

Agenda Building and Agenda Setting in Business: Corporate Reputation Attributes

Ji Young Kim

Department of Communication, Bradley University, Peoria, IL, USA

Spiro Kiouis

College of Journalism and Communications, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

Zheng Xiang

University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

ABSTRACT

Grounded in an agenda-building and agenda-setting framework, the current study explored the transfer of salience relationships among public relations materials, news media coverage and online public communications in a business communication context. A total of 2,576 communication messages were analyzed in terms of the dominant business corporation (object), corporate attributes (substantive attributes) and the tone of attributes (affective attributes). Our results showed that the transfer of salience relationships were strongly supported at the second-level among corporate public relations messages, media coverage and consumers' messages online. The salience of corporate attributes has a stronger correlation than the salience of the corporate names among communication messages. The theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Corporate Reputation Review (2015) **18**, 25–36.
doi:10.1057/crr.2014.18

KEYWORDS: *agenda building; agenda setting; business communication; corporate reputation; interactive media*

The concept of agenda setting was first introduced to explain a strong correlation

between news media and public opinion by offering evidence that public agenda is affected by the news media agenda (Cohen, 1963; McCombs and Shaw, 1972). In an extension of agenda setting, the concept of agenda building expanded its focus on the external information resources such as organizations' public relations efforts – news releases, emails or blogs (Miller, 2010). These information subsidies can play a role in affecting news media and the public agenda, and scholars found the evidence of agenda-building relationships in several communication contexts. In political communication, evidence has shown that political advertising messages can contribute to shaping the priority of issues on television and print news media (Boyle, 2001; Roberts and McCombs, 1994).

Even though the effects of the agenda-building framework have been widely investigated in a political communication context, the transfer of salience can be applied to other types of communication settings such as business communication (ie, Carroll and McCombs, 2003; Miller, 2010). Carroll and McCombs (2003) found that media portrayals of a company can shape



how publics perceive the company. To add more empirical evidence of agenda building in a business communication context, the current study examined the salience of agenda among organization's public relations messages, media coverage and public communications online.

Corporations are concerned with the prevalent messages about them in the news because stakeholder knowledge and communication about corporations can be affected by media content. In this inquiry, stakeholder assessments were measured from online forum messages written by active members of the public.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Agenda Building and Agenda Setting

Traditionally, the concept of agenda setting suggests that mass media have a significant influence on public opinion by telling people 'what to think about' (Cohen, 1963: 13). McCombs and Shaw (1972) showed a positive linkage between the salience of issues presented in news media and the issues prominent in public opinion. Iyengar and Kinder (1987) also found that people ascribed higher importance to a problem that they were shown by network broadcasts in experimental conditions than those not emphasized in the altered newscasts.

Expanding from the agenda-setting conceptualization, agenda building has broadened the scope of influences including external communication sources (Miller, 2010). As Lang and Lang (1981) described, media, government, and citizens reciprocally influence one another (pp. 58–59), and several factors can affect building agendas. These factors include public relations campaign messages, advertising, and investor and interest group efforts (Gandy, 1982; Shoemaker and Reese, 1991). Prior scholarship has explored the role of information subsidies, such as news releases, on the media agenda

(Curtin, 1999; Gandy, 1982). Information subsidies provided by organizations reduce the cost for journalists to gather information, and information is sometimes presented in the media without alteration by journalists (Curtin, 1999; Gandy, 1982; Miller, 2010).

The concept of agenda building suggests that public relations practice can contribute to shaping agendas for media and public. Kaid (1976) showed that journalists may refer to campaign public relations materials to write their campaign-related news stories. In their study of candidate public relations in a gubernatorial race, Kiouisis *et al.* (2006) also found positive correlations among candidate news releases, news coverage and public opinion. Emphasizing the reciprocal relationships among government, news media, and public, Lang and Lang (1981) found that policy elites had played an important role in building agenda for media and public in the context of Watergate scandal.

