Public Relations Review xxx (2016) xxx–xxx

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Public Relations Review

Full Length Article

Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors

Diana C. Sisson

Auburn University, 235 Tichenor Hall, Auburn, AL 36849, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 14 March 2016
Received in revised form 15 July 2016
Accepted 25 October 2016
Available online xxx

Keywords:
Control mutuality
Social media
Organization-public relationships
Relationship management
Donors
Nonprofit organizations

ABSTRACT

Using an online survey and qualitative analysis, this study examined the role of control mutuality in social media engagement to provide insight for social media strategy creation for nonprofit organizations. Guided by OPR and relationship management literature, insights and implications contribute to scholarly discussions of control mutuality and relationship management.

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Nonprofit organizations have different relationships with their publics than corporations (Fussell Sisco, Pressgrove, & Collins, 2013). Nonprofit organizations address societal issuessuch as animal welfare, poverty, or homelessness (Boris & Steuerle, 2006). Many nonprofit organizations work with small budgets and staffs, which often affects how public relations activities are conducted and enhances the attractiveness of social media.

Online resources such as social media and websites are not used to their full potential in the nonprofit sector (Waters & Lord, 2009). An inability to convey what the nonprofit organization does in a meaningful way online might be the cause (Patel & McKeever, 2014). Often held to a high standard (Doh, 2006), nonprofits can hurt their reputation as well as their relationships with donors online and offline with their social media practices. Damaged relationships with donors severely hinder the operations of nonprofit, local animal welfare organizations that rely heavily on individual donations and are not affiliated with a national organization (Caroline Radom, personal communication, 2014).

Social media can help amplify organization-public relationships through its ability to facilitate immediate feedback from members of key publics (Bowen, 2013). This study explores the role of control mutuality in social media engagement as a means of providing insight for social media strategy creation for nonprofit organizations such as local animal welfare organizations.

E-mail address: dcs0016@auburn.edu

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007
0363-8111/© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article in press as: Sisson, D.C. Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors. *Public Relations Review* (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007

2. Literature review

2.1. Reputations

Reputations are "perceptual representations of a company's past actions and future prospects" (Fombrun, 1996; p. 72). Reputations provide organizations with competitive advantages (Fombrun, 1996), and as such, should be considered for their financial implications for donations. Reputations represent what an organization stands for, or its values, and establish performance standards for customers, donors, shareholders, vendors, and other relevant publics (Fombrun, 1996). Consistency in communication and action afford members of key publics the ability to accurately assess the organization to determine if the organization has met or exceeded expectations (Fombrun, 1996).

An organization's ability to engage in dialogue with its key publics and listen to their concerns and feedback is particularly important to managing perceptions about an organization (Fombrun & Rindova, 2000). The ability to listen and exceed publics' expectations is a fundamental component of reputation management (Fombrun & Rindova, 2000). Through listening and adjusting business practices accordingly, organizations can maintain a good reputation (Fombrun & Rindova, 2000).

2.2. Organization-public relationships

Thirteen years after Ferguson's (1984) call for further study of organization-public relationships, Broom, Casey, and Ritchey (1997) examined relationships as a concept, highlighting the need for a universal definition for relationships. Broom et al. (1997) contended that organization-public relationships had antecedents and outcomes. Furthermore, Broom et al. (1997) asserted that organization-public relationships consisted of perceptions and expectations, as well as linkages based on needs of both parties. Broom et al. (1997) noted that the process of forming and maintaining organization-public relationships required measurement, which further highlighted the need for a universal definition.

Organization-public relationships have different dimensions. Ledingham and Bruning (1998) defined organization-public relationships as "the state which exists between an organization and its key publics in which the actions of either entity impact the economic, social, political and/or cultural well-being of the other entity" (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998, p. 62). Ledingham and Bruning (1998) contended that there were five dimensions of organization-public relationships: trust, openness, involvement, investment, and commitment. Acknowledging previous works of J. Grunig, some scholars contended that effective relationships are mutually beneficial for all parties – organizations and their respective publics (Bruning, DeMiglio, & Embry, 2006; Ledingham & Bruning, 1998). Ledingham and Bruning (1998) contended that relationships flourished when there was balance, commitment, openness, and trust in the relationship.

Some scholars focusing on online organization-public relationships argue that the Internet allows organizations to have a more balanced relationship with key publics by fostering understanding (Hallahan, 2006). Hallahan (2006) argued organizations need to be committed to and knowledgeable about the use of online media. Furthermore, Hallahan (2006) argued that there were organizational, system-based, and user-specific antecedents, which included commitment, accessibility, and pre-existing relationships with the organization, to creating organization-public relationships online. Hallahan (2006) noted that the process of creating organization-public relationships online included building awareness and adoption, facilitating cognitive learning, creating opportunities for interaction, as well as impression formation. Consequences of creating online-public relationships include fostering knowledge of the organization, positive attitudes toward the organization, communication activity, as well as repetitive behaviors such as purchases (Hallahan, 2006).

Measurement of organization-public relationships online, especially perceived relational strategies such as conversational human voice and communicated relational commitment, may help heighten perceptions of relational outcomes (Kelleher & Miller, 2006; Kelleher, 2009). Kelleher and Miller (2006) argued that "communicating with a sense of humor, admitting mistakes, treating others as human, and providing links to competitors" formed conversational human voice (p. 399). Kelleher and Miller (2006) found that perceptions of relational strategies on websites and blogs were highly correlated with perceptions of relational outcomes such as trust, satisfaction, control mutuality, and commitment. Findings from Kelleher and Miller (2006) lend to further study of organization-public relationships in different online contexts such as social media.

