Public relations in public institutions: A research on the effectiveness of communication process

Engin Çelebi[1]

Abstract

Public relations practitioners can assume many different roles in public institutions. The common goal of these different roles is to try to influence the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of the target groups through effective communication strategies. Thus, support from the public is considered. In this study, it is aimed to find out the effective strategies to improve the quality of the relations with the target groups of public institutions. For this purpose, the relationship between the communicative process established by public institutions with their target groups and relational results were examined. The research conducted on 251 people revealed that perceived communicative skills of local public institutions had positive effects on public relations perceptions (trust, commitment, satisfaction). The most important dimension is satisfaction. On the other hand, a weak relationship was found between the communicative process and control mutuality. This finding indicates that public relations department is not effective in the decision making process in public institutions. The results of the research are proposed to improve the relational results between public institutions and target groups.

Keywords: Public Relations, Public Institutions, Relationship Management, Communication Management, Public Communication.

Introduction

According to Grunig (1992), one of the pioneers of public relations, "*communication between citizens and the government is negotiated rather than absolute.*" Because public relations are part of the democratic process in which ideas are freely reflected. Therefore, it can be said that communication with the public shouldn't be limited to providing one-way information. According to Van Ruler and Vercic (2005), governments should use public relations not only to announce decisions, but also in policy making. Citizens want to be effective in decision-making as well as being informed. Therefore, public opinion should be included in the decision-making process and needs and concerns should be taken into consideration. This is possible with two-way symmetrical communication.

As in all organizations, it is necessary to establish positive relations with target groups in public institutions and to strengthen these relations psychologically. In this respect, relationship management in public relations can be applied as an approach that improves social values, creates

---
[1] PhD, Cukurova University, Faculty Of Communication, Department of Public Relations and Advertising, engincelebi@cu.edu.tr iD Orcid ID: 0000-0001-5791-8080

public value and strengthens democratic relations in public institutions. For this, it is necessary to understand what the relational results between public institutions and public opinion are, how to develop them and how to achieve mutually beneficial results.

Target groups of public institutions may vary. Disagreements and conflicts between these different groups are likely to occur. According to Taylor (2000) *"the potential for public relations in nation building, reconciling divided societies."*

Liu and Horsley (2007) identified 8 factors that adversely affect public relations in the public sector; *"politics, focus on serving the public, legal constraints, extreme media and public scrutiny, lack of managerial support for public relations practitioners, poor public perception of government communication, lagging professional development and federalism."* Public relations strategies and practices aimed at developing long-term and high-quality relations can play a complementary and inclusive role between different cultural characteristics, values and ideologies.

Johansson and Larsson (2015) compared the role of public relations in the private and public sectors and found no difference between the roles of *"Monitor and evaluator"* and *"Key policy and strategy advisor"* of public relations . In the comparison, the authors found the greatest difference between public and private sector public relations employees in the role of "Issues management expert/Trouble shooter" and "External communication expert". These roles have been put more on public relations practitioners in the private sector. They found the roles of "Communication manager" and "Communication technician" of public relations more prominent in the public sector. Chen (2009) states that public relations in public institutions are seen as a strategic function especially in the field of crisis management and, communication and development of relations with stakeholders and this contributes to the institutionalization of public relations profession.

Relational results are also important in terms of the ability of citizens to characterize the power of their relations with public institutions. Understanding relational outcomes can help us understand the structure and strength of citizens' relationships with public institutions.

Relationship Building Strategies In Public Relations

General definitions of public relations are made on the concept of "relationship management". For the first time in 1984, relationship management as a value-creating concept, which Ferguson drew attention to, was accepted as a good theory and formed the basis of public relations theories and practices. Strategies for establishing relations in public relations are the determination of both the institutions and the public benefit. Grunig and Huang (2000, p. 28) stated that long-term indicators should be focused on relationship management. To this end, it is necessary to assess how perceived, sustained and measured strategies for establishing and managing relationships by target groups.

Hon and Grunig (1999) borrowed relationship building strategies from interpersonal communication studies (Stafford and Canary, 1991). *It's consist of trust, satisfaction, commitment and control mutuality.* Ledingham and Bruning (1998) described relationship development strategies as; to make the promises is "trust", sharing the plans for the future is "openness", considering community welfare is "investment", social solidarity is "involvement", and loyal to the benefit of society is "commitment". According to the authors, these five criteria and behaviors are independent variables that lead to the attitudes and behaviors of the public, and the link between them is also related to "satisfaction".

