	N	SD	M	N	SD	M	N	SD	M	N	SD
Corrective Action	4.80	89	0.55	4.81	89	0.52	4.71	86	0.81	4.77	264	0.64
Mortification	4.53	89	0.92	4.64	89	0.76	4.62	86	0.72	4.59	264	0.80
Compensation	4.46	89	0.81	4.54	89	0.72	4.49	86	0.84	4.50	264	0.79
Bolstering	3.73	88	0.88	2.97	89	0.98	3.75	85	4.54	3.48	262	2.71
Differentiation	2.66	87	0.96	2.57	89	0.98	2.45	86	1.03	2.56	262	0.99
Good Intentions	2.50	88	1.26	2.51	89	0.94	2.60	86	1.00	2.54	263	1.07
Defeasibility	2.38	88	1.08	2.47	89	1.12	2.59	86	1.08	2.48	263	1.09
Transcendence	2.39	88	1.00	2.12	89	0.95	2.45	86	1.00	2.32	263	0.99
Minimization*	2.35	88	1.14	2.08	89	0.83	1.99	86	0.99	2.14	263	1.00
Accident	1.86	88	1.02	1.79	89	0.89	1.97	86	0.99	1.87	263	0.96
Provocation***	1.74	88	0.85	1.62	89	0.79	2.14	83	1.00	1.83	260	0.91
Silence*	1.65	89	0.85	1.79	89	0.85	2.02	86	1.08	1.82	264	0.94
Attack Accuser	1.75	87	0.96	1.62	89	0.63	1.64	85	0.92	1.67	261	0.85
Shifting the Blame**	1.32	88	0.54	1.29	89	0.51	1.60	86	0.80	1.40	263	0.64
Simple Denial*	1.23	88	0.50	1.13	88	0.37	1.34	86	0.61	1.23	262	0.50

*=p≤.05
**=p≤.01
***=p≤.001

Biographies
J.D. WALLACE is an Associate Professor of Communication at Lubbock Christian University. His expertise includes organizational communication, computer-mediated communication, virtual work teams, behavioral assessment and appraisal, training and development, communication ethics and social scientific research methods. His most recent research has been in the area of corporate video communication during crisis events.

DENISE P. FERGUSON is an Associate Professor of Journalism and Public Relations and Chair of the Communication Arts Department at Indiana Wesleyan University in Marion, Indiana. In addition to teaching public relations and advanced journalism coursed, she serves as advisor to the campus newspaper, The Sojourn. She has experience in professional public relations, higher education, and corporate and nonprofit organizations.

ROBERT C. CHANDLER'S expertise includes crisis communication, leadership, psychometric assessment, crisis team selection and development, employee integrity and multi-cultural diversity issues. Recent research includes pandemic communication and crisis communication effectiveness including the application of emerging communication technologies, and leadership characteristics. He currently chairs Pepperdine University's Communication Division.