2.2.1. Organization-public relationships in the nonprofit sector

Over the years, the study of organization-public relationships and relationship management in the nonprofit sector has been prolific (Waters & Bortree, 2010; Waters, 2008, 2009, 2010; Waters, Burnett, Lamm, & Lucas, 2009; Waters and Lord, 2009).

Keeping members of key publics informed on a regular basis is crucial for nonprofit organizations in maintaining relationships. O'Neil (2008) asserted that a nonprofit organization's communication efforts with its donors affected perceptions of trust, satisfaction, and commitment. Assertions made by O'Neil (2008) highlighted how important public relations tactics are in relationship management.

Accurate assessments of organization-public relationships allow nonprofit organizations the ability to tailor public relations efforts. Waters (2009) examined the role of symmetrical and asymmetrical communication in the nonprofit-public relationships. Waters (2008) asserted that aligned perceptions in organization-public relationships allowed nonprofit organizations to be more effective in their communication efforts and relationship management. Furthermore, Waters (2009)

Please cite this article in press as: Sisson, D.C. Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors. *Public Relations Review* (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007

contended that knowing the strengths and weaknesses of the public relations practitioner's nonprofit organization allowed for greater focus on opportunities and areas for improvement in organization-public relationships.

Some organization-public relationship scholars (Waters & Lord, 2009) noted that nonprofit orgnaizations are quite good at incorporating relationship cultivation strategies onto organizational websites. While that may be the case for one online communication channel, Waters et al. (2009) noted weaknesses with nonprofit organizations' relational approaches to social media. Nonprofit organizations aspired to be transparent and open with members of key publics on social media, but did not take advantage of opportunities for interactivity (Waters et al., 2009), which may indicative in a lack of knowledge or understanding of social media strategy (Patel & McKeever, 2014) or online relationship management.

Dialogue is central to online organization-public relationships with key stakeholders such as donors and major donors (Waters, 2010), as well as volunteers (Waters & Bortree, 2010). Waters (2010) argued that relationship cultivation strategies affected donors and major donors who donates more than $10,000 differently, particularly when it came to building trust. Furthermore, Waters (2010) posited that increased dialogue with donors and major donors may have a positive impact on donor loyalty. Waters and Bortree (2010) insisted that nonprofit organizations should look for ways to include key stakeholders because of their effect on relationship quality perceptions of satisfaction and commitment to the nonprofit.

2.2.2. Relationship outcomes

In their foundational white paper, Hon and Grunig (1999) discussed the outcomes resulting from relationship management antecedents, or strategies. These relationship outcomes included: truth, satisfaction, control mutuality, commitment, as well as exchange and communal relationships. Trust was defined as "one's party's level of confidence in and willingness to open oneself to the other party" (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 3). Satisfaction was defined as "the extent to which each party feels favorably toward the other because positive expectations about the relationship are reinforced" (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 3). Control mutuality was defined as "the degree to which parties agree on who has the rightful power to influence one another" (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 3). Commitment was defined as "the extent to which each party believes and feels that the relationship is worth spending energy to maintain and promote" (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 3). Exchange relationships were described as "one party gives benefits to the other only because the other has provided benefits in the past" (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 3). Communal relationships were described as "both parties provide benefits to the other because they are concerned for the welfare of the other" (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 3).

2.2.3. Relationship quality

When both parties in an organization-public relationship perceive greater satisfaction, the relationship may be perceived as mutually beneficial. Bruning, DeMiglio, and Embry (2006) argued that when respondents perceived mutual benefit in their relationship with an organization, this provided a competitive advantage for the organization. Members of key publics whose expectations have been met or exceeded may be more satisfied (Bruning et al., 2006). Bruning et al. (2006) posited that assessments about relationships led to assessments about reputations, which places prominence on fostering positive relationships.

Feedback from key publics may positively affect the quality of organization-public relationships (Bruning, Dials, & Shirka, 2008). Programs and strategies crafted by practitioners employing dialogue should be encouraged (Bruning et al., 2008). Bruning et al. (2008) contended that involving members of key publics in campaign creation and message development was beneficial, providing heightened effectiveness of organizational communication. Assertions by Bruning et al. (2008) revealed the need for including dialogue to improve the effectiveness of organizational communication and quality of organization-public relationships.

2.3. Control mutuality

Some scholars have argued that providing more opportunities for control mutuality through dialogue may foster more reciprocity and potentially, strengthen organization-public relationships (Bowen & Sisson, 2015). In order to provide more opportunities for control mutuality, an understanding of control mutuality is necessary. This researcher aims to enhance current discussions of control mutuality in public relations by drawing upon different areas of academia such as interpersonal communication, risk communication, social and organizational psychology, and nonprofit management.

2.3.1. Interpersonal communication

From the interpersonal communication discipline, control mutuality was defined as, "the extend to which relational partners agree on who has the right to determine relational goals" (Canary & Stafford, 1993; p. 238). Control mutuality consisted of two types of control: unilateral and bilateral control (Stafford & Canary, 1991). Unilateral control was characterized by one party having more power in a relationship than the other party, resulting in domineering behaviors (Stafford & Canary, 1991). Stafford and Canary (1991) likened bilateral control to control mutuality in that both parties in a relationship participated equally in decision-making. Furthermore, Stafford and Canary (1991) argued that control mutuality, or bilateral control, was indicative of stability in relationships.

