by Louis Stein

Director, Campaign and Community Interpretation Dept., Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc., New York

POR the first time in the history of these annual conferences, the name of the American Jewish Public Relations Society appears on the program as an organization. That fact, and the very existence of the Society form a point of departure for this paper.

We are seeking to assess the current place and role of public relations as a professional component in Jewish communal life, examine some of the problems which face us, and chart the future directions of this rapidly developing field.

Public relations is a young profession, although many of its principles and techniques have been practiced for a long time, in the same fashion that there were people who practiced social work long before there was a recognizable and recognized field. The emergence of public relations as a profession has taken place largely from the time of World War II, and although it is still a fledgling among professions it is building up the requisite experience in theory, training, standards, and practice which are necessary to the maturity of any discipline.

The most marked development in public relations has taken place in business and industry, where the field has risen most rapidly to a position of status and

\* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Atlantic City, N. J., May 21, 1960.

recognition as an important function of management. A 1954 study of companies in the Chicago area found that 55 out of 74 respondents created their PR departments from 1 to 15 years ago, with 28 having established them 1 to 5 years before 1954. Sixty out of 84 companies said they planned to expand their PR activities during the next 5 years.

Development in the health and welfare field has been slower. In the Social Work Yearbook of 1960, Frances Koestler, Public Relations Director of the Jewish Child Care Association of N. Y., notes:

"Public relations as a management function, a concept now widely recognized by industry, has yet to achieve universal acceptance in the field of social welfare. In most agencies the distinction between public relations (which influences policy) and publicity (which announces policy) is overlooked. However, particularly in the national agencies, recent years have seen a growing awareness of the larger scope of public relations and a corresponding rise in the status, responsibilities, and influence of the public relations practitioner.

"The growing concern of social workers with the status of their profession has engendered a new respect for the techniques of mass communication and a willingness to recognize PR as a specialized and valuable discipline."

In this context, what are the goals of public relations, particularly in the general health and welfare field, and in Jewish communal service?

Mrs. Koestler tells us that "the public relations function in a social welfare agency embraces everything that helps or hinders the agency's being known, understood, liked, used, and supported. Its content ranges from the organization's very name and symbol to its total program planning. Properly employed, the public relations function enters into every area of agency performance."

Relating this concept to Jewish communal service, and perhaps moving it a step further, is the statement by Donald B. Hurwitz, Executive Director of the Federation of Jewish Agencies of Philadelphia, prepared for the manual on year-round interpretation to be published by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. Mr. Hurwitz says:

"Any question about the need for a yearround public relations program is an academic question. There is no agency, no federation, no community service of any kind without one. It may well be that there is no planned year-round program, but every act of every agency representative every day of the year is, in fact, a public relations act. Failure to understand this simple truth underlies many of the public relations sins both of omission and of commission. The sound of a voice, the attitude of a receptionist, the appearance of a letter-every detail-is part of the total public relations experience. The real question, then, is not whether there should be a year-round program, but rather how best to plan, to organize, and to exploit a program so as to achieve the most fruitful results, in the most intelligent and economical

"Basically, the objective must be to implant a philosophy of society, from which voluntary action on all fronts can flow without interruption—one which brings together the historic, social and spiritual roots of our community life and inspires a sense of responsibility, a feeling of mutual interest, a willingness to share. We speak frequently of the 'what' and 'how' of our activities, but these are of minor importance without a clear understanding of the 'why.' Any program which is built without such a solid

base must be superficial and its results must be superficial."

These, then, are the goals of public relations. But Mr. Hurwitz' emphasis on the planned program, and the dangers of practicing interpretation without planning, bring us to still another question, namely, the relationship of the person who has staff responsibility for organizing a public relations program to the management and committee structure of the agency. Although there are many titles given to this person, his function has been defined succinctly by Gordon Brown, Executive Director of the State Charities Aid Association of New York. Mr. Brown was formerly public relations director of that agency.