Many articles in the literature have used these elements as common value, and most of the research has revealed that relationship-building strategies are positively associated with relational outcomes such as trust, commitment, satisfaction and control mutuality (Çelebi, 2018a).

There is a long-term relationship between the citizens and public institutions. Relational outcomes such as public engagement, participation in public services, perceived responsibility and assessment of public benefits may form the basis for the accurate development and measurement of public institutions' relationships with their target groups. In all of these, it is necessary to analyze communication strategies (process) differently in order to reveal the effect and importance of

relational results in public relations. For this, the quality of all elements, assessments and attitudes that define the strategic relations between public institutions and the public needs to be determined and clarified. Because, according to Grunig and Jaatinen (1999, p. 219), although the general principles for relational outcomes in public relations are the same for all organizations, the specific conditions under which the principles should be applied may vary.

Ledingham (2001) found that relationship building strategies (trust, satisfaction, commitment, control mutuality) are an effective tool in evaluating the relational quality of public institutions with their citizens and predicting citizen behavior. According to Hong et al. (2012), *"citizens are not homogeneous and therefore a wide range of factors such as demographic characteristics (income, gender, education, etc.), media use, social cognition, and participation in social groups should be taken into consideration."* Determining specific characteristics is necessary to understand the level of trust in the state and ultimately to ensure better establishment and maintenance of state-public relations. Cutlip, Center and Broom (1994) explained the importance of government public relations activity in terms of two democratic principles: the government's responsibility to communicate its activities to citizens and their involvement in decision-making. Dialogue between communicative demand and supply should be made possible here.

Communication between public institutions and the public is a necessity. Public relations play an important role in the effectiveness of public institutions. Confidence and cooperation are needed in order to conduct public relations practices productively and effectively. Public relations employees should be able to reflect their professional feelings to the practices considering how trust and cooperation can be established and strengthened, how not only short-term but long-term results can be achieved and value the creation process. Harris and Fleisher (2016) argue that public institutions need to listen to the government's views, and that politicians may not want to hear their own strategic views. However, public institutions need to establish good relations with society in order to survive.

Measurement Of Relational Results In Organization-Public Relations

Relational results are used to determine the strength of the relationships of organizations with their target groups. In order to explain the value of relational results in public relations, it is necessary to look at the most general definition of public relations. Because understanding the definition of public relations will help in understanding the relational results. Cutlip, Center and Broom (1994, p.2) defined public relations as; *"Public relations is the management function that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends."* This definition has been accepted by the pioneers of public relations (Ledingham and Brunig, 1998; Hon and Grunig, 1999; Heath and Coombs, 2006; Broom and Sha, 2013).

If we consider mutuality as a relational process, we can say that relational results consist of trust, commitment and satisfaction. Hon and Grunig (1999, p.3) define the trust (that he divides into 3 as integrity, dependability and competence*) "One party's level of confidence in and willingness to open oneself to the other party."* The authors describe satisfaction as *"The extent to which each party feels favorably toward the other because positive expectations about the relationship are reinforced."* And commitment is *"The extent to which each party believes and feels that the relationship is worth spending energy to maintain and promote."* It can be said that all dimensions are of equal importance. We can say that control mutuality leads to relational results (Hon and Grunig, 1999; Huang, 2001; Ki and Hon, 2007).

The authors considered control mutuality as balance of power and stated that it is a fundamental dimension of establishing and maintaining a link between an organization and its target groups. The power balance shouldn't complicate symmetrical communication. Symmetrical communication is important to facilitate dialogue and strengthen relations between public institutions and the public.

The measurement of public relations practices in public institutions is a subject of debate. This may require different methods and different assessments under different conditions. Understanding what the public values is an opportunity to better plan public relations practices,

provide better services, and measure public support. Approaches such as non-discrimination among citizens, fair and equal treatment of all, and evaluation of opinions and criticisms may strengthen the relational results such as trust, commitment and satisfaction.