The effect of agenda building is not limited to political communication context. Carroll and McCombs (2003) stated that the key concept of agenda building is the transfer of salience from one agenda to another, and the concept can be studied with business news content. Ohl *et al.* (1995) also found a correlation between public relations information subsidies (business news releases) and news media coverage about the business.

First level of Agenda Building and Agenda Setting

An important social issue was used as an object in McCombs and Shaw's (1972) classical agenda-setting study. Still, issues are one of the most frequently used objects in agenda-building and agenda-setting studies; however, an object can also be a political candidate, corporation or a nation (McCombs, 2004). A large body of research suggests that the more frequently news media covers a certain object (issue, candidate, company or nation), the more people would

think about the object and transfer of salience regarding an object is considered as the first-level agenda setting.

At the first level, scholars have focused on the visibility of objects in the media and public agenda, emphasizing ‘news media’s role in generating awareness of issues that should concern the public’ (Golan and Wanta, 2001: 258). Salwen and Matera (1989) found that the amount of media coverage of certain foreign nations would shape public perceptions about these nations. Semetko *et al.* (1992) also found that the visibility of foreign nations on television news affects what the United States public thinks about these nations.

Moreover, in public relations, the transfer of salience regarding an object was also studied to explore the role of information subsidies in affecting news media coverage and public opinion. Sweetser and Brown (2008) reported that up to 80 percent of news coverage was generated from information subsidies (ie, news releases) provided to journalists. There is a substantial amount of research providing evidence of the salience of object salience between public relations materials and news media coverage (ie, Ohl *et al.*, 1995; Wanta and Ghanem, 2007).

Second Level of Agenda Building and Agenda Setting

Distinguished from the first level, the second level of agenda setting and agenda building suggests that media coverage (or public relations) impacts public opinion not only by telling people ‘what to think about,’ but also ‘how to think about objects’ (McCombs, 2004; McCombs and Reynolds, 2002). News media highlight certain characteristics of an object while they are simultaneously ignoring others (McCombs, 2004). The salience transfer of attributes, characteristics of an object, is the key of the second-level agenda setting and agenda building, and there are two dimensions of attributes – substantive and affective.

The substantive attribute refers to the cognitive characteristics of an object. When a political candidate is an object, he/she can be described by different candidate attributes, including personality, policy/issue position or biographical information (Kioussis *et al.*, 2006). When a social issue is an object, certain aspects of the issue are highlighted to inform public about how to understand it (Entman, 1993). In business communication, news media can highlight a firm’s financial report, product/service or CEO’s reputation (Kioussis *et al.*, 2007).

On the other hand, the affective attribute refers to the emotional characteristics of an object such as the tone of the issue (ie, whether the issue is portrayed negatively, neutrally or positively) (ie, McCombs, 2004). The evaluative tone used to describe the object affects public’s judgment regarding an object (Sheafer, 2007).

Corporate Reputation Attributes

Expanding the scope of agenda-building and agenda-setting research in business communication, the current study considered a corporation as an object, and used corporate attributes and the tone as the two attributes – substantive and affective. Lange *et al.* (2011) conceptualized corporate reputation along three dimensions: how familiar people are with the organization (familiarity), what people would believe about the organization (belief) and how people feel about the organization (favorability). These three dimensions reflect the sources of salience transfers in agenda building and agenda setting: objects (familiarity), substantive attributes (belief) and affective attributes (favorability).

Edelman, the world’s largest independent public relations firm, emphasized the impact of trust on society stating that it is the power to keep the world moving, and public relations practitioners should consider it as ‘a tangible asset that must be created, sustained, and built upon’ (Edelman, 2006: 7).



Measuring public trust toward business, government or media across 25 countries, the annual Trust Barometer reports consistent financial returns, innovative products or leadership as primary factors affecting the state of public trust on business (Edelman, 2012). In 2012, the technology industry earned public trust most, followed by automotive, food and beverage, and consumer packaged goods (Edelman, 2012).

The annual report shows that the most crucial predictors of trust are the quality of products or services, customer service and a company's overall reputation, followed by their social and environmental track record, and how the organization treats its employees (Edelman, 2008: 10). Moreover, business is not only interested in economic performance, but they also concerned with socially responsible activities contributing to social and community issues (Edelman, 2008, 2012). This increases public expectations on corporate social responsibility and affects the reputation of the business. Partnerships between business corporations and local non-profit organizations can be another aspect of public trust.