The public relations director, Mr. Brown said recently, in an address to the Health and Welfare Public Relations Association of Greater New York, must be "a member of the management team in an organization... and members of a management team need to have three skills: technical, human and conceptual."

Technical skills, he said, "enable the public relations director to articulate, communicate, and evaluate responses . . . and are skills requiring knowledge, and facility as to method as well as content."

Human relations skills, he went on, enable the public relations director to work productively with others and gain acceptance for his role in the agency.

Conceptual skills enable one to grasp what the agency is all about, understand the organization's relative position in its field of work. Such skills, Mr. Brown added, equip the public relations director to make valuable contributions to the agency executive. The fact that the public relations worker is not responsible for the total operation of the agency gives him an objectivity that the executive cannot have in the same dimension. When knowledge is coupled with objectivity, perspective results.

Now. measured against these goals. where does the Jewish public relations worker stand, in relation to his own field. health and welfare organizations generally, and industry? One of the most important steps undertaken by the American Jewish Public Relations Society during its two years of existence. was the organization of a Committee on Standards and Ethics with responsibility to carry out three studies: (1) a factfinding survey on the role and working conditions of public relations people; (2) development of a code of ethics: and (3) examination of inter-agency relationships. The first of these tasks has almost been completed and, despite some limitations, offers for the first time a picture of the field. We are beginning to know who we are, what we do, where our strong points are—and our weak ones how we relate to social work and the generic public relations field, and what our next steps must be to carry on the continual professionalization of our work.

The AJPRS study, initiated in 1958. consisted of a questionnaire designed to elicit meaningful information in the areas of background and experience, salary and working conditions, participation in policy-making functions, and responsibility for use of media. We received 39 replies, divided among 22 public relations directors, 15 non-directors. and 2 who did not report their titles. This sample, from a universe of about 125 public relations practitioners in Jewish agencies throughout the country—of whom about 70 are members of the AJPRS—is broad enough to give us findings which will have great meaning and value in achieving our objectives.

There is further meaning in relating these findings to the situation found in industrial public relations and in the general field of health and welfare interpretation. The material concerning industrial public relations is drawn from the 1954 study, previously cited, of public relations as a management function, in the Chicago area. The study was sponsored by the Public Relations Society of America and was executed by Douglas Lyke. Material on the health and welfare field was drawn from a 1953-54 study sponsored jointly by the Public Relations Society of America and the National Publicity Council. While comparisons cannot be exact, they nevertheless afford important guides to an understanding of conditions in the field.

The AJPRS and Chicago studies found that the majority of public relations directors are in the 30-49 age range and that the AJPRS people tend to be a better educated group. Statistics concerning educational background and training show that of the 39 AJPRS respondents, 8 earned M.A.s, 25 had B.A.s, and 6 had no college degrees. In the Chicago study, 8 out of 30 department heads had 5 or more years of college, 11 had Bachelor's degrees, and 11 had educations ranging from 3 college years to completion of grade school. There was no comparable data in the Health and Welfare study. Among the 22 AJPRS department heads, 7 had 5 or more years of college, 11 had Bachelor's degrees, and 4 had 1 or more years of college.

Among 15 AJPRS non-director respondents, 4 hold M.A.s, 9 have Bachelor's degrees, 1 had some college training and 1 did not have any college experience. The two respondents who did not indicate titles held B.A.s. In the Chicago study, there were 47 non-director responses. Nine of these had 5 or more years of college, 31 had Bachelor's degrees, and 7 did not complete college (5 of these 7 had some college training).

The academic preparation for public relations shows significant differences between the AJPRS and Chicago studies. In the AJPRS study, 14 respondents indicated that they had majored in English, 11 in Social Sciences, 8 in Journal-

ism, and 6 with scattered concentrations. The Chicago study revealed that among the older practitioners, 6 had majored in Business, 3 in Journalism, 3 each in Law and Science, 2 each in English and the Social Sciences, and 7 with other subjects. The non-directors, a much younger group, showed a distinctly new trend. Eleven majored in Journalism, 7 in English, 5 in Business, 3 each in the Social Sciences and Philosophy.