Please cite this article in press as: Sisson, D.C. Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors. *Public Relations Review* (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007

2.3.2. Risk communication

Risk communications scholars have studied control mutuality in terms of decision-making (Garvey & Buckley, 2010; Gurabardhi, Gutteling, & Kuttschreuter, 2005; Palenchar & Heath, 2006, 2007). Gurabardhi et al. (2005) defined control mutuality as "the interaction between the parties in the risk decision-making process and their mutual influence rather than simply unidirectional control of one stakeholder over the other" (p. 501). Gurabardhi et al. (2005) argued that control mutuality consisted of symmetrical communication, dialogue, and feedback from key publics. Garvey and Buckley (2010) expanded on Gurabardhi et al. (2005) by arguing that control mutuality requires "dialogic communication, multiple communication flows, and wide stakeholder participation" was as necessary as dialogue (p. 956). Furthermore, Garvey and Buckley (2010) argued that information exchange facilitated through control mutuality helped shape opinion.

Control mutuality has been equated to shared control (Palenchar & Heath, 2006). Palenchar and Heath (2006) noted that control is a widely studied variable in risk communication. Palenchar and Heath (2006) argued organizations should recognize that key stakeholders want input in organizational decisions in times of uncertainty. Dialogue in community decision-making might result in increased perceptions of individual control (Palenchar & Heath, 2006). Palenchar and Heath (2006) noted that organizations and risk communicators should participate in the communication process and "seek to help people control their lives rather than challenge that sense of control" (p. 152). Community decision-making through dialogue is a process of clear and transparent communication and negotiation (Palenchar & Heath, 2006, 2007), which may be what Palenchar and Heath (2006) referred to as shared control. Additionally, Palenchar and Heath (2007) argued that collaborative community decision-making, in addition to community outreach efforts, were one ethical method of building trust with key stakeholders.

2.3.3. Social and organizational psychology

Control mutuality has been studied by scholars in social and organizational psychology for its role in discussions of psychological ownership. McIntyre, Srivastava, and Fuller (2009) argued that control mutuality was equivalent to internal locus of control in which individuals felt more control over their environment. McIntyre et al. (2009) postulated that control mutuality could be used to foster psychological ownership in organizations. Psychological ownership is "the state-of-mind where the individual feels as if the target of ownership (whole or part thereof) is his/her own" (McIntyre et al., 2009, p. 383). Interestingly, assertions made by McIntyre et al. (2009) suggested that heightened control mutuality might lead to heightened psychological ownership. Heightened control mutuality and heightened psychological ownership may have implications for nonprofit organization donations.

2.3.4. Nonprofit management

In the nonprofit literature, some scholars have likened control mutuality to mutual influence as it pertains to policy creation and fundraising (Sargeant & Lee, 2004), whereas other scholars (Waters & Bortree, 2010; Waters, 2010) equate control mutuality to balance of power.

Some nonprofit scholars have equated control mutuality to mutual influence (Sargeant & Lee, 2004). Sargeant and Lee (2004) defined mutual influence, or control mutuality, as "the extent to which the donor feels that their views have been influenced or shaped by the nonprofit and the extent to which they believe that they might in turn influence the policy of that organization" (p. 617). Assessments of donor behaviors stemmed from examinations of "relationship investment, mutual influence, communication acceptance, and forbearance from opportunism" (Sargeant & Lee, 2004; p. 617). Findings from Sargeant and Lee (2004) suggest that control mutuality, or mutual control, may have implications for how nonprofit organizations should approach relationship management with their donors, as well as policy creation.

Some nonprofit public relations scholars have moved away from the term 'control mutuality' to discuss power in relationships, particularly the balance of power (Waters & Bortree, 2010; Waters, 2010). Grounding arguments in Ferguson's (1984) suppositions about perceptions of power in relationships, Waters (2010) and Waters and Bortree (2010) argued that nonprofit organizations have as much power as donors in the donor-nonprofit organization relationship, particularly in terms of fundraising. For example, Waters and Bortree (2010) noted nonprofitorganizations can deny accepting donations as much as a donor can withdraw financial support from the nonprofit organization. Waters and Bortree (2010) argued that in healthy organization-public relationships in the nonprofit sector there must be a balance of power.

2.4. Social media

Social media research in public relations has focused on different social media typologies (Valentini & Kruckeberg, 2012), early adoption and measurement challenges (Kim & Johnson, 2012), relationship building (McCorkindale, 2012), as well as it implications on corporate reputations (McCorkindale & DiStaso, 2013). Furthermore, according to longitudinal, social media use studies conducted by Wright and Hinson (2012, 2014), social media use is rapidly increasing among public relations practitioners, as well. Social media is typically thought of as "open source (i.e. publicly accessible) media sites on the internet that accept user-generated content and foster social interaction" (Stacks & Bowen, 2013, p. 30).

Please cite this article in press as: Sisson, D.C. Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors. *Public Relations Review* (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007

2.4.1. Social media in nonprofit sector

Social media research in the nonprofit sector has centered on ethical analysis of nonprofit organizations' social media policies (Messner, 2014), effective Twitter practices (Guidry, Saxton, & Messner, 2015), organizational message strategy (Cho & Schweickart, 2015), and the use of stewardship in visuals (Kim & Keeler, 2015).

For the purpose of this study, social media use by a nonprofit organization's key publics such as donors and volunteers may be a means for making them feel invested in nonprofit organizations (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012; Lovejoy, Waters, & Saxton, 2012; Nah & Saxton, 2013). Continued donations and frequency of donations has a relationship with how vested a donor feels about their nonprofit organization and its operations (O'Neil, 2008). Findings from O'Neil (2008) indicated that donation frequency and control mutuality had a positive relationship. Furthermore, O'Neil (2008) posited that "trust, commitment, satisfaction, control mutuality, and communal relationship" were significantly impacted by donors' happiness to recommend the nonprofit organization to others. Implications from O'Neil (2008) allude to the power of social media to show donors what the nonprofit organization does with financial donations and how it operates.