Hence, the following items were used for corporate reputation attributes: quality products and services, customer service, value for money of products and services, a company's overall reputation, social and environmental track record, reputation as a place to work, financial performance, a respected CEO or leader, the industry sector, the company's presence in the area, a trusted individual works for the company and the location of the headquarters (Edelman, 2008, 2012).

Interactive Media and Public Relations

The practice of public relations has been challenged by the complexity of the social environment as a result of globalization and technology development (Kruckeberg, 2000; Grunig *et al.*, 2002). Communication technology has increased the demand for direct and transparent communication between

organizations and publics, and it has increased expectations for trust-based relationships between them (Grunig and Dozier, 1992; Grunig and Hunt, 1984). Kazouleas and Teigen (2006) stated that interactive media increased stakeholders' access to information and opportunity to engage with the organization. According to Kent and Taylor (1998), dialogue is a byproduct of the two-way communication model between organizations and publics or among diverse key publics.

The emerging interactive media channels such as blogs and online forums have become important information sources for key publics including customers or investors. Prior scholarship has suggested that blogs are one of the most effective interactive communication channels for the public (Kent, 2008; Yang and Kang, 2009). Yang and Kang (2009) also stated that the blogosphere has been used as a communication space where the public can engage to produce cognitive, attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. A negative review revealed on an online forum sometimes extends to mainstream media so that it drives negative public perceptions of the organizations. Chang and Park's (2012) recent study also demonstrated that blogs became an important source of news. Individuals' blog entries collectively created negative public opinion toward US beef imports, and it affected how citizens and journalists engaged with the issue (Chang and Park, 2012). Considering interactive media as a tool for public to express their opinion, the current study explored online forum message to examine first- and second-level agenda-building and agenda-setting relationships.

HYPOTHESES

Based on the logic of first- and second-level agenda building between public relations and media coverage, the following three hypotheses were proposed:

H1: *The salience of corporations in public relations messages will be positively related to the salience of them in media coverage.*

H2: *The salience of substantive corporate attributes in public relations messages will be positively related to the salience of substantive corporate attributes in media coverage.*

H3: *The overall tone towards corporations in public relations messages will be positively related to the tone towards corporations in media coverage.*

The present investigation used online forum messages as customers' opinion sources written by active members of the public. The following set of three hypotheses were proposed based on the logic of first- and second-level agenda building between public relations and customers' online opinions:

H4: *The salience of corporations in public relations messages will be positively related to the salience of them in customers' opinions online.*

H5: *The salience of substantive corporate attributes in public relations messages will be positively related to the salience of substantive corporate attributes in customers' opinions online.*

H6: *The overall tone toward corporations in public relations messages will be positively related to the tone toward corporations in customers' opinions online.*

Finally, the following three hypotheses were proposed based on the logic of first- and second-level agenda setting between media coverage and online messages:

H7: *The salience of corporations in media coverage will be positively related to the salience of them in customers' opinions online.*

H8: *The salience of substantive corporate attributes in media coverage will be positively*

related to the salience of substantive corporate attributes in customers' opinions online.

H9: *The overall tone towards corporations in media coverage will be positively related to the tone towards them in customers' opinions online.*

METHOD

A quantitative content analysis was conducted for public relations materials, media coverage from newspapers and magazines, and online discussion board messages.

Procedure

Corporations

The following 12 corporations were used as objects in this current study: Kraft Foods, Johnson and Johnson, Procter & Gamble, Coca-Cola, McDonald's, Ford Motor, Nike, ExxonMobil, Samsung, Nissan, Unilever and HSBC. These corporations were shown on the annual Trust Barometer report in 2006. A dominant corporation was coded for each public relations message, news coverage and online discussion board message (Table 1).