Regarding prior experience in public relations, both surveys showed that the majority of respondents had worked in allied or kindred fields prior to entering public relations. In the Jewish field 22 out of 31 responding had journalistic experience, and the balance came from the television and radio, or editorial fields. In the industrial study, almost one-third had journalistic backgrounds, while 45 per cent had had some kind of public relations experience prior to joining their present firms.

Comparisons as to salary levels are unfortunately not available on as broad a scale as other information because returns in the industrial study were limited to eight companies. Other than noting that the eight returns seemed to indicate much higher levels than presently found in social work generally, we can examine the results yielded by the AJPRS and the NPC-PRSA studies and possibly relate them to one or more fields in Jewish communal service.

The median "present" salary of the total group of 39 AJPRS respondents is \$9,000-\$10,000. The range for the 22 directors was \$7,500 to \$15,400, and the range for 15 non-directors was \$6,570 to \$10,600. We know that there are several salaries of directors which are higher than those reported in the survey but the owners of those salaries were not among the respondents.

In the study conducted among health and welfare agencies by the NPC and PRSA, it was found that salaries for national agency public relations directors tend to move upward as the size of the staff increases. Although this tendency is not as pronounced among Jewish agencies, it is nevertheless present in some degree.

Of 42 agencies reporting in the 1954 NPC-PRSA study, the range was from under \$5,000 to over \$15,000. Nearly half were in the \$5,000 to \$9,999 group, and 15 were in the \$10,000 to \$14,999 bracket.

It is interesting to note some of the features of this salary study. Of 9 people who constituted one-man staffs, 8 were receiving \$5,000-\$9,999. With staffs of 2-4 people, 11 out of 22 were in the \$10,000-\$14,999 group and with staffs of 5 people or more, 5 out of 11 were in the \$15.000 and over salary bracket. Presumably salaries have risen in the six interim years, but comparisons tend to show that one-man operators in the Jewish field were higher salaried than their counterparts in the health and welfare field, but that public relations directors of larger staffs in the Jewish field lagged behind similar people in the non-sectarian agencies.

A comparative note cited in the health and welfare study, which was tabulated and analyzed by the Opinion Research Corporation at Princeton University, says that "public relations staffs in medium and large industry are generally larger, and salary ranges higher. For example, industrial PR directors with a staff of less than ten ranged in salary from \$5,000 to \$25,000, with about half in the \$10,000 to \$14,999 group."

In assessing the development of public relations as a management function, one of the most important yardsticks is the degree to which public relations directors participate in the formulation of agency policy as a whole, and particularly as PR considerations affect policy and program. The AJPRS study sought answers in this area from the 22 people who oper-

ated on the administrative level. My own feeling about the replies is that while they yielded valuable information, the vagueness of language in many instances tended to confirm an impression that this is a PR function which is observed, in many instances, on a superficial level, or that the PR director himself is on unsure ground and moves very gingerly.

Eighteen out of the 22 respondents reported that they participate actively in the policy formulation of their agencies. However, the important consideration here is the manner of that participation and the level on which it is sought and utilized. In this context the depth of such participation varied widely.

Although this was an open end question, the replies were vague, and did not lend themselves easily to analysis. Many said that they engaged in an "informal" type of arrangement based upon conferences and discussions. Others replied in greater detail, indicating formal participation in administrative, Board and committee meetings.

All of the administrative respondents said that they attend Board meetings. However, only 10 of the 22 are required to give reports at these meetings on a routine basis, and 4 do so on an "occasional" or "sometimes" basis.