2.4.2. Social media engagement

Some scholars argue that social media engagement consists of three types of activities – consumption, contribution, and creation (Muntinga, Moorman, & Smit, 2011; Tsai & Men, 2013). Tsai and Men (2013) contended that *consumption* was the lowest level of social media engagement since it consisted of reading comments and viewing pictures and videos. *Contribution*, a moderate level of social media engagement, consisted of asking and answering questions on an organization's social media (Tsai & Men, 2013). Tsai and Men (2013) contended that creation was the highest level of social media engagement since it consisted in "publishing and sharing videos and pictures. . .that others can consume and contribute to" (Tsai & Men, 2013). Findings from Tsai and Men (2013) suggested that organizations should foster opportunities for symmetrical communication to engage respondents who may have low levels of social media engagement, or consume social media content.

Based on an extensive review of the literature, opportunities emerged for further evaluation of the control mutuality dimension of organization-public relationships. The following research questions are presented:

RQ1: To what extent to donors feel that they have control mutuality in their relationship with their local animal welfare organization?

RQ2: To what extent do donors engage with their local animal welfare organization on the organization's social media platforms?

RQ3: How are relationship outcome variables, specifically control mutuality, associated with social media engagement?

3. Method

An online survey of donors was conducted to collect data about their perceptions and attitudes towards their relationship with their local animal welfare organization (Shoemaker & McCombs, 2003). Attitudes and perceptions regarding animal welfare organization-donor relationships illuminated how local animal welfare organizations could tailor their social media efforts. The online survey method employed in this study is consistent with previous studies examining relationship quality and relationship management in organization-public relationships in the nonprofit sector (Bortree, 2011; O'Neil, 2008; Waters, 2008).

3.1. Survey design

Based on a cross-sectional design (Shoemaker & McCombs, 2003), this online survey used closed-ended questions and one open-ended question (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Based on an extensive literature review, survey items were adapted and modified from previously established scales: trust, commitment, control mutuality, and satisfaction (Hon & Grunig, 1999), as well as social media engagement (Tsai & Men, 2013). Relevant demographic questions were also included at the end of the survey instrument.

The survey instrument was shown to one content expert and one methodology expert to detect inconsistencies or problems with the instrument. Cognitive interviews with two doctoral students and a former colleague were conducted to assess survey directions, format, and scale items. Reliability measures found in the adapted scales (Hon & Grunig, 1999; Tsai & Men, 2013) were used in this study.

3.1.1. Measurements

Trust ($\alpha = 0.90$) was measured using three adapted items from Hon & Grunig (1999). *Commitment* ($\alpha = 0.86$) was measured using two adapted items from Hon and Grunig (1999). *Control mutuality* ($\alpha = 0.92$) was measured using four adapted items from Hon and Grunig (1999). *Satisfaction* was measured using one adapted item from Hon and Grunig (1999). Hon and Grunig (1999) reported the reliability of the satisfaction scale as $\alpha = 0.89$. Social media engagement ($\alpha = 0.75$) was measured using adapted items from Tsai and Men (2013), including reading, commenting, asking, answering, and uploading. For social media engagement, respondents could answer 0 = Never, 1 = Daily, 2 = Weekly, and 3 = Monthly. For data analysis purposes, responses were re-coded as 0 = No or 1 = Yes as dichotomous variables.

Please cite this article in press as: Sisson, D.C. Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors. *Public Relations Review* (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007

3.2. Sample

Online survey links were distributed by five nonprofit animal welfare organizations to their donor publics (n = 1076). Individuals who received a link to the online survey had donated to their local animal welfare organization in the past five years. Individuals who received the online survey link may or may not "like" or follow their local animal welfare organizations on social media. Demographic information was not provided by the participating local animal welfare organizations, but findings from demographic items on the survey instrument provided more clarity and were consistent with other studies (Neumann, 2010). Neumann (2010) argued that "the typical animal welfare volunteer is female, White, pet-owning, heterosexual, employed, childless, married or partnered, Democrat-leaning, between the ages of 40 and 59, has an income between $50,000 and $99,999, and is Protestant" (p. 351). Email addresses of the individuals who received the online survey link were collected through the local animal welfare organization's previous public relations efforts.

Participating nonprofit animal welfare organizations were purposively selected based on population density and geographic service areas. Participating local animal welfare organizations were located in larger cities and tended to have 1900–11,000 individuals who 'liked' or followed their organization on social media.

3.3. Data collection and analysis

The online survey was built in Qualtrics, and links to the online survey were distributed in three email invitations by the five nonprofit animal welfare organizations as part of their privacy policies. Before the online survey was sent out into the field, IRB approval was obtained.

When all five local animal welfare organizations' donor email address databases were combined, the sample frame totaled 14,747, which meant that this study had a 7% response rate – marginally lower than typical online survey response rates (Dillman et al., 2009). Data collection was staggered over a two-month period to accommodate the peak fundraising period. To help increase response rates, four modest incentives of $25 PetSmart gift cards were raffled to respondents who chose to provide their email address at the end of the survey (Dillman et al., 2009). Communicating random selection offset any social desirability bias attributed to the monetary incentive. Data collection limitations are discussed later in this study.

Based on agreements during the nonprofit organization recruitment process, participating local animal welfare organization names were removed from quantitative and qualitative analyses. Significance in the inferential and descriptive analysis was determined at $p < 0.05$. Beta coefficients equal or greater than 0.05 determined whether a regression was meaningful rather than just statistically significant (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Land, 1969).

Qualitative analysis of the one open-ended survey question used pattern matching (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to group qualitative comments by common theme and relationship variables (Hon & Grunig, 1999). Qualitative data analysis was conducted using NVivo (Version 10). Per agreements with participating animal welfare nonprofits, organizations were de-identified to protect confidentiality.