Corporate public relations messages

Global corporate public relations messages were collected from *Business Wire* using the Factiva database. The current study set the time frame between April 1 and September 30 in 2005 and 2011 for all three types of collected communication messages. The six-month period was selected in 2005 because of the data availability. Then more recent data were added in 2011 to deal with the concern of timeliness of the research. Also, to select relevant messages to the business topic, messages were chosen that used the corporate name at least three times or its CEO's name in the article. A total of 961 messages were collected.

**Table 1: Company List of the Study**

<i>Company name</i>	<i>Country of origin</i>	<i>Industry^a</i>	<i>CEO^b</i>
Kraft Foods	US	Food	Roger K. Deromedi (2003–2006) Irene Rosenfeld (2006–present)
Johnson & Johnson	US	Health/personal care	William Weldon (2002–present)
Procter & Gamble	US	Health/personal care	A. G. Lafley (2000–2009) Robert A. McDonald (2009–present)
Coca-Cola	US	Food	E. Neville Isdell (2004–2008) Muhtar Kent (2008–present)
McDonald's	US	Food	James A. Skinner (2004–present)
Ford Motor	US	Automotive	William Clay Ford Jr (2001–2006) Alan Mulally (2006–present)
Nike	US	Sports	William D. Perez (2004–2006) Mark Parker (2006–present)
ExxonMobil	US	Energy	Lee Raymond (1999–2005) Rex W. Tillerson (2006–present)
Samsung	Korea	Technology/electronic	Kun-Hee Lee (1998–2008) Gee Sung Choi (2009–present)
Nissan	Japan	Automotive	Carlos Ghosn (2001–present)
Unilever	Dutch-British	Health/personal care	Patrick J. Cescau (2005–2008) Paul Polman (2009–present)
HSBC	United Kingdom	Bank	M. F. Geoghegan (2004–2006) Stuart Gulliver (2011–present)

^aIf a corporate is involved in more than two industries, the major one was selected

^bName of CEO as of 2005 and 2011

US media coverage

This study analyzed media coverage from two newspapers and two business magazines during the same time frame. Referring to circulation data, *The New York Times* and *Wall Street Journal* were selected as two of the most widely read national newspapers, and *Business Week* and *Fortune* were selected as two of the most widely read national business magazines. A company's name and their CEO's full name were again used as keywords. Newspaper articles that mentioned either the company's name at least three times or its CEO's name at least once were selected from April 1 to September 30 in 2005, and the same period in 2011. For business magazines, messages that mentioned either the company's name or its CEO's name at least once were selected from

the same time period in 2005. A total of 339 stories were collected from *The New York Times*, 517 from *The Wall Street Journal*, 221 from *Business Week* and 98 from *Fortune* magazine.

Online discussion board messages

The investigation also analyzed online discussion board messages using two board message searching services, Boardreader and Omgili using the same time frame. We do not assume that the online customer reviews collected in this study are representative of the overall population; however, we believe that this data can be used for a meaningful exploration of conceptual relationships. Hence, the two sources were selected from

the most useful forum search engine lists that allow for searches of diverse online messages (ie, forum and discussion board) simultaneously. Using a corporate name as a keyword, only English postings were selected from the same time period. A total of 110 messages were collected from Boardreader and 330 from Omgili.

Measurements

Corporations

The main corporation in the message was coded as: (1) Kraft Foods, (2) Johnson and Johnson, (3) Procter & Gamble, (4) Coca-Cola, (5) McDonald's, (6) Ford Motor, (7) Nike, (8) ExxonMobil, (9) Samsung, (10) Nissan, (11) Unilever, and (12) HSBC.

Corporate attributes

In the present study, we analyzed public relations materials, newspaper articles, business magazine articles and online discussion board messages using 15 business attributes. The unit of analysis was the messages selected, and each attribute item was coded with (1) presence and (0) absence. The 15 business reputation attributes, adopted from Edelman (2008, 2012) annual report, were explored: (1) headquarters' location, (2) social/environmental issues, (3) local community issues, (4) network in the local community, (5) competitive position in the industry, (6) partnership efforts with others, (7) quality of product/service, (8) customer service, (9) value for money of product/service, (10) the company's overall reputation, (11) reputation as a place to work, (12) financial performance, (13) dialogue with stakeholders, (14) transparent/honest practices and (15) the visibility of a company's CEO/leader in a message was coded.