Dialogue Process: More dialogue can mean more engagement and interest and can affect the positive evaluation of relationships. Dialogue is a strategic management function in relationship management. Dialogue plays a very important role in the public relations process. In order to achieve common goals, people or groups with different emotions or believes should come together. Dialogue and symmetric communication strategies, at the heart of relationship management, should be utilized to find common ground and achieve common goals. Relational quality can be improved if individuals or groups believe that their opinions and suggestions are evaluated through dialogue and reliability is ensured.

Dialogue means collaborative decision-making, respect for all, and consideration of all parties, based on the principles of reciprocity. The sincerity necessary for dialogue is about a moral experience and is difficult to imitate. The code of ethics should be followed for dialogue and communicative consistency in internal and external actions is required. Dialogue can be seen as a tool to measure the reliability of public institutions. The quality of the dialogue depends on how much people in the communication process explain themselves. This requires clearness, consistency and reliability.

Digital media are one of the easiest and most effective areas for public institutions to establish and develop dialogue with their citizens. Public relations academics and practitioners say that the greatest value of digital, social or mobile communication tools is the ability to reach stakeholders or key groups directly, and that online interaction is positively and significantly associated with relational outcomes (trust, satisfaction, commitment, control mutuality) (Kelleher 2009, p. 184). According to Tolbert and Mossberger (2006) *"there is a statistically significant relationship between trust and use of a local government web site, as well as other positive assessments of federal and local governments."* It is necessary to make a different place in the process of creating dialogue within the power of social media. Avery and Graham (2013, p.287) showed that the effectiveness of by government officials in social media increased the expectations and satisfaction of citizens.

Trust: According to the literature review, trust in the State has been accepted as a key indicator of the quality of state-public relations regardless of socio-political or cultural differences (Kim, 2005). Public relations practitioners must first establish trust in order to create public value and to enable public cooperation. Trust is the most important component of good public administration. Collaboration on trust-based public values is an advocate for decision-making.

It can generate trust between a government and its citizens to encourage participation in democratic processes (Hong et al., 2012). In order to increase trust and efficiency, focus should be on what public values are, how they are created, how public institutions are associated with the public, and how value creation processes can be strengthened. Public relations contribute to the mobilization and development of public support. In this context, public relations activities serve as a trust-based bridge between public institutions and the public.

It can be said that trust alone may not increase the relational results of public relations department and activities in public institutions. However, it can be predicted that trust is the basis of relational results. Therefore, trust has an important role on attitudes, believes and behaviors. According to Welch (2006:151) *"trust and distrust can be viewed as co-existing in a fluid zone of approval."* Therefore, especially public institutions should be very careful when measuring the element of trust.

Strategic Communication Management: According to Bruning (2002, p. 44) in order to manage relationships effectively, practitioners need to conceptualize communication with target groups members and use communication to support a continuous relationship, rather than simply transferring information.

According to Sommerfeldt and Kent (2015, p. 235*), strategic communication involves organizations' attempts to communicate with stakeholders and the public as part of efforts to advance organizational objectives and tasks.* These communicative efforts are generally directed towards the establishment of

"relations" with public and stakeholders. All communicative applications should focus on relational outcomes and develop target groups relationships. For this, it is necessary to measure how communicative practices affect relational perceptions. This may require different strategies and tactics. On the other hand, Hutton et al. (2001) didn't find *a strong correlation between reputation and overall spending on corporate communication activities.* Therefore, communicative activities should be aimed at strengthening the relational results. According to Rise and Sommerville (2013, p.300) productive internal and external relationship build is a key issue for effective communication in government public relations in democracies, but this is fundamentally mitigated by the political context.

Strategic communication management links corporate identity, corporate communication and corporate actions to create a sense of integrity in public relations practices. The communicative consistency thus generated leads to accurate evaluations. Communicative consistency requires that there is no difference between what is said and done and leads to accurate evaluations.

Transparency: Communicative consistency (such as transparency) has an impact on the perception of reality, accuracy and reliability of the target groups. According to Grimmelikhuijsen and Meijer (2012, p. 3) *"Transparency is the availability of information about an organization or actor allowing external actors to monitor the internal workings or performance of that organization."* Transparency can be seen as increasing accountability and information sharing, engaging the target groups in the decision-making process, thereby providing confidence and development. Transparency is an important component of goodwill and trust and positively affects relational outcomes. Transparency, which can be considered as an application of corporate culture, starts with how citizens are included in public institutions. Considering relationship-building strategies, transparency practices become an obligation rather than a necessity. Since transparency is a reflection of corporate culture, public relations practitioners should create institutional support for transparency practices. Corporate transparency requires interaction with target groups members, active information, responsiveness and accountability. For effective communication strategies on management practices based on transparency and originality, it is necessary to focus on people's attitudes, values, character traits and motivating messages.