4. Findings

Findings from this study illuminated some intricacies of control mutuality and social media engagement for local animal welfare organizations and their donor publics. Local animal welfare organizations are nonprofit organizations that rely heavily on individual donations due to clauses in human-specific, government grants and have no affiliation with a national organization (Caroline Radom, personal communication, 2014).

4.1. Respondent demographics

Respondents were predominantly female (84%) with fewer males (16%). Respondents tended to be older than 59-years-old (31%) with other respondents being 50–58-years-old (25%), 42–49-years-old (20%), 34–41-years-old (11%), 26–33-years-old (7%), and 18–25-years-old (6%). Respondents were overwhelmingly Caucasian (96%) with few respondents identifying as African American (1%), Asian/Pacific Islander (1%), Hispanic (1%), and Native American (1%). Respondents had a B.A/B.S. (34%), some college (31%), a M.A./M.S./MBA (19%), or high school or GED (9%). Respondents reported having annual incomes of more than $100,000 (23%), $30,001–$40,000 (11%), and $50,001–$60,000 (10%). Donors tended to donate less than $100 (56%), $101–$200 (20%), or $201–$300 (8%).

Sixty-two percent of respondents identified their role with the local animal welfare organization as a donor. Although, individuals who identified as donors also identified as adopters (27%), X^2 (1, N = 1070) = 28.45, p = 0.00, volunteers (16%), X^2 (1, N = 1067) = 4.28, p = 0.04, and board members (2%), X^2 (1, N = 1068) = 3.84, p = 0.05. This finding seems to suggest that donors can hold several roles in their relationship with their local animal welfare organization.

4.2. RQ1: donors' perceptions of control mutuality

Donors were asked about their perceptions of control mutuality in their relationship with their local animal welfare organization. Donors agreed (40%) or strongly agreed (31%) that their local animal welfare organization and donors similar to them were *attentive to each other's needs and concerns*. Donors agreed (37%) or strongly agreed (31%) that their local

animal welfare organization *valued the opinions* of donors like the respondent. Donors agreed (38%) or strongly agreed (27%) that they felt like they had some *control over their interactions* with their local welfare organization. Donors agreed (22%) or strongly agreed (17%) that whether their local welfare organization gave them a *say in the decision-making* of the content shared from its social media accounts.

'Liking' (or following) a local animal welfare organization's social media platforms may have implications for perception of control mutuality. Respondents who 'liked' (or followed) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms ($M = 15.04$; $SD = 3.95$) and respondents who did not 'like' (or follow) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms were significantly different, $t(697.88) = 2.92$, $p = 0.07$. Respondents who 'liked' (or followed) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms perceived greater control mutuality than those who did not.

4.2.1. Qualitative

Donors, who perceived control mutuality, commented that their opinions and suggestions were valued by the nonprofit organization, which placed importance on listening. Comments of this nature also indicated that donors believed that their opinions and suggestions would have some impact on their relationship with the nonprofit organization. Donors who perceived control mutuality were more likely to offer creative suggestions and ideas for solving perceived organizational problems. For example, one respondent was satisfied with their local animal welfare organization's use of social media to highlight adoption successes, but pointed out that the nonprofit could leverage social media to increase adoptions through posting pictures of animals in need of adoption:

> I wish they would post more pictures of those that need to be adopted. Its great to see pictures of those that found homes but it would also be great to see pictures of those that need homes as well.

Based on qualitative comments, perceived control mutuality may be a means fostering greater social media engagement with donors.

4.3. RQ2: donors' social media engagement

Donors were asked about their social media engagement with their local animal welfare organization. Sixty-eight percent of donors 'liked' or followed their local animal welfare organization on social media, where as 32% of donors did not 'like' or follow their local animal welfare organization on social media. Facebook (62%) and the organization's website (28%) were key social media platforms that donors 'liked' or followed their local animal welfare organization.

In terms of *consumption* (low level engagement), donors read comments on their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms daily (43%) or weekly (34%). In terms of *contribution* (moderate level engagement), donors commented on their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms monthly (24%) or never (46%). Donors engaged in conversation by asking questions on their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms monthly (17%) or never (69%). Donors engaged in conversation by answering questions on their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms monthly (17%) or never (70%). In terms of *creation* (high level engagement), donors uploaded pictures to their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms monthly (11%) or never (80%).

Respondents who 'liked' (or followed) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms donated more than those who did not. Respondents who 'liked' (or followed) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms ($M = 2.45$; $SD = 2.51$) and respondents who did not 'like' (or follow) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms ($M = 2.17$; $SD = 2.30$) were significantly different, $t(672.30) = 1.79$, $p = 0.04$. Furthermore, respondents who 'liked' (or followed) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms were more likely to donate in the future. Respondents who 'liked' (or followed) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms ($M = 5.88$; $SD = 1.71$) and respondents who did not 'like' (or follow) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms ($M = 5.63$; $SD = 1.80$) were significantly different, $t(645.89) = 2.23$, $p = 0.01$.

4.4. RQ3: control mutuality & social media engagement

Regressions between relationship outcome variables and social media engagement were conducted for this study based on an extensive literature review. The only statistically significant and meaningful regression was between control mutuality and social media engagement ($p < 0.05$) (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Land, 1969). The regressions between trust and social media engagement ($p = 0.19$), commitment and social media engagement ($p = 0.26$), and satisfaction and social media engagement ($p = 0.50$) were not statistically significant.

Beta coefficients equal or greater than 0.05 determined whether a regression was meaningful (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Land, 1969). As seen in Table 1, the beta coefficient for commitment ($\beta = 0.11$) was meaningful, whereas the beta coefficient for control mutuality ($\beta = 0.22$) was meaningful and statistically significant. The regressions between trust and social media engagement ($\beta = -0.13$), and satisfaction and social media engagement ($\beta = -0.07$) were neither significant or meaningful (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Land, 1969).