The trust barometer report has been cited in several brand and reputation studies (ie, Burnett and Hutton, 2007; Goodman,

2005), and these corporate attributes are still current and valid (Edelman, 2012). When each corporate attribute item is present within a story or release, the corresponding affective attribute was coded as well with (1) negative, (2) neutral or mixed and (3) positive tone. Then, the primary business attribute within a story was also coded among the 15 business attribute items, and the corresponding affective attribute was coded with (1) negative, (2) neutral or mixed and (3) positive tone.

Data Analysis

To analyze the relationships between different types of communication messages in terms of agenda salience, Spearman's rho correlation tests on SPSS were used. Data files were prepared that included indicators for each salience item: corporation, corporate attributes and affective attributes. First, the frequencies of each corporation were reported to assess the rank order among the 12 corporations on public relations messages, media news coverage and customer's online messages. If a significant correlation was found between media coverage and online messages in terms of corporations it meant that certain corporations were most visible in news media coverage as well as in the online messages.

Regarding corporate attribute salience, the frequencies of each attribute for each corporation were reported (ie, 15 attribute items for Nike, Samsung or HSBC). Then, the rank order of the frequencies was compared among the different types of communication messages. Finally, frequencies of each affective tone for each corporation were reported to determine the rank order relationship between the three types of communication messages.

Intercoder Reliability

Intercoder reliability was measured between two coders using about 10 percent of each



Table 2: Correlations Between Salience Among Public Relations Messages, Media Coverage and Online Messages

	<i>Corporation salience</i>	<i>Substantive attributes</i>	<i>Affective attributes</i>
Correlation coefficient between public relations and media coverage	−0.244	0.860**	0.439**
Correlation coefficient between public relations and online messages	0.011	0.828**	0.223
Correlation coefficient between media coverage and online messages	−0.110	0.656**	0.309*

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

message group (ie, public relations messages, newspapers, magazines and online forum messages). A total of 201 randomly selected messages were analyzed to refine the coding protocol, and Holsti's (Holsti, 1969) and Scott's Pi (Scott, 1955) scores are reported to measure reliability. For the salience of corporations, Holsti's and Scott's Pi figures were 0.98 and 0.96 respectively; for substantive corporate attributes and the tone towards them, the two scores were 0.97 and 0.96 respectively.

RESULTS

For data analysis purposes, SPSS was used to test the hypotheses. Spearman's rho correlations were completed, as has been the case with prior agenda-building and agenda-setting research (ie, Kioussis *et al.*, 2006; McCall, 1994; Weaver, 1981). Hypothesis 1 predicted a positive relationship between the salience of corporations in public relations messages and news media coverage. Table 2 provides a summary of correlation coefficients regarding the salience of corporations among public relations messages, news media coverage and online messages written by the public. As shown in Table 2, first-level agenda-building relationships between public relations and media coverage were not found ($r = -0.244$, $p > 0.05$).

The next two hypotheses ($H2-H3$) proposed second-level agenda-building relationships between public relations messages and media coverage. Hypothesis 2 predicted a positive relationship regarding substantive attribute salience between public relations messages and media coverage, and Hypothesis 3 predicted positive relationships regarding affective attributes between public relations messages and media coverage. Table 2 also summarizes the correlation coefficient results among public relations messages, news media coverage and online messages. The salience of substantive and affective attributes between public relations messages and media coverage was supported. Specifically, the value for substantive attributes and affective attributes (tone toward each corporate attribute) were 0.86 ($p < 0.01$) and 0.44 ($p < 0.01$), respectively. Hence, Hypotheses 2 and 3 were strongly supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicted a positive relationship between the salience of corporations in public relations messages and online messages written by the public. The first-level agenda-building linkages between public relations and online messages were not found, so the hypothesis was not supported ($r = 0.011$, $p > 0.05$).