According to Mengu and Mengu (2016), public communication is essential for development and sustainability, and the objective is to inform the public objectively in cultural, social, political and economic terms through the use of feedback. In this process, according to Scott (2006), citizens demand greater accountability and transparency from public institutions and want to be directly involved in issues affecting them.

Fairbank et al. (2017, p. 35) found that (besides the five models by Heise (1985*); openness, using a variety of channels to disseminate information, seeking feedback from agency publics, avoiding mixing politics and communication and making managers responsible for an agencies communication culture) the communication processes as well as principles of stakeholder management and models of public relations, are essential to transparent communication.*

Research
Creating Research Questions

Citizens may feel that they don't have a say in decision-making processes. This may cause them to see themselves as a less valuable person. The principle of control mutuality and asking citizens for their recommendations can help create the feeling that they are involved in decision-making. Being informed about decision-making and institutional strategies can help citizens think they care. As the attitude of the public, opinions and behaviors were generally accepted as the main results of a public relations program (Ki and Hon, 2009). Ki and Hon (2007: 1) found that perceptions of satisfaction and control mutuality developed a positive attitude towards the organization and positive attitudes were the pioneers of supportive behavioral intentions towards the organization. He says that the measurement of mutual benefit should be at the center of public relations assessment, and that measuring mutually beneficial results can help practitioners demonstrate competitive advantages associated with effective public relations practice.

In public institutions, relational results show the degree to which expectations are met and their perceptions of value. In this research, the effects of the communication process (control mutuality) established by public institutions with the public on relational results will be investigated. Citizens may not have the same experience even if they receive services from the same public institution. The three research questions will measure the relationship between citizens' commitment, satisfaction and trust to public institutions and the communicative process. We can say that control mutuality leads to relational results. (Hon and Grunig, 1999; Huang, 2001; Ki and Hon, 2007). Therefore, the hypotheses are developed as follows;

H1: The communication process established by public institutions with citizens will positively affect the citizens' **trust** level.
H2: The communication process established by public institutions with citizens will positively affect the citizens' **satisfaction** level.
H3: The communication process established by public institutions with the citizens will positively affect the citizens' **loyalty** level.
H4: The communication process established by public institutions with citizens will positively affect the level of **control mutuality** of citizens.
H5: The quality of the communicative process will increase the supportive behavior of citizens towards public institutions.
H6: There is a significant correlation between relational results.

Method of Research

Research has been included in public institutions in Turkey. The data were collected from the citizens on a voluntary basis with the survey technique. The reliability of the questionnaire items was tested on 40 participants with a preliminary study. Data collection took approximately 5 months. A total of 251 people were included in the study.

Within the scope of the research, the time required for the formation of an attitude towards public institutions was determined as 1 year and the questionnaire was applied to persons over 18 years of age who served at least 1 year at the public institution.

A 5-point likert-type scale was used for the research scale (1-strongly disagree, 5-strongly agree). For the questionnaire, the scale developed by Sweetser and Kelleher (2016) was used for the communicative process, and the scale used by Hon and Grunig (1999) for the public relations institute was used for the relational results. 7 items were used for the communicative process (E.g. this public institution positively address complaints or queries), 5 items were used for mutual control (E.g. This public institution believes that the views of citizens are valuable), 6 items were used for the trust (E.g. This public institution fulfills its promises to citizens), 5 items were used for the commitment (E.g. I think this public institution is trying to show a long-term commitment to citizens), 5 items were used for satisfaction (E.g. Generally, I am satisfied with this public institution). This scale was previously adapted to Turkish and the validity of the questionnaire was confirmed (Çelebi and Bilir, 2019).

Research Findings

The internal consistency of the 28-item questionnaire resulted in .867 Cronbach's Alpha. This score shows that the items used in the scales are acceptable.

In order to test the hypothesis 1, the relationship between the communication process established by public institutions with citizens and the trust of citizens to public institutions was examined. As shown in table 1, a significant correlation was found between them. (.523 correlation coefficient) Thus hypothesis 1 is supported.