Perceptions of control mutuality affected level of social media engagement beyond whether a respondent 'liked' (or followed) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms. A one-way ANOVA revealed that respondents with heightened perceptions of control mutuality were more likely to answer questions, $F(16, 658) = 3.13$, $p < 0.001$, ask questions,

Please cite this article in press as: Sisson, D.C. Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors. *Public Relations Review* (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007

Table 1
Regressions of relationship variables on social media engagement.

	β	SE	t
Trust	−0.13	0.09	−1.30
Commitment	0.11	0.08	1.13
Control Mutuality	0.22*	0.02	2.33
Satisfaction	−0.07	0.08	−0.68
Adjusted R^2	0.01		

* $p < 0.05$.

F (16, 653) = 2.19, $p < 0.01$, and upload photos, F (16, 659) = 2.11, $p < 0.01$. Based on this finding, it seems that heightened perceptions of control mutuality affected social media engagement, particularly contribution and creation activities (Men & Tsai, 2013; Muntinga et al., 2011).

4.4.1. *Qualitative*

Perceptions of control mutuality were indicative of whether donors offered suggestions for perceived problems with their local animal welfare organization. For example, one respondent explained that leveraging pre-existing relationships on social media would help with fundraising efforts:

> They need to utilize volunteers more so when it comes to social media and fundraising. ...Our staff work so hard and are so loyal to this shelter, that people like me who volunteer are honored to work with our Shelter Manager and entire staff.

Respondents also indicated that they were particularly satisfied with their local animal welfare organization's social media use as a means of sharing information with members of key publics. One donor described the type of information that their local animal welfare organization shared, "Excellent organization; does a great job of utilizing social media to announce events, needs, and adoption information." Several donors indicated that they perceived social media as a credible and effective tool for local animal welfare organizations. In one instance, a donor elaborated on why social media was effective:

> I feel social media has been a wonderful platform for the organization to communicate to the public any emergent or long term needs. Whether it is fostering or when they need assistance with providing food for the animals in the shelter.

5. Discussion

Publics are quite vocal on social media (Bowen, 2013). When online resources such as social media are not used to their full potential in the nonprofit sector (Waters & Lord, 2009), organization-public relationships do not have the ability to flourish online, which can be damaging to donor relations for organizations dependent primarily on donations.

Findings from this study revealed that donors who 'liked' (or followed) their local animal welfare organization's social media platforms perceived greater control mutuality than those who did not. When donors perceived heightened control mutuality, they were more likely to participate in social media engagement activities such as contribution and creation on a local animal welfare organization's social media platforms. Donors, who perceived heightened control mutuality, also noted that they felt that their suggestions and opinions were valued by their local animal welfare organization and would have an impact on its operations. For example, donors encouraged local animal welfare organizations to use social media to communicate about immediate needs of the organization. One donor commented:

> I feel social media has been a wonderful platform for the organization to communicate to the public any emergent or long term needs. Whether it is fostering or when they need assistance with providing food for the animals in the shelter.

Organizations fostering control mutuality show that they care about their publics' suggestions and opinions; thus, donors are valued for more than a financial contribution. From a relationship management perspective, inclusion of donors in decision-making on local animal welfare organizations' social media through dialogue, or symmetrical communication, is indicative of Taylor's (2010) discussion of civil societies and their tolerance of different ideas. The role of dialogue in civil societies (Taylor, 2010) is significant to discussions of control mutuality; control mutuality can be one means of fostering a civil society. Control mutuality may help make relationship management efforts participatory through the negotiation of change, exchange of ideas, and shared control in a nonprofits' relationship with donors. Given this assertion, control mutuality may also help create value for publics and enhance relational quality of the organization-public relationship.

Organizational culture may play a role in whether a nonprofit organization fosters control mutuality in its organization-public relationships (Bowen, 2004; Sriramesh, Grunig, & Dozier, 1996). Heightening control mutuality, especially in social media, requires a commitment of the nonprofit organization to be open to suggestions and creative ideas from key publics

Please cite this article in press as: Sisson, D.C. Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors. *Public Relations Review* (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007

such as donors, as well as autonomy of the public relations professional to facilitate changes in its online relationship management practices (Bowen, 2006; Holtzhausen, 2000).

5.1. Practical implications

Openness and integrative strategies afford organizations and their publics the ability to share control in the organization-public relationship, as well as on social media efforts equally. Openness strategies focus on dialogue and listening to "thoughts and feelings among parties involved" (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 14). Integrative strategies are symmetrical approaches in which "all parties in a relationship benefit by searching out common or complementary interests and solving problems together through open discussion and joint decision-making" (Hon & Grunig, 1999, p. 16). Based on quantitative and qualitative data, the following recommendations for local animal welfare organizations and their public relations professionals are offered for creating openness and integrative strategies that promote control mutuality in social media efforts with donors.

1. Ask for feedback on a regular basis;
2. Incorporate dialogue into strategies to show you value opinions and suggestions;
3. Implement suggestions on a regular basis;
4. And, finally, provide decision-making opportunities.

Showing donors you value their opinions, as well as including donors in decision-making are crucial for donor retention and donation generation (O'Neil, 2008), as well as social media engagement.

5.2. Limitations

Local animal welfare organization recruitment was a significant limitation of this study. Since data collection was conducted during peak fundraising periods, several local animal welfare organizations were hesitant or did not want to participate. Donor email fatigue and increased unsubscribe rates were also significant concerns. One animal welfare organization was concerned about mixed messages from sending a relationship management survey during fundraising season and, therefore, was removed from the study. New data collection should be conducted during non-peak fundraising period to different local animal welfare organizations.