In applying public relations implications of agency policies, 20 directors said that they were consulted, but 5 qualified this by adding, "at times," or "not always." Only 7 reported that the consultation in this area included meetings with lay boards, committees, or individual leaders, in concert with the executive director. Thirteen reported varying processes involving individual or staff meetings with the executive.

The other aspects of the AJPRS study deal with content of public relations programs, and working conditions, which are not central to our discussion today.

The picture that emerges from the

AJPRS study, in relation to experience and to other studies, shows that the professional PR worker who practices in the field of Jewish communal service, has had much the same growth as his counterparts in industry and in the health and welfare field (although in many respects he has not advanced to the same degree) grapples with many of the same problems of standards and status, and is in the mainstream of a young and vigorous development.

Where the field goes from here, how it matures, how it defines and fulfills its professional objectives, depends to a great extent upon the individuals within that field and how they organize to meet those objectives. The formation of the AJPRS was the greatest step forward that public relations workers in Jewish communal service have ever taken. But the job is only at its beginning, and the AJPRS will only be as successful in assuring further development as its membership will allow it to be.

What are some of the "next steps" that seem to be indicated? Briefly stated these actions should have as their aim the consolidation of recent gains, the strengthening of AJPRS as the solid underpinning of the profession, and constructive movement toward higher standards and status, including recognition of the broader functions of public relations.

- 1. The first task, of course, is to complete and publish the study quoted here, and then to consider the logical implications and implementation of the findings.
- 2. With the conclusion of the study comes the opportunity to develop a code of ethics and standards. Preliminary work in this area has been done, and the project should now be pushed to its conclusion, as a means of setting ethical standards of behavior in relation to the field, the agency, colleagues, and media. Two codes of ethics, that of the National Association of Social Workers and the Public Relations Society of America have

special applicability here. Both are binding upon their members.

Both codes are basically concerned with the same principles, as applied to their own fields, and I need only quote a few examples to illustrate this.

In relation to the employing agency, the social work code enjoins each member to give accurate information concerning his background when applying for a position, accept employment and continue to work only in an agency whose policies and procedures permit him to follow the ethical principles of the code, hold himself responsible for quality and quantity of performance, as an administrator to accept responsibility for providing channels for staff participation in forming policy and procedures, and accept the obligation to attempt—through appropriate channels—to change those agency policies and procedures which violate professional standards.

In relationships with colleagues, the social work code enjoins those of its members who may be working in a setting where another group has major responsibility to maintain identification with the social work profession and integrate it with the major function and purpose of the organization. Also, to treat with respect the position and accomplishments of colleagues, assume responsibility for sharing professional knowledge, treat differences of opinion respectfully, and treat all colleagues without discrimination.

The code also calls upon members to affirm and interpret the importance of professional education, training, and experience, the rights of social workers to good personnel practices, and the acceptance of responsibility to help protect the community against unethical practice.

Regarding the field of social work itself the code calls for support of efforts to improve the standards of the profession, enhancement of public confidence through maintenance of integrity, defense of the profession against unjust attack, and the assumption of responsibility for helping to correct conditions which lead to justifiable criticism of the profession.

The PRSA code is in many respects similar to the NASW version, but some of its aspects which deal with elements peculiar to public relations are worth noting here.

The code declares that a member has the duty of adhering to generally accepted standards of accuracy, truth, and good taste; of safeguarding the confidences of both present and former employers; of not engaging in any practice which tends to corrupt the integrity of channels of public communication; of not intentionally disseminating false or misleading information; of not employing methods tending to be derogatory of another member's client or employer; of not basing compensation on the achievement of certain results: of not encroaching upon the professional employment of another unless both are assured that there is no conflict between the two engagements; and of severing his relations with any organization when he believes his continued employment would require him to conduct himself contrary to the principles of the code.