Table 1: Relationship between communication process and trust

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Communication Process & Trust	251	,523	,000

In order to test the accuracy of hypothesis 2, the relationship between the communication process established by citizens with public institutions and their feelings of satisfaction was examined and it was concluded that the communicative process had a positive effect on satisfaction (correlation coefficient .642). The results are shown in table 2.

Table 2: Relationship between communication process and satisfaction

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Communication Process & Satisfaction	251	,642	,000

As shown in table 3, the coefficient of the relationship between the quality of the communication process and the sense of commitment to the public institutions was found to be 492. Therefore, it was concluded that the communication process positively increased the sense of commitment. This result supports hypothesis 3.

Table 3: : Relationship between communication process and commitment

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Communication Process & Commitment	251	,492	,000

In order to test the validity of hypothesis 4, the relationship between the communication process established by the citizens with the public institutions and the degree of control mutuality was examined and it was concluded that the communicative process had a positive effect on the control mutuality. However, there is a weak correlation between them (, 310). The results are shown in table 4.

Table 4: : Relationship between communicative process and control mutuality

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Communication Process & Control Mutuality	251	,310	,000

The hypothesis 5, about the relationship between the communication process and the supportive behaviors of the citizens towards the public institutions, was tested and the correlation coefficient between the communication process and the supportive behaviors was measured as ,557. The results are shown in table 5.

Table 5: The effect of communication process on supportive behaviors
Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Communication Process & Behavioral Support	251	,557	,000

In order to test H6, whether there was a significant correlation between the relational results was tested, and as shown in table 6, the correlation coefficients were positive between trust and control mutuality ",676" between trust and satisfaction ",598 ", and between control mutuality and satisfaction ",622". According to these results, the fact that commitment is in a weak relationship with other relational results (trust ,269; control mutuality ,280; satisfaction ,319) is an issue that needs further research.

Table 6: Correlation between relational results
Correlations

		Trust	Control Mutuality	Commitment	Satisfaction
Trust	Pearson Correlation	1	,676**	,269**	,598**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000
	N	251	251	251	251
Control Mutuality	Pearson Correlation	,676**	1	,280**	,622**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000
	N	251	251	251	251
Commitment	Pearson Correlation	,269**	,280**	1	,319**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000
	N	251	251	251	251
Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	,598**	,622**	,319**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	
	N	251	251	251	251

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Conclusion And Discussion

According to the results of the research, the communicative process plays an important role in the relations of public institutions with citizens. The communicative process is a pioneering dimension for the public institutions to gain the trust, satisfaction and commitment of the citizens. The communicative process contributes to the formation of positive attitudes and behaviors. Similarly, Ledingham (2001) found that relational elements are an effective tool for evaluating the relational quality of public institutions with their citizens and predicting citizen behavior. Therefore, the power of control mutuality in the communicative process should be recognized and incorporated into all public relations practices.

With two-way symmetrical communication, it can be predicted that the inclusion of citizens in the decision-making process may increase the relational results. Because according to the research data, the communicative process plays a positive role on the relational results. Therefore, the communication barriers between the public institutions and the citizens should be removed,

environments enabling should be established for two-way symmetrical communication and, reliable channels should be provided for feedback. Problems and ideas should be clearly expressed. It is necessary to understand what is involved in the communicative process, which is not the same as control mutuality. Because, Bennett (2016, p. 11) states that "power and influence depend on the control and strategic use of information".

Kim (2010) found that *"citizens' satisfaction with self-expressed values was positively associated with public trust in government".* On the other hand, relational results are dynamic and may vary according to experience. Therefore, it should be considered together with the social and cultural values of the segments of the public. Commitment to public institutions and commitment to the state may show similarities and differences. These may vary over time depending on the generation and demographic characteristics. It may differ emotionally and psychologically. Nevertheless, it is expected to be open and reliable in all conditions and to provide timely and sufficient information. Public relations practitioners are obliged to make this possible. Thus, citizens' commitment to public institutions can be strengthened. Commitment to the desire to maintain the relationship can be considered as a result.

According to Park (2003) influence of cultural perspectives such as gender inequality, in the relationship hierarchy, social and occupational consensus, personal influence model and the behavior of personal relations are very effective in public relations of government systems. Similarly, Huang (2000) suggested that personal influence model is the most popular strategy to strengthen public relations activities.