Lack of diversity among donors who responded to this survey was another study limitation. As previously reported, respondents were predominantly female (84%) and overwhelmingly Caucasian (96%), which indicated that there were few respondents who self-identified as male, African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Native American.

5.3. Future research

Future research should also focus on the ethics of control mutuality and its implications for social media practice in the nonprofit sector.

References

Boris, E. T., & Steuerle, C. E. (2006). Scope and dimensions of the nonprofit sector. In W. W. Powell, & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bortree, D. S. (2011). Mediating the power of antecedents in public relationships: A pilot study. *Public Relations Review*, *37*(1), 44–49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.11.002

Bowen, S. A., & Sisson, D. C. (2015). Alumni commitment, organization-public relationships and ethics. In R. D. Waters (Ed.), *Public relations theory and practice in the nonprofit sector* (2nd ed., pp. 63–88). Routledge.

Bowen, S. A. (2004). Organizational factors encouraging ethical decision making: An exploration into the case of an exemplar. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *52*(4), 311–324.

Bowen, S. A. (2006). Autonomy in communication: Inclusion in strategic management and ethical decision-making, a comparative case analysis. *Journal of Communication Management*, *10*(4), 330–352. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13632540610714791

Bowen, S. A. (2013). Using classic social media cases to distill ethical guidelines for digital engagement. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, *28*(2), 119–133. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08900523.2013.793523

Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (1997). Toward a concept and theory of organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *9*(2), 83–98.

Bruning, S. D., DeMiglio, P. A., & Embry, K. (2006). Mutual benefit as outcome indicator: Factors influencing perceptions of benefit in organization-public relationships. *Public Relations Review*, *32*(1), 33–40. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2005.10.005

Bruning, S. D., Dials, M., & Shirka, A. (2008). Using dialogue to build organization-public relationships, engage publics, and positively affect organizational outcomes. *Public Relations Review*, *34*(1), 25–31.

Canary, D. J., & Stafford, L. (1993). Preservation of relational characteristics: Maintenance strategies, equity, and locus of control. In P. J. Kalbfleisch (Ed.), *Interpersonal communication: Evolving interpersonal relationships* (pp. 237–259). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cho, M., & Schweickart, T. (2015). Nonprofits' use of facebook: An examination of organizational message strategies. In R. D. Waters (Ed.), *Public relations in the nonprofit sector* (pp. 281–295). New York: Routledge.

DeCotiis, T. A., & Summers, T. P. (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*, *40*(7), 445–470. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872678704000704

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (Eds.). (2009). Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method. In. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Please cite this article in press as: Sisson, D.C. Control mutuality, social media, and organization-public relationships: A study of local animal welfare organizations' donors. *Public Relations Review* (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2016.10.007