Hypotheses 5 and 6 proposed positive relationships regarding substantive and affective

attribute salience between public relations messages and online messages. As illustrated in Table 2, the connections concerning substantive attributes predicted in Hypothesis 5 were strongly supported ($r=0.828$, $p<0.01$). On the other hand, no correlation was found regarding the salience of the affective attributes between public relations messages and online messages. Hence, Hypothesis 6 was not supported ($r=0.223$, $p>0.05$).

Moving to agenda-setting relationships between media coverage and online messages, Hypothesis 7 predicted a positive linkage between the salience of corporations in media coverage and online messages written by the public. Our results showed no first-level agenda-building linkages between media coverage and online messages ($r=-0.110$, $p>0.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 7 is not supported.

Hypothesis 8 predicted a positive association regarding substantive attribute salience between media coverage and online messages. The data offer supportive evidence of this hypothesis with overall media coverage and online messages. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was strongly supported ($r=0.656$, $p<0.01$).

Our final hypothesis proposed that the salience of affective attributes between media coverage and online messages is positively associated. The results supported these expectations ($r=0.309$, $p<0.05$). Hence, Hypothesis 9 was supported.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to explore the relationships among public relations efforts, news media coverage and online public communications in a business communication context. In particular, it examines the transfer of salience considering corporations as objects, and their reputation and tone as attributes. Supporting five hypotheses out of nine, our results showed strong evidence for the second-level attribute agenda building and agenda setting, while no evidence was found for the first-level.

Theoretical Implications

The results may be somewhat surprising given the abundant evidence of first-level agenda-building and agenda-setting effects (ie, Carroll and McCombs, 2003; McCombs, 2004; Kioussis *et al.*, 2006; Kioussis *et al.*, 2007). Several prior research studies have focused on the sequence of the two levels of agenda building and agenda setting assuming that second-level analyses would have little implications if first-level relationships are not observed. First-level agenda-building and agenda-setting influence should exist prior to second-level agenda building or agenda setting.

However, this study suggests exploring the relationship between first- and second-level influence in terms of the strength rather than the sequence may also be meaningful. Wu and Coleman (2010) found stronger second-level agenda-setting relationships exploring the strength of first- and second-level agenda setting influence on behavioral outcomes. The results of this current study are consistent with the aforementioned investigation. Also, this study found stronger correlation values for substantive attributes than affective attributes (tone).

The substantive attributes were explored using corporate reputation items including headquarters' location, quality of product/service or financial performance. These items were considered as critical predictors of public trust (Edelman, 2008, 2012). The strong correlation found in this study suggests that public relations scholars and professionals should consider increasing the power of reputational attributes in business communication. Exploring the relationships among public relations efforts, media coverage and public communication, this study implies a strong impact of reputation attributes on public opinion as a consequence of agenda-building and agenda-setting relationships. In political communication, agenda-building and agenda-setting effects have been examined by job approval ratings or voting intentions (ie, Sheafer and Weimann, 2005; Valenzuela and McCombs,



2007). Compared with political communication context, not many studies explored the effects in business communication settings.

Practical Implications

As Lange *et al.* (2011) defined, corporate reputation is a multi-dimensional concept about how familiar, how believable, or how favorable publics perceive a corporation is. Successfully testing the salience transfer of reputation attributes among public relations, news media and public communication, this study provides practical advice to public relations professionals in their communication message strategies such as how to highlight certain aspects of reputation through information subsidies: personal (CEO or employees), business (quality of products), industry (competition) or community (social responsibility) aspects of reputation. The results suggest that the role of public relations professionals is not just limited to a publicity role providing information subsidies, but it should include a managerial role working closely with a reputation management team.

Finally, the current study emphasized the role of interactive media as a tool for publics to express their opinion, and it suggested online forums as an effective public communication channel to gauge public opinion in business communication. Providing a strong correlation evidence between public relations materials (or media coverage) and online forum messages, the results of this study recognize the important role of public relations professionals in setting an agenda for both media and public. Scholars showed that interactive media channels such as blogs have become an important information source of news media (ie, Chang and Park, 2012).