Rawlins and Bowen (2005, p. 718) said that there is no such thing as "general public" in modern public relations. According to the authors, most organizations today have a large number of target groups distinctions. The size and service area of public institutions may vary. However, it can be said that every public institution needs strategic communication practices. A good perception of strategic communication can strengthen positive relational outcomes and ultimately support public institutions.

There is a need for ethical and moral strategies in public relations practices to be implemented in public institutions as in all sectors. Ethical and moral practices increase trust in public relations practices and create originality. Research shows that unethical behaviors negatively affect the relationship building strategies in corporate public relations such as relational commitment, customer service, optimism and responding to criticism (Sweetser 2010, p. 288). An ethical communication dialogue is based on conditions such as mutual respect, sincerity, honesty, accepting mistakes and allowing persuasion (Johannesen et al. 2008, p.70). Ethical principles affect the relational outcomes process. For this, first of all, an ethical culture should be created in public institutions. The dignity of citizens should be respected and institutional and ethical values should be harmonized with each other. Problems between different groups of citizens (ethnic, political, religious, etc.) should be prevented.

Habermas (1991) states that a public space should be created in which citizens can legitimately express their views freely, and that decisions can be taken that reflect rational, agreed and common interest. It is believed that the nature of digital media facilitates citizens' access to state information and thus supports information sharing and government participation in decision-making (Searson and Johnson, 2010). How social media are used as a public relations function has been addressed, in particular, to serve democratic, participatory and transparency models in various state institutions (Graham, Avery, 2013). Kim (2005) emphasized *the advantage of the enhanced functionality of government websites that can facilitate two-way communication between government and citizens and thus promote transparency, usability and interaction.* Also according to Brown (2005) *"Four aspects of e-government have lasting impacts on public administration: citizen-centered service, information as a public resource, new skills and working relationships, and accountability and management models".* In other way, Karlsson et al. (2013: 18) said that digital media can establish relationships with a large number of people, but should not be seen as a key tool in political public relations. According to Authors, this is a complementary tool and not a powerful alternative to other traditional ways of reaching the public.

In recent years, it has been observed that the use of digital media channels such as websites, blogs and social networking sites have increased by public institutions. Through these communication channels, it is aimed to gain public trust by providing information to the public, answering questions of citizens and getting feedback from citizens. Hong (2013) found that such experiences provided in digital environments increase the sense of confidence as a result of his research. Bruning et al. (2008) found out that *"both relationship attitudes and dialogue positively affect respondent evaluations and intended behaviors toward an organization"*. On the other hand, it can be said that unsuccessful experiences may decrease trust.

Openness may vary in public institutions, but transparency is necessary to some extent, including processes of giving and sharing information. One of the most important problems between public and public institutions is transparency and it is one of the key terms. To overcome this problem, strategies to engage more interactively, encourage participation, facilitate dialogue, increase listening and provide feedback are needed to identify public attitudes, behaviors and information needs. Transparency indicates that the public is using the information asked to them in a real way and is open to potential criticism or discontent.

Within the scope of the study, the relationship management model is proposed to increase the level of satisfaction, trust and commitment of citizens to public institutions. From a strategic point of view, in order to create a sense of commitment, first of all it is necessary to create a sense of satisfaction and trust and to strengthen them psychologically (Çelebi, 2018b). It can be said that a sense of commitment can occur when trust and satisfaction are formed. Therefore, we can logically consider commitment as a final result. However, the research data found a weak relationship between commitment and other relational outcomes. It can be said that specific strategies may be needed to create a sense of commitment within each group as public institutions serve target groups with different views and opinions.

The effect of demographic characteristics, expectations and individual differences on relational results was not investigated. In future research, defining the characteristics of public institutions and revealing public perceptions that may affect these characteristics may yield beneficial results. Because the power and quality of the relational results may differ according to the differences of public institutions and may cause different cognitive and emotional perceptions. In order to provide lifelong value to citizens, all dimensions that may affect relational outcomes should be investigated. Future research can be extended to include all these variables.

References

Avery, E.J. & Graham, M.W. (2013) "Political Public Relations and the Promotion of Participatory, Transparent Government Through Social Media", International Journal of Strategic Communication 7:4, pp. 274-291.