Doh, J. P. (2006). Global governance, social responsibility and corporate-NGO collaboration. In S. Vachani (Ed.), *Transformations in global governance: Implications for multinationals and other stakeholders* (3rd ed., pp. 209–224). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
Ferguson, M. A. (1984). Building theory in public relations: Interorganizational relationships. In *Presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications*.
Fombrun, C. J., & Rindova, V. P. (2000). The road to transparency: Reputation management at royal Dutch/Shell. In M. Schultz, M. J. Hatch, & M. Holten Larsen (Eds.), *The expressive organization: Linking identity, reputation, and the corporate brand* (pp. 77–96). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
Fombrun, C. J. (1996). *Reputation: Realizing value from the corporate image*. Harvard Business Press.
Fussell Sisco, H., Pressgrove, G., & Collins, E. L. (2013). Paralleling the practice: An analysis of the scholarly literature in nonprofit public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *25*(4), 282–306.
Garvey, J., & Buckley, P. (2010). Implementing control mutuality using prediction markets: A new mechanism for risk communication. *Journal of Risk Research*, *13*(7), 951–960.
Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co.
Guidry, J. D., Saxton, G. D., & Messner, M. (2015). Tweeting charities: Perceptions, resources, and effective twitter practices for the nonprofit sector. In R. D. Waters (Ed.), *Public relations in the nonprofit sector: Theory and practice* (pp. 267–280). New York: Routledge.
Gurabardhi, Z., Gutteling, J. M., & Kuttschreuter, M. (2005). An empirical analysis of communication flow, strategy and stakeholders' participation in the risk communication literature 1988–2000. *Journal of Risk Research*, *8*(6), 499–511. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13669870500064192
Hallahan, K. (2006). Online public relations. In H. Bidgoli (Ed.), *Handbook of information security* (Vol. 3) (pp. 769–783). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
Holtzhausen, D. R. (2000). Postmodern values in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *12*(1), 93–114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1201_6
Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations*. The Institute for PR. Available at: Http://www.Instituteforpr.Org/research_single/guidelines_measuring_relationships
Kelleher, T., & Miller, B. M. (2006). Organizational blogs and the human voice: Relational strategies and relational outcomes. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *11*, 395–414. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00019.x
Kelleher, T. (2009). Conversational voice, communicated commitment, and public relations outcomes in interactive online communication. *Journal of Communication*, *59*(1), 172–188. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01410.x
Kim, E., & Johnson, T. L. (2012). Social media in public relations practice: Early adopters discuss use and challenges of measurement. In S. C. Duhé (Ed.), *New media and public relations* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 48–55). New York: Peter Lang.
Kim, C. M., & Keeler, J. (2015). Compassion international and pinterest: Developing brand personality and demonstrating stewardship through visuals. In R. D. Waters (Ed.), *Public relations in the nonprofit sector* (pp. 296–309). New York: Routledge.
Land, K. C. (1969). Principles of path analysis. *Sociological Methodology*, *1*, 3–37. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/270879
Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (1998). Relationship management in public relations: Dimensions of an organization-public relationship. *Public Relations Review*, *24*(1), 55–65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0363-8111(98)80020-9
Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *17*(3), 337–353.
Lovejoy, K., Waters, R. D., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Engaging stakeholders through Twitter: How nonprofit organizations are getting more out of 140 characters or less. *Public Relations Review*, *38*(2), 313–318.
McCorkindale, T., & DiStaso, M. W. (2013). The power of social media and its influence on corporate reputation. In C. E. Carroll (Ed.), *The handbook of communication and corporate reputation* (pp. 497–512). John Wiley & Sons.
McCorkindale, T. (2012). Follow me or Be my friend: How organizations are using twitter and facebook to build relationships and to communicate transparently and authentically. In S. C. Duhé (Ed.), *New media and public relations* (2nd ed., pp. 67–74). New York: Peter Lang.
Mclntyre, N., Srivastava, A., & Fuller, J. A. (2009). The relationship of locus of control and motives with psychological ownership in organization. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *21*(3), 383–401.
Messner, M. (2014). To tweet or not to tweet: An analysis of ethical guidelines for the social media engagement of nonprofit organizations. In M. W. DiStaso, & D. S. Bortree (Eds.), *Ethical practice of social media in public relations* (pp. 82–95). New York: Routledge.
Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M., & Smit, E. G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: Exploring motivations for brand-related social media use. *International Journal of Advertising*, *30*(1), 13–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.2501/IJA-30-1-013-046
Nah, S., & Saxton, G. D. (2013). Modeling the adoption and use of social media by nonprofit organizations. *New Media & Society*, *15*(2), 294–313. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461444812452411
Neumann, S. L. (2010). Animal welfare volunteers: Who are they and why do they do what they do? *Anthrozoös*, *23*(4), 351–364. http://dx.doi.org/10.2752/175303710x12750451259372
O'Neil, J. (2008). Linking public relations tactics to long-term success: An investigation of how communications contribute to trust, satisfaction, and commitment in a nonprofit organization. *Journal of Promotion Management*, *14*(3/4), 263–274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10496490802623358
Patel, S. J., & McKeever, B. (2014). Health nonprofits online: The use of frames and stewardship strategies to increase stakeholder involvement. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *19*(4), 224–238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1507
Radom, Caroline (2014, August 4). Initial Informational Interview.
Palenchar, M. J., & Heath, R. L. (2006). Responsible advocacy through strategic risk communication. In K. Fitzpatrick, & C. Bronstein (Eds.), *Ethics in Public Relations: Responsible Advocacy* (pp. 131–153). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
Palenchar, M. J., & Heath, R. L. (2007). Strategic risk communication: Adding value to society. *Public Relations Review*, *33*(2), 120–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2006.11.014
Sargeant, A., & Lee, S. (2004). Trust and relationship commitment in the United Kingdom voluntary sector: Determinants of donor behavior. *Psychology & Marketing*, *21*(8), 613–635. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mar.20021
Shoemaker, P. J., & McCombs, M. E. (2003). Survey research. In G. H. Stempel, D. H. Weaver, & G. C. Wilhoit (Eds.), *Mass communication research and theory* (pp. 231–251). Boston; London: Allyn and Bacon.
Sriramesh, K., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (1996). Observation and measurement of two dimensions of organizational culture and their relationship to public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *8*(4), 229–261.
Stacks, D. W., & Bowen, S. A. (Eds.). (2013). Social media. In *Dictionary of public relations measurement and research*. Institute for Public Relations Measurement Commission. Retrieved from. http://amecorg.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Dictionary-of-Public-Relations-Measurement-and-Research-3rd-Edition-AMEC.pdf
Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *8*(2), 217–242. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407591082004
Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). . *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches* (Vol. 46) SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
Taylor, M. (2010). Public relations in the enactment of civil society. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of public relations* (pp. 5–15). SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
Tsai, W.-H. S., & Men, L. R. (2013). Motivations and antecedents of consumer engagement with brand pages on social networking sites. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, *13*(2), 76–87. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2013.826549
Valentini, C., & Kruckeberg, D. (2012). New media versus social media: A conceptualization of their meaning, uses, and implications for public relations. In S. C. Duhé (Ed.), *New media and public relations* (2nd ed., Vol. 46, pp. 3–12). New York: Peter Lang.
Waters, R. D., & Bortree, D. S. (2010). Building a better workplace for teen volunteers through inclusive behaviors. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *20*(3), 337–355.

Waters, R. D., & Lord, M. (2009). Examining how advocacy groups build relationships on the Internet. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *14*(3), 231–241. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.354
Waters, R. D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., & Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, *35*(2), 102–106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.006
Waters, R. D. (2008). Applying relationship management theory to the fundraising process for individual donors. *Journal of Communication Management*, *12*(1), 73–87. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13632540810854244
Waters, R. D. (2009). Comparing the two sides of the nonprofit organization-donor relationship: Applying coorientation methodology to relationship management. *Public Relations Review*, *35*(2), 144–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.011
Waters, R. D. (2010). Increasing fundraising efficiency through evaluation: Applying communication theory to the nonprofit organization–donor relationship. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *40*(3), 458–475.
Wright, D. K., & Hinson, M. D. (2012). Examining how social and emerging media have been used in public relations between 2006 and 2012: A longitudinal analysis. *Public Relations Review*,. Retrieved from. http://www.prsa.org/Intelligence/PRJournal/Documents/2012WrightHinson.pdf
Wright, D. K., & Hinson, M. D. (2014). An updated examination of social and emerging media use in public relations practice: A longitudinal analysis between 2006 and 2014. *Public Relations Journal*, *8*(2). Retrieved from. https://www.prsa.org/Intelligence/PRJournal/Vol8/No2/index.html#.V4BOPVcSPZE