Limitation and Future Research

While this study has numeral implications, some limitations are worth noting. First, the study only analyzed English-language media

and online forum messages. Considering that half of the companies in this study were international, including foreign language information may produce different results and would have greater implications for international public relations practice. Second, customers' online forum messages cannot represent public opinion overall. Future research should include other types of public communication channels such as blogs or twitter. Third, only news releases were collected from public relations materials. To explore agenda-building relationships between public relations and online public opinion, future research should diversify the sampling pool to collect public relations information subsidies including corporate blogs, emails, Facebook posts or tweets. Finally, the few companies explored in this study were chosen based on a secondary resource. Future research should add more empirical data with sampled companies by the type of industry, size or country or origin.

REFERENCES

- Boyle, T.P. (2001) 'Intermedia agenda setting in the 1996 presidential election', *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(1), 26–44.
- Burnett, J. and Hutton, R.B. (2007) 'New consumers need new brands', *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 16(5), 342–347.
- Carroll, C. and McCombs, M. (2003) 'Agenda-setting effects of business news on the public's images and opinion about major corporations', *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6(1), 36–46.
- Chang, W.Y. and Park, H.W. (2012) 'The network structure of the Korean blogosphere', *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(2), 216–230.
- Cohen, B. (1963) *The Press And Foreign Policy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Curtin, P.A. (1999) 'Reevaluating public relations information subsidies: Market-driven journalism and agenda-building theory and practice', *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 11(1), 53–90.
- Edelman (2006) *2006 Annual Edelman Trust Barometer*. Retrieve from: <http://edelmaneditions.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/edelman-trust-barometer-2006.pdf>, accessed 8 December 2014.