Bennett, W. L. (2016) "News: The politics of illusion", (tenth ed.), University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Broom, G. M. & Sha, B. (2013) "Cutlip and Center's effective public relations", Boston, MA: Pearson.

Brown, D. (2005) "Electronic government and public administration", International Review of Administrative Sciences 71(2), pp. 241-254.

Bruning, S. D. (2002) "Relationship building as retention strategy: Linking relationship attitudes and satisfaction evaluations to behavioral outcomes", Public Relations Review 28, pp. 39–48.

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, pp. 25–31.

Chen, N. (2009) "Institutionalizing public relations: A case study of Chinese government crisis communication on the 2008 Sichuan earthquake", Public Relations Review 35, pp. 187–198.

Cutlip, S. M., Center, A.H. & Broom, G.M. (1994) "Effective Public Relations", Upper Sadddle River, NJ : Prentice-Hall.

Çelebi, E. (2018a) "Measuring the Effectiveness of Organizational Public Relations: An Experimental Research on Crisis Response Strategies", Journal of Communication Theory & Research 46, pp. 275-290.

Çelebi, E. (2018b) "Measuring Effectiveness Of Relationship Management In Public Relations: A Research On Sport Clubs", International Conference On Management, Economics & Social Science - ICMESS 2018, Proceedings Of Researchfora International Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark, p.1-4.

Çelebi, E. & Bilir, F.P. (2019) "Effects Of Relationship Management On Sports Consumers: A Research On Private Sports Centers", in: Recent Advances in Social Sciences, Eds. by. Efe,R., Koleva,I., Öztürk, M., and Arabacı, R., Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle, pp.452-468.

Fairbanks, J., Plowman, K.D. & Rawlins, B.L. (2007) "Transparency in government communication", Journal Of Public Affairs 7, pp. 23-37.

Ferguson, M. A. (1984) "Building theory in public relations: Interorganizational relationships", Presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, Gainesville, FL.

Graham, M.A. & Avery, E.J. (2013) "Government Public Relations and Social Media: An Analysis of the Perceptions and Trends of Social Media Use at the Local Government Level", Public Relations Journal, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 1-21.

Grimmelikhuijsen, S. G. & Welch, E. W. (2012) "Developing and testing a theoretical framework for computer-mediated transparency of local governments", Public Administration Review 72(4), pp. 562–571.

Grunig, J. (1992) "Excellence in public relations and communication management", (Ed. J. Grunig) Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grunig, J. E. & Huang, Y. H. (2000) "From organizational effectiveness to relationship indicators: Antecedents of relationships, public relations strategies, and relationship outcomes", In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), "Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to public relations" (pp. 23–54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E. & Jaatinen, M. (1999) "Strategic, symmetrical public relations in government: From pluralism to societal corporatism", Journal of Communication Management, Vol. 3(3), pp. 218–234.

Habermas, J. (1991) "The structural transformation of the public sphere" (Translated by. T. Burger and F. Lawrence) Cambridge, The MIT Press.

Harris, P. & Fleisher, C. S. (2016) "The SAGE Handbook of International Corporate and Public Affairs", London, Sage Publication.

Heath, R. L. & Coombs, W.T. (2006) "Today's Public Relations: an Introduction", Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Hon, L.C. & Grunig, J.E. (1999) "Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations", Institute for Public Relations, pp.1-40.

Hong, H. (2013) "Government websites and social media's influence on government-public relationships", Public Relations Review 39, pp. 346– 356.

Hong , H., Park , H., Lee, Y. & Park, J. (2012) "Public Segmentation and Government–Public Relationship Building: A Cluster Analysis of Publics in the United States and 19 European Countries", Journal of Public Relations Research 24:1, pp. 37-68.

Huang, Y. (2000) "The personal influence model and Gao Guanxi in Taiwan Chinese public relations", Public Relations Review 26, pp. 219–236.

Huang, Y. (2001) "Values of Public Relations: Effects on Organization-Public Relationships Mediating Conflict Resolution", Journal of Public Relations Research 13:4, pp. 265-301.

Hutton, J.G., Goodman, M.B., Alexander, J.B. & Genest, C.M. (2001) "Reputation management: the new face of corporate public relations?", Public Relations Review 27, pp. 247–261.