- 3. The study dealing with interagency relationships should be activated and carried forward.
- 4. One of the basic long-range tasks of the field is the establishment and improvement of training facilities in public relations. This involves both the social work field and colleges and universities. During the past year or so the AJPRS has been conducting discussions with the Yeshiva University School of Social Work, regarding the development of a curriculum in public relations for graduate social work students. This should be extended to other social work schools. In addition, the AJPRS should relate to schools of social work, colleges and uni-

versities in matters relating to the general development of the public relations field. This is especially important in light of the conditions disclosed by Mrs. Koestler in the 1960 Social Work Yearbook. She notes that there is an "absence of widespread facilities for professional training," and points out the following:

- (a) The New York School of Social Work is the only one to offer a group of courses and field work in public relations.
- (b) Social work schools at Boston College, U. of Tennessee, New York University, and University of Pennsylvania offer elective public relations courses.
- (c) Training in public relations, as a generic field, applicable to a "variety of settings," continues to show some progress.
  - Boston University has a School of Public Relations, and Bethany College and Nasson College have departments.
  - (2) Eleven colleges and universities provide for a public relations major.
  - (3) 78 colleges and universities offer one or more courses.
- 5. With the consciousness that public relations is a separate profession, whose techniques can be applied in many fields, should come efforts on the part of the AJPRS to relate to other professional organizations, within and without the field of social work. Primary to this de-

velopment is a continued, close relationship with the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service and possible affiliation with that group. Other groups with whom close relationships should be maintained include the health and welfare field, the National Publicity Council, and public relations organizations in the industrial field.

- 6. Organized attempts should be made to establish interpretive relationships with administrators of Jewish organizations. Mutual understanding of role, function, and status is indispensable for the maximum mutual benefit of agencies and public relations practitioners.
- 7. Continue to offer the facilities of the AJPRS as a forum for exchange of experience and ideas, and to keep abreast of developments in the field.
- 8. Develop to a greater extent the literature of the field, both as to theory and technique.

There are many other points of development which others could suggest, and which have equal validity with these, but if we have gained some perspective of our past and can use this milestone day as the springboard for discussion and action leading to greater growth for our field and for us as professionals, I say, "dayenu."

## MINUTES OF ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING HELD AT AMBASSADOR HOTEL MAY 22, 1960

## President's Report

President, opened the meeting by reviewing some of the newer developments within the Conference. There was, he indicated, a vitality among the various fields that had resulted in proposals for the Conference to consider the affiliation of new and emerging groups. The new Association of Jewish Homes for the Aged, for example, had proposed formal affiliation with the Conference. This was being examined, Dr. Shapiro stated, but no formal action was required at this date.

Secondly, the American Jewish Public Relations Society was holding its meeting during the time and place of our own annual meeting. This is not a formally-affiliated group, but there are indications that a closer tie might be proposed at a later date.

An informal request had also come to the Conference from the Los Angeles Association of Jewish Communal professionals. The enlargement of Jewish communal services on the West Coast was continuing, Dr. Shapiro said, and demanded more formal Conference recognition.

Finally, he noted that more programming requests were developing from professionals in the smaller Jewish communities. In this area as well, more attention would be required.

Another major development, Dr. Shapiro went on, was the stimulation of local Conference activities, whereby the major papers at the Conference, and the summary of the buzz session groups, would be used within local communities as the basis for cross-discipline discussion. With a minimum of mechanics, he felt, this could be achieved easily, with minor modifications adapted to the structure of the local Jewish community. It was a very fruitful way of bringing the Conference thinking to the entire country for the professionals who were unable to attend the annual meeting.

Dr. Shapiro concluded his remarks by noting that a determined effort would also be made during the year, to interpret to the laity the importance of the Conference to the professional field. This understanding was important, he indicated, to encourage the widest form of Conference attendance and participation.

## Resolutions

David Weiss, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, presented the following resolution:

Whereas the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, May 20-24, 1960, is another salient in the progressive, dynamic contributions of our Conference, now completing 62 years of continuous service to the American Jewish Com-