- Edelman (2008) *2008 Annual Edelman Trust Barometer*. Retrieve from: <http://www.edelman.com/assets/uploads/2014/01/2008-Trust-Barometer-Executive-Summary.pdf>, accessed 8 December 2014.
- Edelman (2012) *2012 Annual Edelman Trust Barometer*. Retrieve from: <http://sharedvaluemedia.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/79026497-2012-Edelman-Trust-Barometer-Executive-Summary-1.pdf>, accessed 8 December 2014.
- Entman, R. (1993) 'Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm', *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Gandy, O.H. (1982) 'Public relations and public policy: The structuration of dominance in the information age', in E.L. Toth and R.L. Heath (eds.), *Rhetorical and Critical Approaches to Public Relations*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 131–163.
- Golan, G. and Wanta, W. (2001) 'Second-level agenda setting in the new hampshire primary: A comparison of coverage in three newspapers and public perceptions of candidates', *Journalism and Mass Communications*, 78(2), 247–259.
- Goodman, M.B. (2005) 'Restoring trust in American business: The struggle to change perception', *Journal of Business Strategy*, 26(4), 29–37.
- Grunig, J.E. and Dozier, D.M. (1992) *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Grunig, J.E. and Hunt, T. (1984) *Managing Public Relations*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.
- Grunig, L.A., Grunig, J.E. and Dozier, D.M. (2002) *Excellent Public Relations and Effective Organizations: A Study of Communication Management in Three Countries*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Holsti, O.R. (1969) *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Iyengar, S. and Kinder, D.R. (1987) *News that Matters: Television and American Opinion*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Kaid, L.L. (1976) 'Newspaper treatment of a candidate's news releases', *Journalism Quarterly*, 53(1), 135–137.
- Kazoleas, D. and Teigen, L.G. (2006) 'The technology-image expectancy gap: A new theory of public relations', in C.H. Botan and V. Hazleton (eds.), *Public Relations Theory II*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 415–433.
- Kent, M.L. (2008) 'Critical analysis of blogging in public relations', *Public Relations Review*, 34(1), 32–40.
- Kent, M.L. and Taylor, M. (1998) 'Building dialogic relationships through the world wide web', *Public Relations Review*, 24(3), 321–334.
- Kiouis, S., Mitrook, M., Wu, X. and Seltzer, T. (2006) 'First- and second-level agenda-building and agenda-setting effects: Exploring the linkages among candidate news releases, media coverage, and public opinion during the 2002 Florida gubernatorial election', *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 18(3), 265–285.
- Kiouis, S., Popescu, C. and Mitrook, M. (2007) 'Understanding influence on corporate reputation: An examination of public relations efforts, media coverage, public opinion, and financial performance from agenda-building and agenda-setting perspective', *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 19(2), 147–165.
- Kruckeberg, D. (2000) 'Public relations toward a global professionalism', in J.A. Ledingham and S.D. Bruning (eds.), *Public Relationship as Relationship Management: A Relational Approach to the Study and Practice of Public Relations*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 145–158.
- Lang, G.E. and Lang, K. (1981) 'Watergate: An exploration of the agenda building process', in G.C. Wilhoit and H. de Bock (eds.), *Mass Communication Review Yearbook*. Vol. 2, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, pp. 447–468.
- Lange, D., Lee, P.M. and Dai, Y. (2011) 'Organizational reputation: A review', *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 153–184.
- McCall, R.B. (1994) *Fundamental Statistics for Behavioral Sciences*, Duxbury, San Francisco, CA.
- McCombs, M. and Reynolds, A. (2002) 'News influence on our pictures of the world', in J. Bryant and D. Zillmann (eds.), *Media Effects*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 1–16.
- McCombs, M. and Shaw, D. (1972) 'The agenda setting function of the mass media', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- McCombs, M.E. (2004) *Setting the Agenda: The Mass Media and Public Opinion*, Blackwell, Malden, MA.
- Miller, B. (2010) 'Community stakeholders and marketplace advocacy: A model of advocacy, agenda building, and industry approval', *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22(1), 85–112.
- Ohl, C.M., Pincus, J.D., Rimmer, T. and Harrison, D. (1995) 'Agenda building role of news releases in corporate takeovers', *Public Relations Review*, 21(2), 89–101.
- Roberts, M. and McCombs, M. (1994) 'Agenda setting and political advertising: Origins of the news agenda', *Political Communication*, 11(3), 249–262.
- Salwen, M.B. and Matera, F. (1989) 'Public salience of foreign nations', *Journalism Quarterly*, 69(3), 623–632.
- Scott, W.A. (1955) 'Reliability and content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 19(3), 321–325.
- Semetko, H.A., Brzinski, J.B., Weaver, D. and Willnat, L. (1992) 'TV news and US public opinion about foreign countries: The impact of exposure and attention', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 4(1), 18–36.
- Sheafer, T. (2007) 'How to evaluate it: The role of story-evaluative tone in agenda setting and priming', *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 21–39.



- Sheafer, T. and Weimann, G. (2005) 'Agenda building, agenda setting, priming, individual voting intentions, and the aggregate results: An analysis of four Israeli elections', *Journal of Communication*, 55(2), 347–365.
- Shoemaker, P.J. and Reese, S.D. (1991) *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content*, Longman, New York.
- Sweetser, K.D. and Brown, C.W. (2008) 'Information subsidies and agenda-building during the Israel-Lebanon crisis', *Public Relations Review*, 34(4), 359–366.
- Valenzuela, S. and McCombs, M. (2007) Agenda-setting effects on vote choice: Evidence from the 2006 Mexican election. Presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Wanta, W. and Ghanem, S. (2007) 'Effects of agenda setting', in R.W. Preiss, B.M. Gayle, N. Burrell, M. Allen and J. Bryant (eds.), *Mass Media Effects Research: Advances Through Meta-Analysis*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 37–51.
- Weaver, D.H. (1981) 'Basic statistical tools', in G.H. Stempel and B.H. Westley (eds.), *Research Methods in Mass Communication*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 49–89.
- Wu, H.D. and Coleman, R. (2010) 'Advancing agenda-setting theory: The comparative strength and new contingent conditions of the two levels of agenda-setting effects', *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 86(4), 775–789.
- Yang, S.U. and Kang, M.J. (2009) 'Measuring blog engagement: Testing a four-dimensional scale', *Public Relations Review*, 35(3), 323–324.