Johannesen, R.L. , Valde, K.S. & Whedbee, K.E. (2008) "Ethics in human communication", Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Johansson, B. & Larsson, L. (2015) "The Complexity of Public Relations Work: PR Managers in the Public and Private Sector in Sweden", Nordicom Review 36 (1), pp.125-139.

Karlsson, M., Clerwall, C. & Buskqvist, U. (2013) "Political Public Relations on the Net: A Relationship Management Perspective", Public Relations Journal, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 1-23.

Kelleher, T. (2009) "Conversational voice, communicated commitment, and public relations outcomes in interactive online communication", Journal of Communication 59, pp. 172–188.

Ki, E. & Hon, L.C. (2007) "Reliability and Validity of Organization: Public Relationship Measurement and Linkages Among Relationship Indicators In a Membership Organization", Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, Vol. 84, No. 3, pp. 419-438.

Ki, E.J. & Hon, L. C. (2009) "Causal linkages between/among relationship cultivation strategies and relationship quality outcomes", International Journal of Strategic Communication 3:4, pp. 242–263.

Kim. S.E. (2005) "The role of trust in the modern administrative state: An integrative model", Administration & Society, 37(5), pp. 611–635.

Kim, S. (2010) "Public Trust in Government in Japan and South Korea: Does the Rise of Critical Citizens Matter?" Public Administration Review, Vol. 70, Issue 5, pp. 801-810.

Ledingham, J.A. (2001) "Government-community relationships: extending the relational theory of public relations", Public Relations Review 27, pp. 285–295.

Ledingham, J. A. & Brunning, S.D. (1998) "Relationship Management in Public Relations: Dimensions of an Organization Public Relationship", Public Relations Review, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 55-65.

Liu, B.F. & Horsley, J. S. (2007) "The Government Communication Decision Wheel: Toward a Public Relations Model for the Public Sector", Journal Of Public Relations Research 19 (4), pp. 377-393.

Mengu, S. & Mengu, M. (2016) "Making Sense of Public Relations as Culture Policy", Journalism and Mass Communication, Vol. 6, No. 10, pp. 632-639.

Park, J. (2003) "Discrepancy Between Korean Government and Corporate Practitioners Regarding Professional Standards in Public Relations: A CoOrientation Approach", Journal of Public Relations Research, Vol. 15:3, pp. 249-275.

Rawlins, B. L., & Bowen, S. A. (2005) "Publics. In Encyclopedia of public relations", (Ed.) Heath, R.L., pp. 718–721. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rise, C. & Sommerville, I. (2013) "Power-sharing and political public relations: Government press relationships in Northern Ireland's developing democratic", Public Relations Review 39, pp. 293–302.

Searson, E. M. & Johnson, M.A. (2010) "Transparency laws and interactive public relations: An analysis of Latin American government Web sites", Public Relations Review 36, pp. 120–126.

Scott, J. K. (2006). "E" the people: Do U.S. municipal government web sites support public involvement?", Public Administation Review, Vol. 66(3),pp. 341–353.

Sommerfeldt, E.J. & Kent, M.L. (2015) "Civil Society, Networks, and Relationship Management: Beyond the Organization–Public Dyad", International Journal of Strategic Communication 9:3, pp. 235-252.

Sweetser, K. D. (2010) "A losing strategy: The impact of nondisclosure in social media on relationships", Journal of Public Relations Research, Vol. 22(3), pp. 288–312.

Sweetser, K.D. & Kelleher, T. (2016)" Communicated commitment and conversational voice: Abbreviated measures of communicative strategies for maintaining organization-public relationships", Journal Of Public Relations Research, Vol. 28, No. 5–6, pp. 217–231.

Taylor, M. (2000) "Media relations in Bosnia: A role for public relations in building civil society", Public Relations Review, Vol. 26(1), pp. 1–14.

Tolbert, C.J. & Mossberger, K. (2006) "The Effects of E-Government on Trust and Confidence in Government", Public Administration Review, Vol. 66/3, pp. 354-369.

Van Ruler, B. & Vercic, D. (2005) "Reflective Communication Management, Future Ways for Public Relations Research", Annals of the International Communication Association, Vol. 29:1, pp. 239-274.

Welch, M. (2006) "Rethinking relationship management: Exploring the dimension of trust", Journal of Communication Management, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 138-155.